NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are ***not*** identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: LONG BRANCH	School: Amerigo A. Anastasia School
Chief School Administrator: DR. MICHAEL SALVATORE	Address: 92 Seventh Avenue
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: 1-5
Title I Contact: Mrs. Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Mr. Francisco E. Rodriguez
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: frodriguez@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: (732) 571-2868 ext. 40311	Principal's Phone Number: (732) 571-3396

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

❑ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

_____ _____ _____

Principal's Name (Print) **Principal's Signature** **Date**

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ _____, which comprised _____% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $_____, which will comprise _____% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Parent Involvement	3	Family and Community Engagement		
Extended Day Tutors	1&2	Extended Learning Time and Extended Day		
Professional Development	1&2	Content Specific Staff Training		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): *"The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

***Add lines as necessary**.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Francisco E. Rodriguez	School Staff- Administrators	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Michelle Merckx	School Staff- Administrators	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lee Carey	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Special Education	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Melissa Christopher	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Michele LaPiana	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Judith Louis	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Erin Smith	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

Lauren Sweet	Community Groups	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kelley Stiles	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 3	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Markus Rodriguez	School Staff – Student Facilitator	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Jessica Alonzo	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:
The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
10/29/14	Amerigo A. Anastasia School, Room 140	Comprehensive Needs Assessment, revisit school's mission, review schoolwide goals, discuss implementation of new programs	X		x	
11/18/14	Amerigo A. Anastasia School, Room 140	Review all data measures, review allocation of funds	X		x	
12/17/14	Amerigo A. Anastasia School, Room 140	Schoolwide Plan Development, review data assessment results, analyze data, brainstorm reviewing schoolwide goals/findings from data	X		x	
1/20/15	Amerigo A. Anastasia School, Room 140	Program Evaluation, data assessment results, research based perception surveys	X		X	
2/26/115	Amerigo A. Anastasia	PARCC expectations,	X		X	

	School, Room 140	professional development, scheduling, observations, AAA school survey, reflections				

***Add rows as necessary**.

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	The singular aim and sole commitment of our school system is to equip every Long Branch student with the competence and confidence to shape his/her own life, participate productively in our community, and act in an informed manner in a culturally diverse global society. Our District Leadership Team diagnostically crafted an Instructional Focus, which will serve as a roadmap for making Long Branch Public Schools a benchmark of excellence among school districts in New Jersey. The roadmap is built on four foundations, or Four Pillars, namely: • Holding students and adults to high expectations of conduct and performance. • Ensuring that all students master the academic standards. • Working collaboratively and basing decisions on fact, not opinion. • Building strong partnerships with families and community. New and refined school wide programs in reading, writing and math are incorporated to raise student achievement. Parental involvement activities are offered to build a stronger

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

	community partnership to enhance the education of our students.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (*Evaluation*). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned? The school wide program was not fully implemented as planned. The Long Branch Public School District continued to implement the research based literacy program, Treasures, to address the English Language Arts priority problem, but did not provide professional development specific to the program; however, reading trainings and support was provided through Achieve3000 professional development and within Professional Learning Communities within the school year, but not during the summer. The research based mathematics program, Everyday Math, continued to be implemented to address the mathematics priority problem and professional development was provided with this program during the school year, but not during the summer.
2. What were the strengths of the implementation process? The strengths were weekly Professional Learning Community meetings throughout each grade level that focused on standards and analysis of data. As a result, quarterly goals were set by each teacher in order to work towards increasing student achievement to address the priority problems.
3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter? One challenge the school encountered was that the district did not offer Summer Learning Institutes as was done in the past. Another challenge was that due to other priorities, professional development was offered to Bilingual and ELL teachers, but not to general education staff. A final challenge was that the afterschool tutoring programs began late in the year instead of during the first marking period.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation? Teachers were provided with time to collaborate on successful teaching strategies and to analyze and discuss student assessment data during weekly PLC meetings and sometimes during weekly faculty meetings. Another step was the addition of professional development days built into the 2014-2015 calendar to provide teachers with opportunities to improve their teaching techniques, to differentiate instruction curriculum, and to meet the needs of all students in the classroom. Teachers were then asked to use the data to identify students in need of additional support and refer them to afterschool RTI tutoring. The apparent strength of implementation is the process of identifying students with specific needs and then providing them with the additional resources and differentiating instruction to help meet their needs within the classroom or afterschool.
5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs? The buy in was not very difficult because most of the initiatives were district wide and being implemented throughout the school district and supported by central office administration. Having administrators, supervisors, and teachers collaborating together in creating the most effective way to apply the programs was beneficial. Also, meeting to reflect about what was working and what needed some adjustments helped to keep the programs aligned with the vision.
6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions? Staff was administered the New Jersey School Climate Survey. Staff responded to questions based on 8 domains. The domain scores are as follows with a higher domain score depicting a healthier school climate: Physical environment 70.6%, Teaching and Learning

