



2017-2018 Abbot Downing School Title I Annual Targeted Assistance Program Evaluation

- This Program Evaluation Template is a part of a continuous cycle of improvement.
- It consists of: a review of the strategies and activities in the Title IA Plan to evaluate their effectiveness; an analysis of data to show the impact of the Title I funds in increasing student achievement/performance; and input from internal and external stakeholders to inform the plan revision. This document is intended to be posted publicly on school websites and readily available to families and members of the community.

Section A: School Program Review Team and Responsibilities

1) Please complete the following details:

Name	Title	Affiliation/Stakeholder Group	Task/Responsibility in the Evaluation Process
Kathleen Riordan	Principal	Administration	Supervision of School's Title I Compliance, Title I Staff and Title I Budget
Heather Santitto	Title I Reading Specialist	Title I Staff	Supervision of Title I Compliance and Title I Tutors Implementation of Title I at Abbot Downing School
Robert Belmont	Director of Student Services	District Title I Project Manager – Title I Compliance	Supervision of Title I Compliance for District and Title I Schools, supervision

	Title I Project Manager		of Title I Staff and Title I Budget
<p>2) Briefly describe the following:</p> <p>a. Is there representation from all stakeholder groups? Representation is evidenced by the stakeholder groups of school administration, Title I Reading Specialist and district administration</p> <p>b. Describe the process for the evaluation. The process for the evaluation included a meeting on May 23, 2018 at Abbot Downing School with Principal Kathleen Riordan, Title I Reading Specialist Heather Santitto and Director of Student Services – Title I Project Manager Robert Belmont that collected the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Supervision of Title I Programming at Abbot Downing School, 2.) Title I student enrollment in Title I School Day and Summer Programming, 3.) Title I students exiting from Title I School Day and Summer Programming, 4.) Implementation of scientific research base interventions in reading and mathematics Title I programming, 			

- 5.) Communication of Title I student progress to student, parent/s and educators,
 - 6.) Assessment of how Title I programming is closing the learning gap in reading and mathematics for Title I students,
 - 7.) Parent Involvement, and
 - 8.) Services to students deemed homeless under the McKinney Vento Homeless Act
- c. Describe the process for making changes to the targeted assistance program.**
The Principal, Reading Specialist, Title I staff, Title I parent involvement group and school staff have a voice as well as the use of Title I student data informs the process of making changes to the targeted assistance program.

Section B: Data Collection

1) Select the types of data collected: List the name of the instrument/tool used under each type. Please note that the type of data collected is specific to each school and title I program, and there may not be data for each type listed below.

Performance Data	Non-Performance Data	Perception Data	Process Data	Other
Formative and Summative Student Academic and Behavior Assessments	Attendance, Retention, Graduation, Special Needs, Demographic,	Family, Student, Staff, Community Surveys, Questionnaires, Observations, Interviews	School's programs and Practices, Instructional and Assessment Strategies	
Formative and Summative Student Academic Data from: F & P, Aimsweb, Eureka Mathematics, OGAP, PNOA, Wilson	Attendance, Special Needs and Demographic e.g. homeless	Parent – Family Involvement Questionnaire, Staff Questionnaire, Observations by Principal and Title I Reading Specialist	School’s Program and Practices for Title I School Day Program, and Summer Programming and Instructional and Assessment Strategies	

Section C: Review of the Current Title IA Plan

Please describe the process for the review of the Title IA Plan.

The Title IA Plan is reviewed by the Principal, Title I Reading Specialist, Title I staff, school staff, Title I Parent Involvement Group and PTO.

