



May 18th & May 25th, 2023 Multidisciplinary Needs Assessment Meetings

Needs Assessment for Title IA Targeted Assistance and Schoolwide Schools

The process of conducting a needs assessment is required for all Title I programs. It is unique to each school, as the focus of the assessment, and the sources and collection of data are determined by local factors.

What is a needs assessment and what are the benefits of conducting one?

- A “Needs Assessment” is a systematic approach to determining the strengths and needs of a school community.
- It focuses on the process and the outcomes to be attained in the development of a school’s vision for the future.
- It gathers data by means of established procedures and methods designed for specific purposes. The types of data and the scope of the methods are selected to fit the purposes and context of the need’s assessment.
- A needs assessment informs priorities and determines criteria for solutions so that planners and managers can make sound decisions.
- A needs assessment informs criteria for determining how best to allocate available money, people, facilities, and other resources.
- An annual needs assessment is a critical component of a school’s continuous process of improvement. Action that will be taken as a result of this assessment will assist schools in improving programs, services, organizational structure and operations, or a combination of these elements.
- It brings together stakeholders that represent the community, with a diverse range of perspectives, knowledge, skills, and experiences to enrich the process.

This template is designed to be used in conjunction with the Targeted Assistance and Schoolwide School plans and can be organized for schools’ specific educational programs and needs.

Name of School: Hillsboro-Deering Elementary

School Year: 2022-2023

Needs Assessment Committee Members (should include representation from all stakeholder groups, both internal and external.)

- Stacey Vazquez/Director of Student Support Services/Title I Project Manager
- Robin Whitney/Lower Elementary Principal
- Veronica Hytner, Student Support Coordinator
- Jeni Laliberte, Curriculum Coordinator
- Dagmar Herrick/Reading Specialist
- Kate Griffin/Math Specialist
- Paul McQuilkin, Title I Math Interventionist
- Elizabeth Licht/Behavior Specialist
- Jill Cover/Classroom Teacher
- Stephani Martin/Parent
- Amanda Morris/Parent

1) Identify Data Sources: Examples (non-exhaustive)

<u>Data</u>	<u>Non-Performance Data</u>	<u>Perception Data</u>	<u>Process Data</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Formative & Summative SAS ● iREADY Assessment ● AimsWeb, K-2 ● PALS, K ● Great Leaps ● HearBuilder ● Informal Assessments ● Foundations ● Push-in/pull-out small groups ● Before School Intervention Support ● Summer Academic Intervention Program ● Kinderfun ● Preschool Program, TS Gold ● Leveled Literacy Intervention, K-5 to establish a consistent Tier II Intervention Program for students in need of supplemental instruction ● Purchase of multiple math materials to support the provision of supplemental instruction ● Purchase of summer reading materials to provide students with materials that will supplement and support grade level curriculum and to prevent summer regression ● Provision of before and after school tutoring for students who are not meeting grade level standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attendance ● Discipline ● Behavior: Responsive Classroom ● Special Education ● 504 Support Plans ● Homeless & Migrant Families ● Demographics ● Family Education Activity Night ● Surveys ● Parent Conferences ● Technology ● Reactivate Library Limo ● Providing PD for staff that will be implementing newly purchased LLI Program ● K-2 Professional Development: The Why Behind the Work ● LETRS Training: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Climate/Culture Data ● Family, Student, Staff, Community Surveys, Questionnaires, Observations, Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School's programs and Practices, Instructional & Assessment Strategies ● Budgetary Process

New Hampshire SAS READING Results

School Year 2021-2022	Proficiency Level	Percent of Students	School Year 2020-2021	Proficiency Level	Percent of Students	School Year 2018-201 9	Proficiency Level	Percent of Students
Grade 3	Above Proficient:	16.2%	Grade 3	Above Proficient:	19.6. %	Grade 3	Above Proficient:	13.40%
	Proficient:	16.2%		Proficient:	17.90%		Proficient:	35.80%
	Approaching Proficient:	23%		Approaching Proficient:	25%		Approaching Proficient:	19.40%
	Below Proficient:	44.6%		Below Proficient:	37%		Below Proficient:	31.30%
Grade 4	Above Proficient:	13.3%	Grade 4	Above Proficient:	12.5. %	Grade 4	Above Proficient:	6.40%
	Proficient:	35%		Proficient:	10.90%		Proficient:	20.50%
	Approaching Proficient:	16.7%		Approaching Proficient:	28.10%		Approaching Proficient:	26.90%
	Below Proficient:	35%		Below Proficient:	48.40%		Below Proficient:	46.20%
Grade 5	Above Proficient:	9%	Grade 5	Above Proficient:	4.5	Grade 5	Above Proficient:	6.10%
	Proficient:	34.3%		Proficient:	23.90%		Proficient:	24.40%
	Approaching Proficient:	20.9%		Approaching Proficient:	23.90%		Approaching Proficient:	30.50%
	Below Proficient:	35.8%		Below Proficient:	47.90%		Below Proficient:	39%

Grade 3: The number of students scoring in the proficient range for the 2021-2022 school year **decreased** to 32.4% proficient from 37.5% proficient for the 2020-2021 school year. **Grade 4:** The number of students scoring in the proficient range for the 2021-2022 school year **increased** to 48.3% proficient from 23.4% proficient for the 2020-2021 school year **Grade 5:** The number of students scoring in the proficient range for the 2021-2022

school year **increased** to 43.3% proficient from 28.4% proficient for the 2020-2021 school year. (Proficient is measured by combining the Above Proficient and Proficient categories).