72.4%, Morale in the School Community 72.4%, Relationships 74.6%, Parental Support and Engagement 67.4%, Safety 86.4%, Emotional Environment 70.1%, Administration Support 76.6%.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions? Students were administered the New Jersey School Climate Survey. Students responded to questions in 7 domains. The domain scores are as follows with a higher domain score depicting a healthier school climate: Physical environment 79.0%, Teaching and Learning 78.3%, Morale in the School Community 79.6%, Student Relationships 63.5%, Parental Support and Engagement 95.4%, Safety 77.2%, Emotional Environment 69.1%.
8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)? The method of delivery for Language Arts, teachers followed the whole group, small group, centers techniques incorporated in Treasures. Treasures groupings are based in the Gradual Release of Responsibility model. Teachers used multiple methods including small group instruction, one-on-one instruction, and programs such as KidBiz and Lexia to address the individual needs of struggling student populations. In Mathematics, the online differentiated tool provided by Everyday Mathematics identified specific areas of need for students so that teachers could provide individualized small group and whole group differentiated activities to help reinforce weak concepts and skills in mathematics. Teachers were also encouraged to use differentiated activities to address the individual needs of struggling student populations.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

9. How did the school structure the interventions? Teachers were required to differentiate their teaching as per the program's lay out and tutors provided additional intervention to specific students. Students performing below grade level were provided with tutoring, extended-day and extended-year learning opportunities, mentoring, and support from the I&RS team. Students were placed in RTI after-school tutorial program, which provided extra help in the areas of reading and math that are tailored to the student's needs. All students received research-based instruction in the areas of reading, writing, math, science, and social studies, and their parents were invited to the building throughout the year to see classroom instruction and ways to enable them to better help their students at home. Furthermore, all parents were given students' user names and passwords for Treasures, Everyday Mathematics, and Kidbiz3000 to practice targeted weaker academic areas at home.
10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions? Students needing a higher level of interventions would be brought to the attention of the I&RS team.
11. What technologies did the school use to support the program? Technology utilized to support the programs were Treasures online, Everyday Math online, Kid Biz, Pupil Pages, teacher web pages, computer lab, and the use of tablets. The researched based program, Achieve3000 (Kidbiz3000), allowed all students access at home and at school on practice of the common core curriculum standards for reading. Teacher web pages also provided the community and parents with homework and other activities that students were doing in class based on the common core curriculum standards. The school houses a student computer lab with 24

workstations to support these programs. Tablets were also available to all grades 3-5 students in the school to use for online programs. Teachers were also able to use smart boards to support their instruction.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how? Technology offered students the opportunity to access tools which reinforced concepts and skills presented throughout the school day. The technology component needs to be more supported by staff and monitored more closely for it to yield greater success.

Provide a separate response for each question.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** or ***did not*** result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	86	TBD using PARCC	• Kidbiz3000 • Lexia • Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level ELA teachers • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • In-class support using support staff • Job embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings and demo lessons • Treasures program and resources • Differentiated teaching	TBD once 2014-2015 state assessment data is provided

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

			• Afterschool RTI tutoring program • Push-in ELL support	
Grade 5	60	TBD using PARCC	• Kidbiz3000 • Lexia • Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level ELA teachers • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • In-class support using support staff • Job embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings and demo lessons • Treasures program and resources • Differentiated teaching • Afterschool RTI tutoring program • Push-in ELL support	TBD once 2014-2015 state assessment data is provided
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mathematics	**2013-2014**	**2014-2015**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Grade 4	46	TBD using PARCC	• Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers • Push in tutors • Quarterly goal setting/action planning	TBD once 2014-2015 state assessment data is provided

