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Federal Programs

School Improvement

*All Title I Schools required to complete improvement plans* must assure to the Pennsylvania Department of Education the school’s compliance with the following expectations by developing and implementing an improvement plan or otherwise taking actions that meet the expectations described by the Assurances listed below. **Assurances 1 through 12**

The school has verified the following Assurances:

- **Assurance 1**: This School Improvement Plan contains Action Plans that address each reason why this school failed to make Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and/or is identified in the lowest 10% of Title I schools.

- **Assurance 2**: The resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented have been identified and the necessary approvals obtained to allow the procurement and allocation of these resources.

- **Assurance 3**: Documentation of the resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented; including specific, related budgetary information, is available for review upon request by the LEA or SEA.

- **Assurance 4**: If designated as a Priority or Focus School the district has determined whole-school meaningful interventions directly associated with the unmet AMO(s).

- **Assurance 5**: The school improvement plan covers a two-year period.

- **Assurance 6**: The school has adopted and/or continued policies and practices concerning the school’s core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement.

- **Assurance 7**: High performing LEAs with varied demographic conditions have shown they share common characteristics. The following nine characteristics are embedded in the plan:
  - Clear and Shared Focus
  - High Standards and Expectations
  - Effective Leadership
  - High Levels of Collaboration and Communication
  - Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Aligned with Standards
• Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning
• Focused Professional Development
• Supportive Learning Environment
• High Levels of Community and Parent Involvement

• **Assurance 8:** Focus Schools must implement locally developed interventions associated with a minimum of one of the below principles, while Priority Schools must implement all seven:
  
  o Providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership or demonstrating to the State Education Agency that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum and budget.

  o Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; and (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools.

  o Redesign the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration

  o Strengthen the school’s instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with state academic content standards.

  o Use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data.

  o Establish a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students’ social, emotional and health needs.

  o Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement

• **Assurance 9:** The school improvement plan delineates responsibilities fulfilled by the school, the LEA and the SEA serving the school under the plan.
• **Statement 10**: Establish specific annual, measurable targets for continuous and substantial progress by each relevant subgroup, which will ensure all such groups of students, update to align with the new AMOs to close the achievement gap.

• **Statement 11**: A mentoring/induction program used with teachers new to the school exists; the essential elements of the mentoring/induction program are documented and the documentation is available for review upon request by LEA or SEA authorities.

• **Statement 12**: All parents with enrolled students will receive an annual notification letter which includes the reasons for its identification as Priority or Focus and the school’s plan to improve student achievement.

**Assurance 13**

The school is communicating with parents regarding school improvement efforts via the following strategies:

• School web site
• School newsletter
• District web page
• WikiSpaces, Yahoo, Facebook, etc.
• Board meeting presentations
• Periodic mailings/letters, postcards, etc.
• Invitations to planning (etc.) meetings
• Family Night/ Open House / Back to School Night/ Meet-the-Teachers Night, etc.
• Regular Title 1 meetings

**Assurance for Priority Schools (Annually Updated SIP)**

The school has indicated the following response to indicate if it has completed an evaluation with the assistance of our Academic Recovery Liaison:

No

**Coordination of Programs**

**Technical Assistance**

*The LEA provides guidance, technical assistance and support to schools developing schoolwide programs in the areas of needs assessment, comprehensive planning, implementation, and evaluation of schoolwide program and requirements.*

Describe the technical assistance provided. Explain why it was considered high quality technical assistance.
Damali Brunson-Murray assists with providing guidance in meeting the Title I requirements and monitors to ensure compliance. Sarah Kelly from CAIU assists with Title I and School Improvement Planning requirements and updates via the web application and face-to-face meetings January 2017 and March 2017. Ms. Kelly walked us through the process to ensure critical information and supporting documentation is evident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Kelly</td>
<td>4/13/2018</td>
<td>School Improvement Discussion Marshall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Assessment of Progress**

Describe strategies or processes that have included teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to improve the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.

Administrators have included several strategies to ensure that all teachers are included in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to improve the achievement of individual students as well as the overall instructional process. These include continuous grade level data chats, team meetings, and observation/Walkthroughs.

In order to assist students in meeting challenging achievement goals, increased instructional time is a necessity. Please indicate (yes/no) the options for increased time that students will have access to if identified as at-risk of failing or failing to meet achievement standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended School Day/Tutoring Programs</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before School</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch/Study Periods</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer School Program</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-class Instructional Support</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull Out Instructional Support</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consolidation of Funds**

Please indicate if your school/charter is consolidating state, local, and federal funds. (Your school/charter must keep on file an approval letter from your Regional Coordinator).
No, the school does not intend to consolidate the funds.
Needs Assessment

School Accomplishments

Accomplishment #1:

2013 PVAAS Reading:

- There is moderate evidence that 6th and 8th grades exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic and Basic in 6th grade, and Below Basic in 8th grade showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic growth.

- There is significant evidence that 7th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to score Below Basic, Basic and Proficient showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2014 PVAAS Reading:

- There is moderate evidence that 6th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

- There is evidence that 7th and 8th grade met the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, 8th grade students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015 PVAAS Reading:

- There is evidence that show 6th grade met the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

- There is moderate evidence that 8th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic or Basic showed moderate evidence of exceeding the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2016 PVAAS Reading:

- There is moderate evidence that 8th grade exceeded the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

- The 3-year growth measure for 8th grade shows moderate evidence of growth.
• Students who were predicted to be Basic in 8th grade showed moderate evidence of exceeded the PA Standard for Academic Growth. Students who were predicted to be proficient met the standard for growth.