New Hampshire SAS MATH Results

School Year 2021-2022	Proficiency Level	Percent of Students	School Year 2020-2021	Proficiency Level	Percent of Students	School Year 2018-201 9	Proficiency Level	Percent of Students
Grade 3	Above Proficient:	14.9%	Grade 3	Above Proficient:	21.40%	Grade 3	Above Proficient:	14.90%
	Proficient:	28.4%		Proficient:	32.10%		Proficient:	35.80%
	Approaching Proficient:	25.7%		Approaching Proficient:	19.6.%		Approaching Proficient:	26.90%
	Below Proficient:	31.1%		Below Proficient:	26.80%		Below Proficient:	22.40%
Grade 4	Above Proficient:	16.7%	Grade 4	Above Proficient:	6.2.%	Grade 4	Above Proficient:	2.50%
	Proficient:	43.3%		Proficient:	25%		Proficient:	19%
	Approaching Proficient:	25%		Approaching Proficient:	40.60%		Approaching Proficient:	34.20%
	Below Proficient:	15%		Below Proficient:	28.10%		Below Proficient:	44.30%
Grade 5	Above Proficient:	9.1%	Grade 5	Above Proficient:	0	Grade 5	Above Proficient:	0
	Proficient:	21.2%		Proficient:	7.50%		Proficient:	11%
	Approaching Proficient:	36.4%		Approaching Proficient:	31.30%		Approaching Proficient:	45.10%
	Below Proficient:	33.3%		Below Proficient:	61.20%		Below Proficient:	43.90%

Grade 3: The number of students scoring in the proficient range for the 2021-2022 school year **decreased** to 43.3% proficient from 53.5% proficient for the 2020-2021 school year. **Grade 4:** The number of students scoring in the proficient range for the 2021-2022 school year **increased** to 60.0% proficient from 31.2% proficient for the 2020-2021 school year **Grade 5:** The number of students scoring in the proficient range for the 2021-2022 school year **increased** to 30.3% proficient from 7.5% proficient for the 2020-2021 school year. (Proficient is measured by combining the Above Proficient and Proficient categories).

Data Collection: Focus Areas Examples

2) Performance Data

Assessment(s): iReady READING									
	Fall 2022 Data			Winter 2023 Data			Spring 2023 Data		
	Reading			Reading			Reading		
	Total Students Per Grade	% of Students 2 or more grades below grade level (Grouping 1)	% of Students 1-grade below grade level (Grouping 2)	Total Students Per grade	% of Students 2 or more grades below grade level' (Grouping 1)	% of Students 1-grade below grade level (Grouping 2)	Total Students per grade	% of Students 2 or more grades below grade level (Grouping 1)	% of Students 1-grade below grade level (Grouping 2)
K	61	0 Students	46 Students: 70%	67	0 Students	18 Students: 27%	66	0 Students	5 Students:8%
1	68	10 Students: 15%	45 Students: 67%	68	4 Students: 6%	39 Students: 57%	68	1 Student: 1%	28 Students: 44%
2	61	20 Students: 33%	33 Students: 55%	60	9 Students: 15%	25 Students: 42%	60	5 Students: 12%	21 Students: 35%
3	67	26 Students: 31%	20 Students: 31%	68	16 Students: 23%	14 Students: 20%	69	14 Students: 20%	9 Students: 13%
4	78	31 Students: 11%	22 Students: 30%	81	24 Students: 30%	30 Students: 37%	81	17 Students: 9%	26 Students: 33%
5	57	26 Students: 26%	15 Students: 28%	57	18 Students: 32%	18 Students: 32%	56	16 Students: 22%	12Students: 28%

**Assessment(s): Aimsweb
READING**

Using Fall 2022 Data				Using Winter 2023 Data			Using Spring 2023 Data		
Students < 25th %ile				Students < 25th %ile			Students < 25th %ile		
Reading				Reading			Reading		
	Total Students	# of students	% of class	Total Students	# of students	% of class	Total Students	# of students	% of class
K	61	20	29%	67	31	47%	66	44	66%
1	68	44	65%	68	45	67%	68	41	61%

Analysis of Reading Data:

Kindergarten: Overall **iReady results** from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, *One Grade Level Below* decreased from 70% to 8%; the number of students *Early/On Grade Level* increased from 21% to 24%; and, the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 0% to 67%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 123%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Thirteen Kindergarten students received Title I supplemental reading interventions with the following results:

- Five students moved from the Emerging K Level to Mid K Level while achieving 79% to 107% progress toward their predicted Annual Stretch Growth.
- Four students moved from the Emerging K Level to Early K Level while achieving 30% to 115% progress toward their predicted Annual Stretch Growth.
- Two students moved from the Emerging K Level to Early K Level while achieving 52% to 103 % progress toward their predicted Annual Stretch Growth target.
- One student remained at the same Emerging K Level; however, she achieved 25% progress toward her predicted Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student remained at the same Emerging K Level and did not demonstrate progress toward his predicted Annual Stretch Growth.