The Principal provided administratively close proximity and supervision of the four (FTE. 2.93) Title I tutors and one Family Literacy Facilitator (FTE .12). The NHDOE Title I Reading Specialist FTE .2969 were within 50% of the Title I tutors time within close proximity as a NHDOE certified teacher supervising certified teacher. The ADS NH Certified Reading Specialist provided even closer daily proximity and supervision of the four (FTE. 2.93) Title I tutors. The ADS NH Certified Teacher/Reading Specialist (FTE .2969 Title I and FTE .70 General Fund) and ADS NH Certified Reading Specialist (General Fund) provided the Title I assessment and planning of the four (FTE 2.93) Title I tutors services. The Principal provided supervision of the ADS NHDOE Certified Teacher/Reading Specialist by meeting with the Title I Reading Specialist on a weekly basis discussing the Title I program, Title I tutors and closing the gap interventions in reading and mathematics with Title I students.

Abbot Downing 2017-2018 Title I End of Year Evaluation

Evaluation completed by: Principal Kathleen Riordan and Reading Specialist Heather Santito

Title I School Day Program provided in reading in K – Grade 5

Title I Summer Program provided in reading and math in K – Grade 5

Title I School Day Program enrollment = 80 students

2017 Title I Summer Program enrollment = 33 students in Grades K - 5

Title I School Day # of students no longer eligible – exit program = 17 out of 80 = 21 %

Title I Summer Program # of students no longer eligible – exit program = 0 = 0 %

Scientific research-based interventions used to close the gap in learning: LLI (Leveled Literacy Instructions, Lexia Core 5 Reading System, Foundations, LIPs, Wilson, Visualize and Verbalizing, Bear Sorting, Great Leaps, Just Words

What criteria does the school's Title I staff use to identify when a student in Title I is no longer eligible? Title I Reading uses F & P Benchmark and Title I Mathematics uses Eureka End of Module Assessment, OGAP Assessment, PNOA, and Teacher Recommendation

How does Title I communicate student progress for a Title I student to the Title I student, student's general education teacher and parent/legal guardian?

Student – shared reading goal and shared formative assessment

Teacher – shared in collaborative meetings

Parent – Progress Reports sent to parent/legal guardian

Did all Title I students in the school receive a Title I Progress Report? Yes, in the Title I school day for reading.	
Did you find the Title I school day program make a significant difference in closing the learning gap in reading for the Title I students? Yes, but not for all.	
Did you find the Title I summer program make a significant difference in closing the learning gap in reading? Why? Not enough time for program which was only three weeks in July – The program may have eliminated regression. Maintained skills in reading.	
Did you find the Title I summer program make a significant difference in closing the learning gap in mathematics? Why? Not enough time for program which was only three weeks in July – The program may have eliminated regression.	
Based on the 2017-2018 Title I Parent Involvement Survey, how would you implement the 2018-2019 Title I Parent Involvement Program? Breakfast and Books and Math Nights, always gets a good turnout and feedback. Offer morning and evening events.	
How many students were deemed homeless at Abbot Downing School for 2017-2018? 4 What services were provided to students deemed homeless at Abbot Downing School for school year 2017-2018? Clothing, school supplies and transportation.	

Section D: Changes to the Targeted Assistance Plan

Please describe the process for all changes made to the Title IA Plan.

- Based on 2017-2018 Title I funding consider more Title I staffing for school day programming and summer programming.
- Increase interventions e.g. Foundations at Kindergarten, grade 1 to grade 2 levels.
- Based on Title I funding in 2017-2018, explore expansion of Title I mathematics for Title I extended day programming.
- Fine tune the application and implementation of evidence – based interventions in reading and mathematics .

Section E: Notification to Internal and External Stakeholders

Please explain how the results from this evaluation and subsequent changes to the program plan will be shared with all internal and external stakeholders.

Principal and Title I Reading Specialist will share results with Abbot Downing School Title I staff, school staff and Abbot-Downing School PTO in September 2018.

The Principal will share results with Abbot Downing School Title I Reading Specialist, Title I staff, school staff, parents and Abbot-Downing School PTO in September 2018 the progress the school has made toward obtaining School Wide Program (SWP) status in school year 2018-2019.

Section F: Impact of Title IA Program

Please Complete a review of the activities in the Title IA Grant that have an impact on student performance.

If the School used the NH Schoolwide School Plan Template, then the updates can be copied and pasted from here into the Schoolwide Plan.

1. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
To improve each Title I School Day student with a Title I reading intervention by 10% based on a pre-test and post-test intervention assessment.	Specific scientific research based reading intervention implemented for each Title I student for pretest, progress monitoring, posttest, Title I Progress Report, and Title I Intervention Session Attendance	Read Naturally, LLI – Literacy Intervention, Soar to Success, READ 180, Just Words, RAVE-O, LIPs or Lexia
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.	
Intervention pretest, Intervention progress monitored, Intervention posttest and Title I Progress Report	Promising evidence	

<p>Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Specific to each Title I student's achievement. Why or why not? (explain briefly)</p> <p>The activity did work to meet the Title I goal. There has been an increase in the trend of students moving toward proficiency in reading.</p>		
<p>What changes will you make to your Title I plan as a result of this review?</p> <p>In 2018-2019, there will be an increase in student specific Title I scientific research based intervention data collected and used to address closing the learning gap with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention – pretest data, • Intervention – posttest data, • Days of Attendance for student, • Frequency and duration of intervention provided to each Title I student. 		
2. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
To improve each Title I School Day student receiving a reading intervention to 85% attendance for all scheduled Title I reading intervention sessions.	Student school day daily attendance Student Title I Intervention attendance	School daily attendance including definitions of absent, tardy and/or dismissed.
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.)	
Collection of school day attendance for Title I student Collection of school day Title I intervention session attendance	Promising evidence	
<p>Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Specific to each Title I student Why or why not? (explain briefly)</p> <p>The activity did work to meet the Title I goal. There has been an increase in Title I student attendance for all scheduled Title I reading intervention sessions.</p>		

<p>What changes will you make to your Title I program as a result of this review?</p> <p>In 2018-2019, there will be the high level of maintaining student attendance data for school day and Title I scientific research based intervention sessions.</p>		
3. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
To improve each Title I School Day student with a Title I mathematics intervention by 10% based on a pre-test and post-test intervention assessment.	Specific scientific research based math intervention implemented for each Title I student for pretest, progress monitoring, posttest, Title I Progress Report, and Title I Intervention Session Attendance	Number Worlds, Fraction Nation, The FASST Math, Do the Math, Do the Math Now or Dreambox
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)		Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.
Intervention pretest, Intervention progress monitored, Intervention posttest and Title I Progress Report		Promising practice
<p>Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no)) Specific to each Title I student Why or why not? (explain briefly)</p> <p>The activity did work to meet the Title I goal. There has been an increase in the trend of students moving toward proficiency in mathematics.</p>		
<p>What changes will you make to your Title I plan as a result of this review?</p> <p>In 2018-2019, there will be an increase in student specific Title I scientific research based intervention data collected and used to address closing the learning gap with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention – pretest data, • Intervention – posttest data, • Days of Attendance for student, and • Frequency and duration of scientific research based intervention provided to each Title I student. 		
4. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
To improve each Title I School Day student receiving a mathematics	Student school day daily attendance Student Title I Intervention attendance	School daily attendance including definitions of absent, tardy and/or dismissed.

intervention to 85% attendance for all scheduled Title I mathematics intervention sessions.		
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.)	
Collection of school day attendance for Title I student Collection of school day Title I intervention session attendance	Promising practice	
Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Specific to each Title I student Why or why not? (explain briefly) The activity did work to meet the Title I goal. There has been an increase in Title I student attendance for all scheduled Title I mathematics intervention sessions.		
What changes will you make to your Title I program as a result of this review? In 2018-2019, there will be the high level of maintaining student attendance data for school day and Title I scientific research based intervention sessions.		
5. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
To improve a Title I student deemed homeless to 98% attendance rate.	PowerSchool Data Transportation Billing	School daily attendance including definitions of absent, tardy and/or dismissed.
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.)	
Student attendance recorded in PowerSchool Student attendance recorded in Transportation Billing	Promising Practice	
Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Specific to each Title I student deemed homeless. Why or why not? (explain briefly) The activity did work to meet the goal of a 98% attendance rate for students deemed homeless. The Abbot Downing School Homeless Liaison worked in close contact with the Concord School District Transportation Department and Office of the Supt. District Homeless Liaison to facilitate transportation to and from Abbot Downing School for each student deemed homeless.		