2017 PVAAS Reading:

• There is significant evidence that 8th grade exceeded the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

• The 3-year average growth measure for 8th grade shows significant evidence of growth.

• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in 6th and 8th grade, and Basic for 8th grade, showed moderate evidence of exceeded the PA Standard for Academic Growth. Students who were predicted to be proficient in 7th and 8th grade met the standard for growth.

Accomplishment #2:

2013 PVAAS Math:

• There is moderate evidence that 5th and 7th grades exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic and Basic in 5th grade, and Below Basic, Basic and Proficient in 7th grade showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic growth.

• There is significant evidence that 6th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to score Below Basic, Basic and Proficient showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2014 PVAAS Math:

• There is evidence that 5th grade met the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• There is significant evidence that 6th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic and Basic showed moderate evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• There is moderate evidence that 8th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015 PVAAS Math

• There is moderate evidence that 6th grade exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence of exceeding the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• There is evidence that 8th grade met the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2016 PVAAS Math
• Grade 7 met the PA standard for Academic Growth, and Grade 8 showed significant evidence of exceeding the PA Academic Standard for Growth.

• Grade 6 students were placed in the lowest 40% compared to other students across the state; however, they show moderate evidence of exceeding the PA standard for Academic Growth.

• Students who were predicated to be Below Basic in Grade 8 showed moderate evidence of Exceeding the PA Academic Standard for Growth.

2017 PVAAS Math:

• There is moderate evidence that 7th and 8th grades exceeded the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

• The 3-year growth measure for 8th grade shows significant evidence of growth.

• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in all grades showed moderate evidence of exceeded the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

Accomplishment #3:

2013 PVAAS Science:

According to 2013 PVAAS, there is evidence that 8th grade met the standard for PA Academic Growth in Science.

2016 PVAAS Science:

• Grade 8 met the PA Standard for academic growth.

• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence of exceeding the PA Standard for Academic growth.

2017 PVAAS Science:

• Grade 8 showed moderate evidence of exceeding the PA Standard for academic growth.

• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence of exceeding the PA Standard for Academic growth.

Accomplishment #4:
2013 PVAAS Writing:

According to 2013 PVAAS, there is evidence that 8th grade met the standard for PA Academic Growth Writing.

Accomplishment #5:
PSSA Math:

2013

- According to the Math PSSA, there was an increase of 9% of 4th graders who scored proficient or advanced from 2012 to 2013, and an increase of 5.1% of 7th graders who scored proficient or advanced from 2012 to 2013.

2014 Proficient or Advanced:

- Grade 4 increased by 2.6% from 2013.
- Grade 6 increased by 2.0% from 2013.
- Grade 8 increased by 13.3% from 2013.

2016 Proficient or Advanced:

- Grade 5 increased by 20% from 2015.
- Grade 6 increased by 7% from 2015.

Accomplishment #6:
PSSA Reading

2014 Proficient or Advanced:

- Grade 4 increased by 6% from 2013.
- Grade 6 increased by 2.5% from 2013.

2016 Proficient or Advanced
- Grade 5 increased 10% from 2015.
- Grade 6 increased 3% from 2015.
- Grade 8 increased 5% from 2015.

**Accomplishment #7:**

**PSSA Science**

**2014 Proficient or Advanced:**

- Grade 8 Science increased by 8.7% from 2013.
- Grade 8 Writing increased by 5.2% from 2013.

**2016 Proficient or Advanced:**

- Grade 8 increased by 9% from 2015.

**Accomplishment #8:**

**2013-2014 SY Attendance:**

Target is 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Report 1</th>
<th>Report 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>95.78%</td>
<td>93.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td>97.51%</td>
<td>89.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>98.03%</td>
<td>91.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>90.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2014-2015 SY Attendance:**

Target is 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Report 1</th>
<th>Report 2</th>
<th>Report 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>83.39%</td>
<td>89.76%</td>
<td>72.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015-2016 SY Attendance:

Target is 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Report 1</th>
<th>Report 2</th>
<th>Report 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>96.80%</td>
<td>96.96%</td>
<td>95.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td>96.45%</td>
<td>94.37%</td>
<td>91.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>97.29%</td>
<td>94.82%</td>
<td>95.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>96.91%</td>
<td>95.11%</td>
<td>96.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.93%</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.12%</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016-2017 SY Attendance

*Report 3 (through march 31, 2017)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Report 1</th>
<th>Report 2</th>
<th>Report 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>93.98</td>
<td>93.93</td>
<td>94.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td>92.93</td>
<td>94.13</td>
<td>96.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>97.68</td>
<td>90.87</td>
<td>94.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>91.29</td>
<td>96.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Concerns

**Concern #1:**

*2013 PVAAS Writing*
• There is evidence 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Writing. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic growth.

**Concern #2: PVAAS Reading**

**2013**

• According to 2013 PVAAS, 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth Reading.
• In 5th grade, 12% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 7% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 15% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

**2014**

• There is significant evidence that 5th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic growth.

**2015**

• There is moderate evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 13% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 79% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

**2016**

• There is moderate evidence Grade 7 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017

• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in grade 5, and Basic in grades 5, 6 and 7 met the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 6.
• 9% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 7.
• 4% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 8.