As kindergarten students are unfamiliar with computer-based assessments, AimsWeb is also administered to students at the kindergarten and first grade as it is found to be a more accurate assessment of student's abilities and skills given their grade level and unfamiliarity with computer-based assessments such as iReady.

AimsWeb results indicate that the number of students at the kindergarten grade level performing below the 25th %ile increased from 29% to 66% from Fall to Spring Benchmark Assessments.

First Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 15% to 1%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 67% to 44%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 9% to 16% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 9% to 38%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 108%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Nine First Grade students received Title I supplemental reading interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Early 1 to Mid Grade 1 while demonstrating 57% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Seven students remained at the same K Level; however, each student demonstrated progress ranging from 21% to 107% growth toward their predicted Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from the Emerging K Level to Grade K Level while demonstrating 44% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth.

AimsWeb results indicate that the number of students at the first grade level performing below the 25th %ile decreased from 70% to 61% from Fall to Spring Benchmark Assessments.

Second Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 33% to 12%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 55% to 35%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 3% to 13% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 8% to 40%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this school group is 143%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Fourteen Second Grade students received Title I supplemental reading interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Grade 1 to Grade 3 Level while demonstrating 234% growth.
- Three students moved from Grade 1 to Mid Grade 2 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 153% to 172%.
- Two students moved from Grade 1 to Early Grade 2 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 91% to 100%.
- Four students moved from the K Level to Grade 1 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 79% to 85% towards their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Two students remained at the same Grade 1 Level; however, each student demonstrated growth ranging from 83% to 104%.
- One student remained at the same Grade 1 Level and did not demonstrate progress.
- One student remained at the same K Level; however, the student demonstrated 111% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.

Third Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 31% to 20%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 31% to 13%;

the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 22% to 35% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 8% to 30%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 133%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Seven Third Grade students received Title I supplemental reading interventions with the following results:

- Two students moved from Grade 1 to Early 3 Grade Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 103% to 113% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Two students moved from Grade 1 to Grade 2 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 84% to 90% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Two students remained at the Grade 1 Level; however, they demonstrated 68% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from Grade K Level to Grade 2 Level while demonstrating 86% growth toward her Annual Stretch Growth.

Fourth Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 11% to 9%; the number of students One Grade Level Below increased from 30% to 33%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 12% to 16%; and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 16% to 26%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 140%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Three Fourth Grade students received Title I supplemental reading interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Grade 1 to the Early Grade 4 Level while demonstrating 42% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from Grade 2 to Grade 3 Level while demonstrating 150% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student remained at the Grade 1 Level while demonstrating 39% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.

Fifth Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 26% to 22%; the number of students One Grade Level Below stayed the same 28% to 28%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 11% to 22% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 11% to 15%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 130%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Twelve Fifth Grade students received Title I supplemental math interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Grade 4 to Mid 5 Grade Level while demonstrating 100% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth. (
- Four students moved from Grade 4 to Early 5 Grade Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 42% to 148% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from Grade 3 to Grade 4 Level while demonstrating 89% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth Target.
- One student moved from Grade 2 to Grade 3 Level while demonstrating 39% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth Target.

- One student remained at the same Grade 3 Level; however, he demonstrated 17% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth Target.
- One student made no progress.
- Two students regressed.

Summary of Reading Data, comments and suggestions:

AimsWeb results indicate that the number of students at the kindergarten grade level performing below the 25th %ile increased from 29% to 66% from Fall to Spring Benchmark Assessments and the number of students at the first grade level performing below the 25th %ile decreased from 65% to 61% from Fall to Spring Benchmark Assessments.

Regarding iReady, the school changed from using percentile ranks to grade levels to determine student selection for Title I supplemental instruction (students one or more grades below grade level) as it is the metric iReady uses to measure student baseline, progress and projected growth. It was determined that grade levels best align with iReady when selecting students for support. iReady results indicate students made progress across all grade levels. **iReady results** for K-5 from Fall to Spring assessment results indicate: the number of students two or more Grades Below Grade Level **decreased** from 113 students to 59 students; the number of students One Grade Level Below **decreased** from 181 to 106 students; the progress of the students at the Early On Grade Level on the fall assessment resulted in an **increase** of 49 students from 84 students by their spring assessment; and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level **increased** from 36 to 143 students.