What changes will you make to your Title I plan as a result of this review?		
Continue current practice of recording student deemed homeless in PowerSchool and evidenced in transportation billing.		
6. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.)	
Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Why or why not? (explain briefly)		
What changes will you make to your Title I program as a result of this review?		
5. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.)	

Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Why or why not? (explain briefly)		
What changes will you make to your Title I plan as a result of this review?		
6. Goal	Data Points:	Anecdotal Data:
Activities that support the goal (Activity name or description, not the activity number)	Level of Evidence-based practice (Please see the Evidence-Based Practices definitions on the last page of this document.)	
Did this activity work to meet your Title I goal? (yes or no) Why or why not? (explain briefly)		
What changes will you make to your Title I program as a result of this review?		

Levels of Evidence

Please note: For schools identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement (formerly Focus or Priority Schools), all practices being incorporated must fall within the Strong, Moderate, or Promising levels.

Strong Evidence. To be supported by *strong evidence*, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (e.g., a *randomized control trial*) *WWC Evidence Standards without reservations*) on the intervention. The Department considers an experimental study to be

“well-designed and well-implemented” if it meets *WWC Evidence Standards with reservations* or is of the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*. Additionally, to provide *strong evidence*, the study should:

- 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other *relevant outcome*;
- 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same intervention in other studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*;
- 3) Have a *large sample* and a *multi-site sample*; and
- 4) Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) AND settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

Moderate Evidence. To be supported by *moderate evidence*, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented *quasi-experimental study* on the intervention. The Department considers a quasi-experimental study to be “well-designed and well-implemented” if it meets *WWC Evidence Standards with reservations* or is of the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*. Additionally, to provide *moderate evidence*, the study should:

- 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other relevant outcome;
- 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that intervention from other findings in studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*;
- 3) Have a *large sample* and a *multi-site sample*; and
- 4) Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) OR settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

Promising Evidence. To be supported by *promising evidence*, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias on the intervention. The Department considers a correlational study to be “well-designed and well-implemented” if it uses sampling and/or analytic methods to reduce or account for differences between the intervention group and a comparison group. Additionally, to provide *promising evidence*, the study should:

- 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the intervention on a student outcome or other *relevant outcome*; and
- 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that intervention from findings in studies that meet *WWC Evidence Standards with or without reservations* or are the equivalent quality for making *causal inferences*.

Demonstrates a Rationale. To demonstrate a rationale, the intervention should include:

- 1) A well-specified *logic model* that is informed by research or an evaluation that suggests how the intervention is likely to improve *relevant outcomes*; and
- 2) An effort to study the effects of the intervention, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the intervention or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the intervention elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that intervention.

(USDE, 2017)

If you have any questions or comments about this Program Evaluation Template, please contact your NHDOE Title I Consultant or the Director of Integrated programs.

TITLE PROGRAM

CONSULTANT

TELEPHONE

EMAIL

Administrator, Bureau of Integrated Programs	Heather Gage	271-6052	<u>Heather.Gage@doe.nh.gov</u>
Title I – Lakes Region	Deborah Fleurant	271-3838	<u>Deborah.Fleurant@doe.nh.gov</u>
Title I – North Country	Kathryn “Joey” Nichol	271-6087	<u>Kathryn.Nichol@doe.nh.gov</u>
Title I – Seacoast	Cynthia Proulx	271-3145	<u>Cynthia.Proulx@doe.nh.gov</u>
Title I – South Central	Mary Bubnis	271-3889	<u>Mary.Bubnis@doe.nh.gov</u>
Title I – South West Region	Jane Waterhouse	271-7382	<u>Jane.Waterhouse@doe.nh.gov</u>

If you need technical assistance with the Template itself, please contact Jane Waterhouse.