Concern #3: PVAAS Math

2013

• There is moderate evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, there is moderate evidence that students who took the Keystone Algebra 1 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• In 5th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 20% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014

• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, all performance levels showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015

• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Students who were predicted to be Basic in 6th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 0% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 95% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in all grades.

Concern #4:
PVAAS Science

2013
• There is significant evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Only 7% of students in 8th grade are projected to be proficient or advanced on the Science PSSA.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 8th grade science did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
• There is moderate evidence that 8th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 5% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 3% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 87% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016

• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017

• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

Concern #5:
PSSA Reading

2010-2013

• 4th grade declined 21.8%
• 5th grade declined 28.3%
• 6th grade declined 18.1%
• 7th grade declined 15.1%
• 8th grade declined 16.2%

2014

• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 12.1%.
• 8th grade proficient or advanced dropped 2.7%.

2015

• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 12.5%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 13.6%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 14.3%

2016

• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 10.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017

- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 13.6%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 14.3%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 9.5%

Concern #6:

PSSA Math

2010 - 2013

- 4th grade declined 14.2%
- 5th grade declined 31.3%
- 6th grade declined 26.2%
- 7th grade declined 6.3%
- 8th grade declined 21.1%

2014

- 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 13.1%

2015

- 6th grade proficient or advanced: 8.2%
- 7th grade proficient or advanced: 0.0%
- 8th grade proficient or advanced: 3.6%

2016
- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 20.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 2.8%

**2017**

- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 3.6%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 4.3%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%

**Concern #7:**

**PSSA Science**

**2016**

- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

**2017**

- 8th Grade Proficiency: 4.5%

**Prioritized Systemic Challenges**

**Systemic Challenge #1 (Guiding Question #3)** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.

**Aligned Concerns:**

**PSSA Reading**

**2010-2013**

- 4th grade declined 21.8%
- 5th grade declined 28.3%
- 6th grade declined 18.1%
• 7th grade declined 15.1%
• 8th grade declined 16.2%

2014
• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 12.1%.
• 8th grade proficient or advanced dropped 2.7%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 12.5%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 13.6%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 14.3%

2016
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 10.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 13.6%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 14.3%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 9.5%

PSSA Math
2010 - 2013
• 4th grade declined 14.2%
• 5th grade declined 31.3%
• 6th grade declined 26.2%
• 7th grade declined 6.3%
• 8th grade declined 21.1%

2014
• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 13.1%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 8.2%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 0.0%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 3.6%

2016
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 20.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 2.8%

2017
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 3.6%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 4.3%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%

2013 PVAAS Writing
• There is evidence 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Writing. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic growth.

PVAAS Science
2013
• There is significant evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Only 7% of students in 8th grade are projected to be proficient or advanced on the Science PSSA.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 8th grade science did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic Growth.
2015

- There is moderate evidence that 8th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 5% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
- 3% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
- 87% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016

- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017

- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

PVAAS Math

2013

- There is moderate evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, there is moderate evidence that students who took the Keystone Algebra 1 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- In 5th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 6th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 7th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 8th grade, 20% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014

- There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, all performance levels showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015

- There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- Students who were predicted to be Basic in 6th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
- 0% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 95% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

**2016**
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

**2017**
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in all grades.

---

**PVAAS Reading**

**2013**
• According to 2013 PVAAS, 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth Reading.
• In 5th grade, 12% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 7% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 15% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

**2014**
• There is significant evidence that 5th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic growth.

**2015**
• There is moderate evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 13% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 79% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

**2016**
• There is moderate evidence Grade 7 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in grade 5, and Basic in grades 5, 6 and 7 met the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 6.
• 9% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 7.
• 4% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 8.

PSSA Science
2016
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017
• 8th Grade Proficiency: 4.5%

Systemic Challenge #2 (Guiding Question #2) Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures school-wide use of data that is focused on school improvement and the academic growth of all students

Aligned Concerns:

PSSA Reading
2010-2013
• 4th grade declined 21.8%
• 5th grade declined 28.3%
• 6th grade declined 18.1%
• 7th grade declined 15.1%
• 8th grade declined 16.2%
2014

- 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 12.1%.
- 8th grade proficient or advanced dropped 2.7%.

2015

- 6th grade proficient or advanced: 12.5%
- 7th grade proficient or advanced: 13.6%
- 8th grade proficient or advanced: 14.3%

2016

- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 10.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017

- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 13.6%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 14.3%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 9.5%

PSSA Math

2010 - 2013

- 4th grade declined 14.2%
- 5th grade declined 31.3%
- 6th grade declined 26.2%
- 7th grade declined 6.3%
- 8th grade declined 21.1%

2014

- 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 13.1%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 8.2%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 0.0%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 3.6%

2016
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 20.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 2.8%

2017
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 3.6%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 4.3%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%

2013 PVAAS Writing
• There is evidence 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Writing. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic growth.

PVAAS Science
2013
• There is significant evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Only 7% of students in 8th grade are projected to be proficient or advanced on the Science PSSA.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 8th grade science did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
• There is moderate evidence that 8th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• 5% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 3% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 87% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

PVAAS Math
2013
• There is moderate evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, there is moderate evidence that students who took the Keystone Algebra 1 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• In 5th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 20% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, all performance levels showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• Students who were predicted to be Basic in 6th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 0% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 95% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency
2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in all grades.