Results also provide information regarding areas of concern per grade level and areas of focus for the 2022-2023 School Year. They are as follows:

- HDES considers AimsWebPlus to be a more accurate assessment tool of beginner learners, K-1, as it best represents a child's ability given iReady is a computer based assessment and a format unfamiliar to most young learners. According to AimsWeb description, "when assessing Kindergarten and Grade 1 students, aimswebPlus uses digital record forms (DRFs) in combination with print stimulus materials. Students are administered test content individually and respond to items presented in stimulus books, while the teacher records student responses via the DRF on a computer or touch screen tablet."
- AimsWeb results for kindergarten indicate an area of concern given the number of students performing below the 25th percentile increased from Fall to Spring. The results need to be reviewed with current kindergarten and first grade teachers in the Fall of 2022 to plan accordingly for incoming kindergarteners and first grade students. The school's PLC team needs to review the data to not only guide the identification of skills based on the tests of Early Literacy to identify select skills, but to also highlight what the focus needs to be during instructional and intervention times.
- The third to fourth grade teams, as well as, the PLC team needs to review data results variables and possible reasons that interfered with the students who did not respond to interventions as evidenced by a lack of progress as well as students who regressed in the skills they developed. A closer look at these students is necessary to address and support what is interfering with their progress.
- Continue efforts to hire certified educators for Title I Interventionist positions.

- It is also recommended that Title I Interventionists/tutors work with students K-1 who fall between the 11th and 25th percentile as measured by AimsWeb benchmark assessment; and, students 2-5 who are one to two grade levels below their current grade level as measured by iReady diagnostics. HDES' math and reading specialists will continue to focus on the neediest of students who fall below the 11th percentile and two or more grades below their current grade level.
- Continue to work with local colleges such as New England College of Henniker, New Hampshire to enlist the support and employment of college students interested in a Title I Interventionist position with the goal of providing sufficient staff to work with students across grades K-5 with the provision of supplemental instruction.
- Hillsboro-Deering School District has also experienced periods of 10-21 days of absences per student due to increased COVID exposures and transmissions during 2021-2022.

**Assessment(s): iReady
MATH**

	Fall 2022 Data			Winter 2023 Data			Spring 2023 Data		
	Math			Math			Math		
	Total Students Tested Per Grade	% of Students 2 or more grades below grade level (Grouping 1)	% of Students 1-grade below grade level (Grouping 2)	Total Students Tested Per grade	% of Students 2 or more grades below grade level (Grouping 1)	% of Students 1-grade below grade level (Grouping 2)	Total Students Tested per grade	% of Students 2 or more grades below grade level (Grouping 1)	% of Students 1-grade below grade level (Grouping 2)
K	61	0 Students	44 Students: 79%	66	0 Students	32 Students: 48%	65	0 Students	9 Students 15%
1	68	16 Students: 24%	42 Students: 63%	68	7 Students: 10%	36 Students: 53%	68	2 Students: 3%	30 Students: 43%
2	61	26 Students: 43%	31 Students: 52%	61	10 Students: 17%	24 Students: 40%	59	2 Students: 5%	18 Students: 30%
3	67	13 Students: 20%	49 Students: 74%	68	8 Students: 12%	30 Students: 43%	68	4 Students: 6 %	21 Students: 32%
4	78	31 Students: 41%	27 Students: 36%	82	18 Students: 22%	34 Students: 42%	81	Students: 20%	Students:41 %
5	57	14 Students: 26%	32 Student: 41%	57	11 Students: 20%	18 Students: 32%	54	Students: 18%	Students:20%

Assessment(s): AimsWeb MATH									
Fall 2022 Data				Using Winter 2023 Data			Using Spring 2023 Data		
Students < 25th %ile				Students <25th % ile			Students <25th % ile		
Math				Math			Math		
	Total Students	# of students	% of class	Total Students	# of students	% of class	Total Students	# of students	% of class
K	59	20	34%	64	13	20%	65	18	28%
1	64	27	42%	65	26	40%	65	25	39%

Conclusions:

Kindergarten: Overall **iReady results** from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, One Grade Level Below decreased from 79% to 15%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 14% to 24%; and, the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 7% to 61%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 100%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level. **AimsWeb results** indicate that the number of students at the kindergarten grade level performing below the 25th %ile decreased from 34% to 28%.

Fourteen Kindergarten students received Title I supplemental math interventions and demonstrated growth with the following results:

- Eight students moved from the Emerging K to Mid K Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 77% to 205% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Two students moved from the Emerging K to Early K Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 38% to 100% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Four students remained at the same Mid K and K Level; however, each student demonstrated growth ranging from 17%% to 135% toward their Annual Stretch Growth.

First Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 24% to 3%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 63% to 43%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 7% to 18% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 6% to 37%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 103%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level. **AimsWeb results** indicate the number of students at the first grade level performing below the 25th %ile decreased from 42% to 39%.