PVAAS Reading
2013
• According to 2013 PVAAS, 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth Reading.
• In 5th grade, 12% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 7% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 15% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 5th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic growth.

2015
• There is moderate evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 13% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 79% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• There is moderate evidence Grade 7 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in grade 5, and Basic in grades 5, 6 and 7 met the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 6.
• 9% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 7.
• 4% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 8.

PSSA Science
2016
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017
• 8th Grade Proficiency: 4.5%

Systemic Challenge #3 (Guiding Question #4) Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

Aligned Concerns:

PSSA Reading
2010-2013
• 4th grade declined 21.8%
• 5th grade declined 28.3%
• 6th grade declined 18.1%
• 7th grade declined 15.1%
• 8th grade declined 16.2%

2014
• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 12.1%.
• 8th grade proficient or advanced dropped 2.7%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 12.5%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 13.6%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 14.3%

2016
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 10.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 13.6%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 14.3%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 9.5%

PSSA Math
2010 - 2013
• 4th grade declined 14.2%
• 5th grade declined 31.3%
• 6th grade declined 26.2%
• 7th grade declined 6.3%
• 8th grade declined 21.1%

2014
• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 13.1%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 8.2%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 0.0%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 3.6%

**2016**
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 20.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 2.8%

**2017**
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 3.6%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 4.3%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%

---

**2013 PVAAS Writing**
• There is evidence 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Writing. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic growth.

---

**PVAAS Science**

**2013**
• There is significant evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Only 7% of students in 8th grade are projected to be proficient or advanced on the Science PSSA.

**2014**
• There is significant evidence that 8th grade science did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic Growth.

**2015**
• There is moderate evidence that 8th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 5% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 3% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 87% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

PVAAS Math
2013
• There is moderate evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, there is moderate evidence that students who took the Keystone Algebra 1 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• In 5th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 20% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, all performance levels showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Students who were predicted to be Basic in 6th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 0% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 95% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in all grades.

PVAAS Reading

2013
• According to 2013 PVAAS, 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth Reading.
• In 5th grade, 12% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 7% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 15% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 5th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic growth.

2015
• There is moderate evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 13% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 79% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• There is moderate evidence Grade 7 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in grade 5, and Basic in grades 5, 6 and 7 met the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 6.
• 9% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 7.
• 4% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 8.

PSSA Science
2016
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017
• 8th Grade Proficiency: 4.5%

Systemic Challenge #4 (Guiding Question #5) Ensure that the organizational structure, processes, materials, equipment, and human and fiscal resources within the school align with the school’s goals for student growth and continuous school improvement.

Aligned Concerns:

PSSA Reading
2010-2013
• 4th grade declined 21.8%
• 5th grade declined 28.3%
• 6th grade declined 18.1%
• 7th grade declined 15.1%
• 8th grade declined 16.2%

2014
• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 12.1%.
• 8th grade proficient or advanced dropped 2.7%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 12.5%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 13.6%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 14.3%

2016
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 10.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

2017
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 13.6%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 14.3%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 9.5%

PSSA Math
2010 - 2013
• 4th grade declined 14.2%
• 5th grade declined 31.3%
• 6th grade declined 26.2%
• 7th grade declined 6.3%
• 8th grade declined 21.1%

2014
• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 13.1%.

2015
• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 8.2%
• 7th grade proficient or advanced: 0.0%
• 8th grade proficient or advanced: 3.6%

2016
2013 PVAAS Writing

- There is evidence 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Writing. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic growth.

PVAAS Science

2013

- There is significant evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

- Only 7% of students in 8th grade are projected to be proficient or advanced on the Science PSSA.

2014

- There is significant evidence that 8th grade science did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015

- There is moderate evidence that 8th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

- 5% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency

- 3% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency

- 87% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency
2016
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

PVAAS Math

2013
- There is moderate evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, there is moderate evidence that students who took the Keystone Algebra 1 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- In 5th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 6th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 7th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 8th grade, 20% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014
- There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, all performance levels showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
- There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- Students who were predicted to be Basic in 6th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
- 0% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
- 95% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.
2017

- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in all grades.

PVAAS Reading

2013

- According to 2013 PVAAS, 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth Reading.
- In 5th grade, 12% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 6th grade, 7% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 7th grade, 15% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 8th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014

- There is significant evidence that 5th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic growth.

2015

- There is moderate evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
- 13% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
- 79% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016

- There is moderate evidence Grade 7 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in grade 5, and Basic in grades 5, 6 and 7 met the standard for PA Academic Growth.

• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 5.

• 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 6.

• 9% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 7.

• 4% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 8.

---

**PSSA Science**

**2016**

• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

**2017**

• 8th Grade Proficiency: 4.5%

---

**Systemic Challenge #5 (Guiding Question #1)**

Ensure that there is a system in the school and/or district that fully ensures the principal is enabled to serve as a strong instructional leader who, in partnership with the school community (students, staff, parents, community, etc.) leads achievement growth and continuous improvement within the school.

**Aligned Concerns:**

**PSSA Reading**

**2010-2013**

• 4th grade declined 21.8%

• 5th grade declined 28.3%

• 6th grade declined 18.1%

• 7th grade declined 15.1%

• 8th grade declined 16.2%

**2014**

• 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 12.1%.

• 8th grade proficient or advanced dropped 2.7%.

**2015**

• 6th grade proficient or advanced: 12.5%
- 7th grade proficient or advanced: 13.6%
- 8th grade proficient or advanced: 14.3%

**2016**
- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 10.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

**2017**
- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
- 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 13.6%
- 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 14.3%
- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 9.5%

**PSSA Math**

**2010 - 2013**
- 4th grade declined 14.2%
- 5th grade declined 31.3%
- 6th grade declined 26.2%
- 7th grade declined 6.3%
- 8th grade declined 21.1%

**2014**
- 7th grade proficient or advanced dropped 13.1%.

**2015**
- 6th grade proficient or advanced: 8.2%
- 7th grade proficient or advanced: 0.0%
- 8th grade proficient or advanced: 3.6%

**2016**
- 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 20.0%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 15.4%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 2.8%

2017
• 5th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 3.6%
• 6th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 4.3%
• 7th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%
• 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 0.0%

2013 PVAAS Writing
• There is evidence 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Writing. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic growth.

PVAAS Science
2013
• There is significant evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Only 7% of students in 8th grade are projected to be proficient or advanced on the Science PSSA.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 8th grade science did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
• There is moderate evidence that 8th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 5% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 3% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 87% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency
2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

PVAAS Math
2013
• There is moderate evidence that 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, there is moderate evidence that students who took the Keystone Algebra 1 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• In 5th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 6th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 7th grade, 25% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
• In 8th grade, 20% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014
• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. Additionally, all performance levels showed moderate evidence they did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2015
• There is significant evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• Students who were predicted to be Basic in 6th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
• 0% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
• 95% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
• 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.
2017

- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in all grades.

PVAAS Reading

2013

- According to 2013 PVAAS, 4th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth Reading.
- In 5th grade, 12% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 6th grade, 7% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 7th grade, 15% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.
- In 8th grade, 22% of students projected to be proficient or advanced.

2014

- There is significant evidence that 5th and 8th grades did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, all performance levels showed moderate evidence of not meeting the standard for PA Academic growth.

2015

- There is moderate evidence that 7th grade did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Proficient did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency
- 13% have a probability between 40%-70% of obtaining proficiency
- 79% have a probability below 40% of obtaining proficiency

2016

- There is moderate evidence Grade 7 did not meet the standard for PA Academic Growth.
- 3% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 5.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 6.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 7.
- 0% have a probability of 70% or higher of obtaining proficiency in Grade 8.

2017

-
 Students who were predicted to be Below Basic in grade 5, and Basic in grades 5, 6 and 7 met the standard for PA Academic Growth.

- 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 5.
- 0% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 6.
- 9% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 7.
- 4% have a probability of obtaining proficiency in grade 8.

**PSSA Science**

**2016**

- 8th Grade Proficient or Advanced: 19.4%

**2017**

- 8th Grade Proficiency: 4.5%

**Systemic Challenge #6 (Guiding Question #6)** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.
School Level Plan

Action Plans

**Goal #1:** Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.

**Indicators of Effectiveness:**

*Type: Annual*

Data Source: 2013 Results with CRO Plan Target of 5% increase annually

PSSA Reading 5-8

PSSA Math 5-8

Specific Targets: CRO/PSSA 2014 Proficient/Advanced:

- Grade 5-Math 31.2%/Reading 21.7%
- Grade 6-Math 42.3%/Reading 25.9%
- Grade 7-Math 45%/Reading 36.5%
- Grade 8-Math 25%/Reading 42.9%

*Type: Annual*

Data Source: 2015 PSSA Math and Reading

Specific Targets: CRO/PSSA 2015 Proficient/Advanced:

- Grade 5-Math 36.2%/Reading 26.7%
- Grade 6-Math 47.3%/Reading 30.9%
- Grade 7-Math 50%/Reading 41.5%
- Grade 8-Math 30%/Reading 47.5%

*Type: Annual*

Data Source: 2016 PSSA Math and ELA (9 kids in 5th, 9 kids in 6th)

Specific Targets: CRO/PSSA 2016 Proficient/Advanced:

- Grade 5-Math 41.2%/ELA 31.7%
- Grade 6-Math 52.3%/ELA 35.9%
- Grade 7-Math 55%/ELA 46.5%
- Grade 8-Math 35%/ELA 52.5%

CRO Target for 2016 Updated Proficient/Advanced

- Grade 5 Math 12.3%/ELA 25.4%
- Grade 6 Math 12.2%/ELA 26.6%
- Grade 7 Math 8.6%/ELA 22.7%
- Grade 8 Math 8.9%/ELA 25.8%

*Type: Annual*
Data Source: 2017 PSSA Math and ELA
Specific Targets: CRO/PSSA Math and ELA Proficient/Advanced
Grade 5-Math 46.2%/ELA 36.7%
Grade 6- Math 57.3%/ELA 40.9%
Grade 7-Math 60%/ELA 51.5%
Grade 8-Math 40%/ELA 67.5%

CRO Target for 2017 Updated Proficient/Advanced
Grade 5 - Math 18.4%/ELA 32.7%
Grade 6 - Math 17.7%/ELA 33.4%
Grade 7 - Math 13.5%/ELA 29.9%
Grade 8 - Math 13.1%/ELA 32.3%

Type: Interim
Data Source: Classroom Diagnostic Tools
Specific Targets: Interim growth goal is 5% for each test interval at each grade level for Reading, Math and Science

Type: Annual
Data Source: 2018 PSSA Math and ELA
Specific Targets: CRO Target for 2018 Updated Proficient/Advanced
Grade 5 - Math 24.5%/ELA 40.0%
Grade 6 - Math 22.7%/ELA 40.5%
Grade 7 - Math 18.4%/ELA 37.1%
Grade 8 - Math 17.3%/ELA 38.8%

**Strategies:**

**Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction**

**Description:**

The Backward Design framework will guide teachers in the development of standards-based instruction and assessments. Backward Design is a research based framework. Staff development will help teachers reflect on their habits of instruction as it relates to planning, teaching, and assessing. This strategy will require teachers to use the standards to develop assessments and drive their instructional practices.