Eighteen First Grade students received Title I supplemental math interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from the Early K to Mid Grade 1 Level while demonstrating 57% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from the K to Early Grade 1 Level while demonstrating 124% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Seven students remained at the same K Level; however, each student demonstrated growth ranging from 32% to 103% toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Nine students moved from the Emerging K to K Grade Level while demonstrating 14% to 135% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.

Second Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 43% to 5%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 52% to 30%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 3% to 22% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 2% to 43%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this school group is 138%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Nineteen Second Grade students received Title I supplemental math interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Early 2 to Mid 2 Grade Level while demonstrating 54% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Seven students moved from Grade 1 to Mid Grade 2 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 72% to 156%.
- One student moved from Grade 1 to Early 2 Level while demonstrating 86% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Three students remained at the Grade 1 Level; however, each demonstrated progress ranging from 43% to 58% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Three students moved from Grade K to Early Grade 2 Level while demonstrating 98% to 204% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Four students moved from Grade K to Grade 1 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 67% to 221%.

Third Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 20% to 6%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 74% to 32%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 5% to 28% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 2% to 35%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 104%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Thirteen Third Grade students received Title I supplemental math interventions with the following results:

- Two students moved from Grade 2 to Mid 3 Grade Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 134% to 140% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.

- Two students moved from Grade 2 to Early 3 Grade Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 54% to 83% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Five students remained at the Grade 2 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 14% to 91% toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from the Grade 1 to Early 3 Grade Level while demonstrating 119% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Three students moved from Grade 1 to Grade 2 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 40 % to 70% toward their Annual Stretch Growth.

Fourth Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 41% to 20%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 36% to 41%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 12% to 16%; and, the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 12% to 23%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 94%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Seven Fourth Grade students received Title I supplemental math interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Grade 3 to Early Grade 4 Level while demonstrating 50% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Two students moved from Grade 2 to Grade 3 Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 10% to 22% toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- Three students remained at the same level; however, each demonstrated growth ranging from 12% to 41% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth
- Two students remained at Grade 3 Level and did not demonstrate progress.

Fifth Grade: Overall iReady results from Fall to Spring Diagnostics, Current Placement Distribution, the number of students Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 26% to 18%; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 41% to 20%; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 24% to 31% and the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 9% to 30%. The median percent progress towards Typical Growth for this group is 56%. Typical Growth is the average annual growth for a student at their grade and baseline placement level.

Twelve Fifth Grade students received Title I supplemental math interventions with the following results:

- One student moved from Grade 4 to Mid 5 Grade Level while demonstrating 100% growth toward his Annual Stretch Growth.
- Four students moved from Grade 4 to Early 5 Grade Level while demonstrating growth ranging from 42% to 148% growth toward their Annual Stretch Growth.
- One student moved from Grade 3 to Grade 4 Level while demonstrating 89% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth Target.
- One student moved from Grade 2 to Grade 3 Level while demonstrating 39% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth Target.
- One student remained at the same Grade 3 Level; however, he demonstrated 17% progress toward his Annual Stretch Growth Target.
- One student made no progress.
- Two students regressed.

Summary of Math Data, comments and suggestions:

According to **AimsWeb results**, the total number of students below the 25th percentile in kindergarten decreased from the Fall to Spring from 34% to 28%. The total percent of students below the 25th percentile in first grade decreased from Fall to Spring from 42% to 39%. Regarding iReady, the

school changed from using percentile ranks to grade levels to determine student selection for Title I supplemental instruction (students one or more grade below grade levels) as it is the metric iReady uses to measure student baseline, progress and projected growth. It was determined that grade levels best align with iReady when selecting students for support. iReady results indicate students made progress across all grade levels. According to **iReady results** from Fall to Spring assessment results of students K-5 indicate the number of students performing at Two or More Grades Below Grade Level decreased from 88 students to 38 students; the number of students One Grade Level Below decreased from 230 to 128 students; the number of students Early On Grade Level increased from 45 students to 85 students; and, the number of students Mid or Above Grade Level increased from 11 to 123 students. Results also provide information regarding areas of concerns per grade level and areas of focus for the 2023-2024 school year. They are as follows:

- A continuation of intervention is recommended in order to support students not making progress as indicated by performance indicators.
- It is critical to continue to address the unfinished learning from instruction missed during COVID related restrictions both in the classroom as well as through small group intervention services for the 2022-2023 school year that continues to be a challenge.
- Students should be allowed and encouraged to use physical manipulatives during growth checks and diagnostics.
- The Math Specialist and Title I staff should administer the Aimsweb assessments to grades K and 1 three times/school year. The math specialist will then continue to compile the data to provide to the teachers. In doing this, there is more fidelity to the assessment and less disruption to the learning in each classroom.
- It is also recommended that Title I Interventionists/tutors work with students K-1 who fall between the 11th and 25th percentile as measured by AimsWeb benchmark assessment; and, students grades 2-5 who are one to two grade levels below their current grade level as measured by iReady diagnostics. HDES' math and reading specialist will continue to focus on the neediest of students who fall below the 11th percentile and two or more grades below their current grade level.
- Provide support and collaborate with administration for the students who did not respond to interventions as evidenced by their lack of progress as well as students who regressed in the skills they previously developed.
- Continue efforts to hire certified educators for Title I Interventionist positions.
- Continue to work with local colleges such as New England College of Henniker, New Hampshire to enlist the support and employment of college students interested in a Title I Interventionist position with the goal of providing sufficient staff to work with students across grades K-5 with the provision of supplemental instruction.
- Hillsboro-Deering School District has also experienced periods of 10-21 days of absences per student due to increased COVID exposures and transmissions during 2021-2022.
- Provide additional tutoring outside of school hours to support students, as needed