Teachers received PD on BD and unpacking the standards into their lessons and LEQs. This strategy was implemented until the ENI curriculum was rolled out in
January 2015 by the district for all schools. Teachers were then given PD on ENI curriculum for the second half of the year.

**Updated

We are no longer doing Backward Design or as of 2016-17.

**SAS Alignment:** Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources

**Professional Learning Communities**

**Description:**

The purpose of creating Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) at Marshall is to review instruction and curriculum and to use the data to drive instruction. The development of PLCs is a research-based approach to school improvement developed by Robert Eaker, Richard Dufour, and Rebecca Dufour. This framework is one of the most promising strategies for substantive school improvement. Developing a PLC involves many elements: collaboration; develop a mission, vision, values, and goals; focused on learning; leadership; school improvement plans; celebration; and persistence. The culture of a PLC is characterized by collaborative teams, whose members work interdependently to achieve common goals.

**SAS Alignment:** Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, Safe and Supportive Schools

**Implementation Steps:**

**Review Current Curriculum Framework**

**Description:**

In collaboration with the Curriculum and Instruction department the Middle School Administrative teams will review and identify any gaps in the current curriculum framework.

Evidence: Agenda/Meeting Notes

**Start Date:** 4/1/2014  **End Date:** 6/28/2018

**Program Area(s):**
**Supported Strategies:**

- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction

**Professional Development on Understanding Your Standards**

**Description:**

This is a series of professional development sessions to provide teachers with a deep understanding of standards-based instruction and assessments. This will be done on a monthly basis during half-day PD and grade level meetings, and provided by building administrators or another designee. Professional Development Sessions will be focused on the following:

1. Introduction of Backward Design and PA Core Standards - whole staff
2. Backward Design training - lead teachers/department chairs
3. Backward Design and organizing standards - whole staff
4. Unpacking the standards; 3 stages of Backwards Design - whole staff

**Evidence:** Sign-in Sheets

We are no longer doing backward design; however we are still working with and assisting teachers, through PLC's, on understanding their content standards.

**Start Date:** 5/14/2014  **End Date:** 4/30/2015

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction
- Professional Learning Communities

**Develop Common Postings**

**Description:**
Teachers will develop bulletin/white boards that identify current standards being taught, as well as evidence students will need to demonstrate that standard (rubrics, etc.). In the beginning stages, teachers will post the standard and acceptable evidence. Throughout the year, teachers will have professional development where they review and discuss student work, identifying acceptable evidence, as well as adding different elements to their board, so that by the end of the year, they will have a standards-based bulletin board which includes: standards, acceptable evidence, student work at various levels with specific feedback. This step will be evaluated after 1 year of implementation.

Evidence: Bulletin Boards

**Start Date:** 1/5/2015  
**End Date:** 9/29/2018

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction
- Professional Learning Communities

**Implement Common Assessments**

**Description:**

Middle School Departments, in collaboration with curriculum specialists and representatives from the high school, will meet to review and collaborate about implementation of comprehensive common assessments, based on standards. One assessment will be created per marking period, per subject, per grade level. This is a two year process beginning with teachers understanding the standards, understanding how to assess the standards, and building assessments for their class. Throughout PLCs, teachers will begin the collegial process of discussing assessments, with eventual development of common assessments within and between schools.

Evidence: Common Assessments

**Start Date:** 8/4/2014  
**End Date:** 5/31/2016

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction
- Professional Learning Communities
Focus on Learning

Description:

This is the first step in a series of Professional Development sessions that focuses on the effective implementation of PLCs. During this session, "Focus on Learning," will be discussing the purpose of the group, the research and the vision behind PLCs.

By the end of the 2015-2016 school year, we will have fully functioning Professional Learning Communities that exhibit all four priorities.

Evidence: Sign-in sheets

Start Date: 8/4/2014   End Date: 6/22/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

• Professional Learning Communities

Focus on Collaborative Culture

Description:

This is the second step in a series of Professional Development sessions that focuses on the effective implementation of PLCs. During this session, "Focus on Collaborative Culture," the focus will be on protocols and how to run the PLC effectively.

Start Date: 8/11/2014   End Date: 6/1/2018

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

• Professional Learning Communities

Focus on Results
Description:

This is the third step in a series of Professional Development sessions that focuses on the effective implementation of PLCs. During this session, "Focus on Results" will be about how to collect, analyze and utilize data to inform instructional practices.

Evidence: sign-in sheets

**Start Date:** 10/6/2014  **End Date:** 5/25/2018

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Professional Learning Communities

---

**Provide Timely, Relevant Information**

Description:

This is the last step in a series of Professional Development sessions that focuses on the effective implementation of PLCs. During this session, "Provide Timely, Relevant Information" we will designate a team that will provide data to teachers in a timely manner.