3) Non-Performance Data
DETAILED ATTENDANCE SUMMARY
(08/31/2022 - 05/03/2023)

Number of Students	Present	Absent	Excused	Tardy	Dismissed	Percent of Students Attended
332	53,538 hrs	3,500 hrs	6,164 hrs	950 hrs	990 hrs	93.86%

Demographics:

Number of students living with both parents.	262
Number of students living with one parent.	103
Number of students living with grandparents as guardians.	1
Number of students living with others as guardians/adopted.	22

Tier II and Tier III behavior data and the Impact it has with meeting the high academic needs of students.					
Infraction by Type	2018/2019 August to March Totals	2019/2020 August to March Totals	2020/2021 August to March Totals	2021/2022 August to March Totals	2022/2023 August to April Totals
Academic Dishonesty (repeated)	0	0	0	1	0
Bullying	1	1	0	5	13
Bus Infraction	49	26	5	2	5
Disrespect Toward Staff	73	58	17	62	11
Disruptive/Inappropriate Behavior	358	267	117	220	110
Electronic Device Misuse (including cell phones)	0	5	7	0	3
Excessive Unexcused Tardiness	0	0	0	1	0
Harassment - Verbal	0	0	0	2	5
Harassment - Physical	0	1	0	0	0
Harassment - Sexual	0	0	0	0	0
Insubordination/Defiance	20	10	1	255	140
Leaving Class/Area Without Permission	87	111	19	61	47
Misuse of District Technology	4	11	6	5	3
Possession of A Weapon	1	1	1	0	0
Physical Contact - Aggression	274	197	29	190	137
Physical Contact - Assault	4	6	2	0	0
Physical Contact - Fighting	19	23	4	8	7
Theft	4	2	0	1	3
Threatening	19	11	2	3	3
Vandalism	12	15	0	0	5
Verbal Issue - Teasing/Taunting	24	8	8		0

Verbal Issue - Disrespectful Language	32	29	9		45
Leaving School Grounds W/out Permission	2	0	0	0	0
ES Minors	7	1	0		4
Did not Do Work	18	16	9		
Dress Code Violation	2	1	8	0	0
Throwing Items at Others	17	36	3	0	
Swearing	2	3	2	52	45
Talking Back/Arguing	17	11	8		34
Misusing Property	10	9	4	3	1
Throwing Items	17	21	4	0	
Horseplay	2	9	0	0	
Aggressive Posturing	0	3	1	1	
Lying	0	4	1	1	2
Totals:	1075	896	267	873	669
	20% decrease from 18/19 to 19/20		N/A	2% decrease from 19/20 to 21/22	26% decrease from 21/22 to 22/23

Analysis: Based on overall behavioral referrals across a 5 year period, with the exception of 2020-2021, there is a downward trend in behavioral referrals and in turn, a decrease in interrupted instruction.

Within the yellow highlighted areas above, there was a 50% decrease in disruptive/inappropriate behavior from the 2021-2022 school year and 1.3% decrease in Physical Contact- Aggression. The sub-category of Leaving Class/Areas without permission remained the same at 7% from 2021-2022 to the 2022-2023 school year with a general downward trend from 2019-2020 school year. The area of Insubordination/Defiance showed a decrease of 8% from the 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 school years. Areas of focus are bullying and talking/arguing with both areas increased from 5 to 13 from 21-22 to 22-23 with 0 talking back/arguing in 21-22 increased to 34 in 22-23 reported incidents.

In an effort to revise and maximize the use of Tier I behavioral supports, fidelity measures are required for: Implementation of School wide Behavioral Expectations, Implementation of Responsive Classroom Structures including consistent classroom management techniques (3 steps), and School Counseling instruction. Additionally, to be able to identify and communicate student needs in a timely and consistent manner the district implemented School Wide Information System (SWIS) to track behavioral referrals with the goal of improving the schools ability to identify and intervene with student behavioral needs at the school, grade, classroom and student levels.