Evidence: sign-in sheets

**Start Date:** 11/3/2014  **End Date:** 5/25/2018

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Professional Learning Communities

---

**Developing Common Meeting Time**

Description:

Through the development of the master schedule and the collaborative meeting schedule, time will be created for grade levels, departments, leadership, data, PBIS, RtII, and administrators to meet as PLCs within and between middle schools. Time
will be modified on a yearly basis. This is a step that will be completed on an annual basis for the next 3 years.

Evidence: Master Schedule

**Start Date:** 5/26/2014    **End Date:** 5/25/2019

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Professional Learning Communities

**Lesson Plan Review**

**Description:**

Grade level and department Professional Learning Communities will meet to review lesson plans and provide feedback on standards, assessments, and instruction. These meetings will occur bi-weekly. Administrators will review lesson plans and provide feedback. There will be an established and consistent protocol and expected outcomes for these meetings focused on student improvement. This will be conducted on a regular basis throughout the school year for the next three years.

Evidence: Observations, walkthroughs, feedback at Common Planning meetings

**Start Date:** 8/4/2014    **End Date:** 5/25/2019

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction
- Professional Learning Communities

**Project-Based Learning**

**Description:**
This is a series of professional development sessions in order to train the teachers on the use of Project-Based Learning (PBL) in the core content areas. The seven principles of PBL include: need to know, needs a driving question, provides student voice and choice, utilizes 21st century skills, nurtures inquiry and innovation, provides feedback and revision, and encourages public presentation.

**Start Date:** 6/1/2014  **End Date:** 5/25/2019

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**
- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction
- Professional Learning Communities

**STEM**

**Description:**

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) training will deepen teachers' knowledge in their respective instructional content areas. These professional development sessions will be provided in collaboration with community partnerships such as local universities and businesses.

This year (15-16) science and math teachers received professional development in Discovery Education and training in STEM Pulse at the CAIU.

**Start Date:** 6/2/2014  **End Date:** 5/25/2019

**Program Area(s):** Professional Education

**Supported Strategies:**
- Standards Based Instruction/Standards Aligned Instruction

**Monitor Student Data**

**Description:**

All teachers will actively monitor their students' data and use the data collected to inform direct instruction and plan for interventions.

Evidence: common planning meetings, Act 80 days
**Goal #2:** Ensure that there is a system in the school and/or district that fully ensures the principal is enabled to serve as a strong instructional leader who, in partnership with the school community (students, staff, parents, community, etc.) leads achievement growth and continuous improvement within the school.

**Indicators of Effectiveness:**

**Type:** Annual

**Data Source:** Federal Monitoring Report

**Specific Targets:** There will be no adverse federal monitoring findings relative to the school improvement plan.

**Strategies:**

*Share the Comprehensive Plan With All Stakeholders*

**Description:**

Research shows that if all stakeholders take a part in developing, knowing, and implementing a school improvement plan, there will be more of a chance of building capacity and sustainability.

We will share this plan by numerous steps but reminders will be made periodically, by Connect-Ed phone call system to all stakeholders in our school, informing them of the plan and how to obtain it.

**SAS Alignment:** Safe and Supportive Schools

**Implementation Steps:**
**Post comprehensive plan on school and district website**

**Description:**

The appointed web administrator from the school will post the completed comprehensive plan on the school website under announcements.

Evidence: Posting on website and data from Schoolwires will show how many times the plan was looked at.

**Start Date:** 8/11/2014  
**End Date:** 8/14/2018

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Share the Comprehensive Plan With All Stakeholders

**Share comprehensive plan with parents at PTA/Literacy Nights**

**Description:**

Each month there will be a PTA/Literacy Night focused around a particular topic. The plan will be scheduled to be shared at one of these evenings.

Evidence: Meeting agenda, sign in sheets and plans available to take home by parents.

This will be done annually to accommodate new parents and stakeholders.

**Start Date:** 8/11/2014  
**End Date:** 5/25/2019

**Program Area(s):**

**Supported Strategies:**

- Share the Comprehensive Plan With All Stakeholders

**Leadership Team Meetings**

**Description:**
The leadership team will oversee the implementation of strategies schoolwide. The team will meet once per week. This is something ongoing every year.

Evidence: agenda, schedule

Start Date: 8/11/2014   End Date: 5/25/2019

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Share the Comprehensive Plan With All Stakeholders

**Build Education Morale**

Description:

All staff will take an active role in the building of the education morale and respectfulness of all parents and students.

Evidence: Team building strategies, parent and student-teacher conferences and mentoring meetings

Start Date: 8/20/2018   End Date: 5/31/2019

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Share the Comprehensive Plan With All Stakeholders
Appendix: Professional Development Implementation

Step Details

| LEA Goals Addressed: | Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2014</td>
<td>5/25/2019</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) training will deepen teachers' knowledge in their respective instructional content areas. These professional development sessions will be provided in collaboration with community partnerships such as local universities and businesses. This year (15-16) science and math teachers received professional development in Discovery Education and training in STEM Pulse at the CAIU.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>App.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>principal, teachers, school leadership team</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAIU</td>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge

- Increases knowledge in STEM instruction.

Supportive Research

- STEM is a good practice.

Designed to Accomplish

- For classroom teachers, school counselors and education Enhances the educator’s content knowledge in the area of the educator’s certification or assignment.
specialists: Increases the educator’s teaching skills based on research on effective practice, with attention given to interventions for struggling students.

For school and district administrators, and other educators seeking leadership roles:

Provides the knowledge and skills to think and plan strategically, ensuring that assessments, curriculum, instruction, staff professional education, teaching materials and interventions for struggling students are aligned to each other as well as to Pennsylvania’s academic standards.

### Training Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Whole Group Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Participant Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle (grades 6-8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Follow-up Activities

| Team development and sharing of content-area lesson implementation outcomes, with involvement of administrator and/or peers |
| Lesson modeling with mentoring |

### Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom student assessment data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Assurance of Quality and Accountability

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the school level plan for Marshall Academy in the Harrisburg City SD has been duly reviewed by a Quality Review Team convened by the Superintendent of Schools and formally approved by the district's Board of Education, per guidelines required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

We hereby affirm and assure the Secretary of Education that the school level plan:

- Addresses all the required components prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education
- Meets ESEA requirements for Title I schools
- Reflects sound educational practice
- Has a high probability of improving student achievement
- Has sufficient District leadership and support to ensure successful implementation

With this Assurance of Quality & Accountability, we, therefore, request that the Secretary of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education grant formal approval to implement the school level plan submitted by Marshall Academy in the Harrisburg City SD for the 2014-2019 school-year.

No signature has been provided

Superintendent/Chief Executive Officer

No signature has been provided

Board President

No signature has been provided

IU Executive Director
Evaluation of School Improvement Plan

2017-2018 Improvement Evaluation

Describe the success from the past year.

Academics
-Growth goals were met for math grades 5-6 and ELA grades 6-7.

Behavior
-Recognized as sustaining Tier I PBIS.
-Able to decrease the amount of Office referrals and Out of School suspensions using PBIS practices.

Community/partnerships
-Increased the number of community partners and projects completed
-Increased the number of parents and family-members’ attendance at school functions
-Principal Chat and Chew with parents established
-PTA continues to work with school

Describe the continuing areas of concern from past the year.

Academic
- 7th and 8th grades continue to underperform in Math

Attendance
-Due to the death of a student this year and impacts that it had on our students we saw a decrease in attendance.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.
-95%, Systems 44, Imagine Learning, Read 180, and Study Island we are programs that have been implemented with fidelity this past year.
-Schedules were changed to allow for more planning time between regular education teacher, ELL teacher, Special Ed teacher, and Title I math and reading teachers.
-More time was built into the schedule for Math and Reading.

2016-2017 Improvement Evaluation

Describe the success from the past year.

Academics
-Goals, based on PVAAS predictions, were met in 8th grade for ELA, Math and Science.
- In 7th grade all students were in the "less than 40%" category but we had 12 students who scored basic.

Behavior
- Use of PBIS approach consistently has reduced the number of office referrals
- School was recognized for accomplishing Tier I implementation of PBIS

Attendance
- Goal to keep attendance at 90% or better has been met

Community/Partnerships
- PTA was re-established

Describe the continuing areas of concern from the past year.

Academic
Students are not meeting proficiency goals in 5th, 6th and 7th grades in ELA and Math. Teacher turnover is a concern for the Marshall program. Implementing appropriate and effective interventions for reading and mathematics

Community/Partnerships
Increasing parental involvement

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.
- ENI common assessments were implemented
- ASPIRE curriculum was implemented
- 5th grade Eureka math was implemented

2015-2016 Improvement Evaluation

Describe the success from the past year.
The Marshall Academy has achieved their attendance goal by doing the following:

- Teachers are accurately taking attending
- Teachers are contacting parents and following up with them
- Parents have been receiving fines and they have been held accountable
- TPE meetings are being held

Describe the continuing areas of concern from the past year.
Achievement will continue to be an issue for Marshall Academy. The population the school is trying to serve has many needs. This summer training will be provided to teachers for student who have mental health or emotional support issues.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.
Targets for ELA and Math PSSA were adjusted for 2016 and 2017 per CRO plan April 2016. Math Design Collaborative: Marshall Academy lost staff who were trained in MDC except
for one staff member who still uses some of the elements of the program. This implementation step was removed since the school is no longer implementing it pervasively.

**2014-2015 Improvement Evaluation**

Describe the success from the first year plan.

- Academic growth in 6th and 8th grades
- Implementation of a Standards Aligned curriculum in Reading and Math
- Implementation of Standard Aligned Common Assessments in Reading and Math
- Evans-Newton data reports for Reading and Math that are timely, relevant and easily accessible for teachers
- Lesson plan review provided teachers with regular feedback on planning
- Professional development was provided to teachers focused on Understanding your Standards and Unpacking the Standards.
- Comprehensive plan has been posted and shared with stakeholders.
- Implementation of STEM related projects
- Development of Community partnerships
- Time for teacher collaboration in the master schedule

Describe the continuing areas of concern from the first year plan.

- Attendance in grades 5-8 overall
- The need for a standards aligned curriculum and common assessments in Science

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.

- ENI Curriculum was implemented in January for Reading and Math for the 2nd half of the year. Therefore, the strategy "Standards Based Instruction" and the Professional Development that accompanied it has slightly altered.
- The implementation Step "Leadership Meetings" was added to Action Plan #2. This step was added during the school year to oversee the school strategies.