Currently, HDES is in its fourth year of developing a Multi-Tiered System of Support with the objective of early identification of students behavioral needs, timely determination and application of effective interventions, and regular progress monitoring. Behavioral Goals are as follows: 1) through

teacher consultation and training from behavioral support team (behavioral interventionist, school counselors, school psychologist) the number of students receiving effective in-class support for identified area of need will increase (ie. lagging skills inventory- Ross Greene); and, 2) through increased accurate identification of student needs, less students will require less time outside the classroom to obtain behavioral support. Both of these goals will result in all students having increased, uninterrupted instructional time. In *Advancing Education Effectiveness: Interconnecting School Mental Health and School Wide PBIS, Volume 2 An Implementation Guide* (Eber, L. et. al. 2019) authors cite research that supports an integrated approach and the interconnected effect of behavior on academics and academic achievement on emotional functioning. The publication states, "in studies on children and youth, effective academic intervention has been found to improve school performance, and also improve emotional/behavioral (EB) functioning (Mulcahy et al., 2017). Relatedly, well-done counseling may improve EB functioning and also improve school performance (Suldo et al.,2014)". p.2.

4) Perception Data: (Insert Data Tables or Description here)

5 Fean nights this school year, cybersecurity 5 people in attendance, reading w/ 56 in attendance, math w/52 in attendance, bike safety and vocabulary w/98 in attendance: interactive w/bike, SRO, vocabulary applied to everyday activities, in order to increase attendance had raffles related to the small meal, and provided waiver to book fair for up to \$9.99. Family Fun Fest w/family engagement gave away 782 books. Method of obtaining the books across the grade levels: talked to student interest, we talked to students to get interest areas, with principals asking students individually. Wings of Fire was a big hit.

Survey information from FEAN: quality of information presented, games were games parents could connect with and were not electronic. Plan to survey parents, historically it has been hard to verbalize/identify what they'd like to hear more about. Maybe constructing a checklist for parents, with different categories, to prioritize in terms of areas of interest. Parent training versions and information with methods and skills we teach. Continue to find creative ways to get into the school buildings- think about times of day we offer this, for example offer in the morning and do a breakfast and getting a variety of parents to participate. Idea from parent and team member to break activities presented in FEAN to be broken down into grade level so they can examine activities by grade level. Typical development and areas of needs can be emphasized to the same degree.

Surveys are provided to parents at the beginning of the school year and during monthly FEAN events when held; however, parents did not respond to the survey. FEAN is also an opportunity when surveys are offered to parents; however, large events were not held in person due to a continuation of COVID restrictions. Parents did respond to a questionnaire offered to them at the Parent/Teacher Conferences held during March 2022 to which parental input was requested regarding their interest in their child attending the Title I Summer program. As a result, 49-students will be attending the summer program based on one of the five options for their child to attend (small group instruction in person, one to one instruction in person, remote tutoring, independent work packet with teacher access and independent work packet).

Based on information that is available on the Title I section of the HDES' website and Student/Parent Handbook, parents are provided with the following information:

- HDES is a Title I school.
- Title I programs available to their child.
- Efforts are made to create a stronger sense of community for students and staff and that staff are very dedicated.
- Majority of parents shared that there is sufficient time for parents and teachers to have meaningful discussions during parent-teacher conferences.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

- If possible, continuity with schedules between grades as parents are often confused with the changing schedules per grade level and per school year, and communicate changes and rationale to parents.
- It is also recommended that Title I Interventionists/tutors work with students K-1 who fall between the 11th and 25th percentile as measured by AimsWeb benchmark assessments; and, students 2-5 who are one to two grade levels below their current grade level as measured by iReady diagnostics. HDES' math and reading specialist will continue to focus on the neediest of students who fall below the 11th percentile and two or more grades below their current grade level.
- Conduct multiple surveys over the course of the year (i.e., Open House, Student Showcase, Parent Conferences, FEAN, 603 Bright Futures Surveys.)
- Survey students and staff as well as parents.
- Provide alternate ways to survey families (electronically, mail, email, Survey Monkey type of service.)
- Provide parent education opportunities at varying times to which most families are available to attend.
- Provide training and improved communication of assessment results and how to interpret results to increase parents' understanding of their child's abilities and challenges.
- Increase resources for parents to use and keep to support their child at home.
- Continue to provide FEAN on a monthly basis in order to further educate, connect and increase meaningful engagement with families.
- If possible, schedule a FEAN event with guidance counselors providing training to support children's mental health per age/grade level.
- Schedule events at a date and time that does not conflict with HDMS and HDHS to ensure parents' availability for HDES' events.
- For the 2022-2023, add an assessment/reflection of progress with goals established at Needs Assessment Meeting for the 2022-2023 school year (see 2022-2023 School Plan below.)
- Strength accommodating nature of teachers to have parents attend PTC and keep lines of communication open. This year PTC attendance numbers were over 80% both in fall and spring.

5) Process Data: Data was collected and reviewed multiple times during the school year to obtain the effectiveness of the intervention and its educational impact. A multidisciplinary team consisting of administrators, reading specialist, math specialist, behavior specialist, teachers, interventionists, and a parent reviewed multiple forms of data included in the Needs Assessment and provided recommendations to guide educational and behavioral interventions.

1) Strengths of the educational program as determined by data collection and analysis.

- Veteran Staff with master's degree
- Diverse and multiple resources
- Technology and purchases to support and enhance students' access to the core curriculum
- After School clubs and student participation, Robust before and afterschool program that is run in the school building.
- Offering Parent Nights for specific trainings per parent interest (i.e., *Anxiety, Finding Calm in the Midst of Emotional Storm, Positive Parenting*)
- Purchase of Ready Math program, assessment/diagnostic component, IReady, and ongoing professional development opportunities
- Purchase of Lucy Calkin's *Units of Study, Reading and Writing Program* used in combination with Foundations for phonics instruction.
- PLC groups developed per grade level for the 2019-2020 School Year
- The work completed as a result of the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan resulting in being removed from CSI status.
- Administrative Structure, revised ILT (Instructional Team Leaders) to a decision-making body, WestEd Administrative Coaching
- After School clubs
- Duncan Jenkins Grant available to enrich student and staff opportunities and experiences
- PTO Involvement and generosity
- Preschool and multiple programs available to students at risk and children with educational disabilities
- Preschool and kindergarten orientation for parents
- One-to-one devices for students to access software programs at home
- Safety Care Training: in-house training provided by three staff who were trained to train staff (District prides itself on building capacity from within via the *train the trainer model*)
- Summer books for students
- WestEd targeted support for teachers and staff to improve educational practices, continued
- Obtained new Cargo Van and Book Mobile Van
- Expanding Book Mobile Program to engage families in an outreach manner

2) Areas needing to be strengthened as determined by the data collection and analysis.

- Project Aware integrating with frameworks/structures in place to enhance the response to mental health issues, to reduce behavior problems that result in violence, bullying, and suspensions (include in data analysis).
- Increased experiential opportunities for students
- To increase the purchase of programs such as HearBuilder and Great Leaps for students at-risk to access programs at home for school-to-home skill practice
- To increase family engagement through events such as FEAN, Open House, Parent/Teacher Conferences; to purchase resources that include but are not limited to assisting with homework support, reducing video game use, mental health support; and, to purchase activities that include but are not limited to educational games for reading and math practice for families to keep for home use
- Continue efforts to work with local agencies, i.e. *Grapevine: Family and Community Resource Center*, as a response to support grandparents raising their grandchildren
- Continue efforts to hire Title I Academic Interventionists

2023- 2024 SCHOOL PLAN

(Based on 2022-2023 Annual Needs Assessment, held May 18th and 25th, 2023)

Strengths: Hillsboro-Deering Elementary School continues to establish consistency and fidelity of instruction across grade levels with the purchase and implementation of READY Math, an adaptive diagnostic and instruction that includes both student online and teacher-led instruction that readily correlates to Common Core State Standards while meeting the individual needs of students. To improve students' reading and writing skills, the Lucy Calkin's *Units of Study, Reading and Writing Program* was also purchased and implemented throughout the 2020-2021 school year in combination with Foundations for explicit instruction in Phonics. Teachers, specialists, interventionists, paraeducators and administrators received training at the beginning of the school year and throughout the school year.

The support of the behavior specialist, two school counselors and Tier II and Tier III support from the school psychologist, continues to have an impact on improved student behavior as evidenced by data and narrative noted in the non-performance section of the Needs Assessment.

Weaknesses: Continued work is needed to improve reading and math skills for students given the number of students performing below the 25th percentile and grade level as noted in the performance section of the Needs Assessment. Continued work is needed to decrease the highest area of disruptive behaviors that are interfering with educational progress of students as noted in the non-performance section of the Needs Assessment.

GOALS:

- 1) In the area of reading, 75% of students in grades K-5 will perform at or above grade level as evidenced by the district's progress monitoring measured three times per school year.
- 2) In the area of reading and of the students that receive Title I supplemental instruction, 100% of the students will demonstrate growth as evidenced by the district's progress monitoring assessments.
- 3) In the area of math, 75% of students in grades K-5 will perform at or above grade level as evidenced by the district's progress monitoring measured three times per school year.
- 4) In the area of math and of the students that receive Title I supplemental instruction, 100% of the students will demonstrate growth as evidenced by the district's progress monitoring assessments.
- 5) Improve behavior and culture by decreasing Tier II and Tier III disruptive behaviors by 50% in the areas with the highest incidences through the direct support of the two School Counselors and Behavior Interventionist as evidenced by school wide data base, SIS, discipline reports.
- 6) Transition from Preschool to Kindergarten: 85% of students attending *Kinderfun* summer program will demonstrate academic and social/emotional readiness for kindergarten as evidenced by their performance across all settings (i.e., classroom, specials, lunch, and recess) within the first 30-days of the school year as evidenced by teachers' reports.
- 7) To improve the individual skills of preschool students in the following areas: positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge of early language and communication and early literacy skills, and to improve use of appropriate behaviors from entering program baseline to exiting program as measured by Teaching Strategies (TS) Gold and staff observations.