			• Job embedded professional development in mathematics • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments • Afterschool RTI Tutoring • EM program and resources	
Grade 5	32	TBD using PARCC	• Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers • Push in tutors • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • Job embedded professional development in mathematics • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments • Afterschool RTI Tutoring • EM program and resources	TBD once 2014-2015 state assessment data is provided
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language	2013 -	2014 -	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** **or** ***did not*** **result in**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Arts	2014	2015		proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 1	54 using the DRA	TBD using the DRA	• Lexia • Common planning periods for all grade level ELA teachers • In-class support using support staff • Pull-out small group instruction • Job embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings and demo lessons • Treasures program and resources • Differentiated teaching • Afterschool RTI tutoring program • Push-in ELL support	TBD once assessment data is provided
Grade 2	45 using MP4 2014 WCPM	TBD using MP4 SRI	• Lexia • Common planning periods for all grade level ELA teachers • In-class support using support staff • Pull-out small group instruction • Job embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings and demo lessons • Treasures program and resources • Differentiated teaching • Afterschool RTI tutoring program • Push-in ELL support	TBD once assessment data is provided
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided ***did*** **or** ***did not*** **result in proficiency (Be specific for each**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

				intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 1	86 based on LinkIt Form A (Baseline)	18 based on LinkIt Form A Retake	• Everyday Math 4 program • Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers • Push in tutors • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • Job embedded professional development in mathematics • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments • Afterschool RTI Tutoring • EM program and resources	Staff actively used data from all interventions throughout the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation.
Grade 2	126 based on LinkIt Form A (Baseline)	77 based on LinkIt Form A Retake	• Everyday Math 4 program • Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers • Push in tutors • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • Job embedded professional development in mathematics • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments • Afterschool RTI Tutoring • EM program and resources	Staff actively used data from all interventions throughout the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation.
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Treasures reading program	Yes	LinkIt Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 54 out of 59 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A assessment. April 2015: 45 out of 59 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake assessment.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Everyday Math program	Yes	LinkIt Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014 0% of students with disabilities scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 15.6% of students with disabilities scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment.
ELA	Homeless (5 documented students)	Treasures reading program	No	DRA LinkIt Assessments	DRA -Sept. 2014: 1 out of 1 students scored proficient on the DRA (1 was not in school yet). -June 2014: TBD LinkIt -Sept. 2014: 0 out of 2 students scored 60% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. (1 was not in the school yet).

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					-April 2015: 1 out of 3 of students scored 60% or higher on Linkit Form A Retake assessment.
Math	Homeless (5 documented students)	Everyday Math Program	No	Linkit Assessments	Sept. 2014 2 out of 5 homeless students scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015 2 out of 5 homeless students scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment.
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Push-in ELL support, ELL Treasures Intervention Handbook and resources	Yes	LinkIt Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 40 out of 42 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A assessment. April 2015: 33 out of 42 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake assessment.
Math	ELLs	ELL Everyday Math Handbook	No	LinkIt Assessments	18.9% of ELL students scored 80% or higher in September 2014 and April 2015 on the Linkit Form A assessment.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures reading program	No	LinkIt Assessments	Sept. 2014: 30% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). April 2015: 32% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year).

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Everyday Math program	Yes	LinkIt Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 2.9% of Economically disadvantaged students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 22.4% of Economically disadvantaged students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment.
ELA	Schoolwide	Treasures reading program	Yes	LinkIt Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. -Sept. 2014: 17.5% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). -April 2015: 39% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year).
Math	Schoolwide	Everyday Math program	Yes	LinkIt Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 3.5% of total students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 40.8% of total students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment.

Extended Day/Year Interventions – **Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with	• Kidbiz	Yes	LinkIt Assessments (because	There were 10% less failures from September

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	Disabilities	• Treasures Online • Lexia • Summer Enrichment Camp		SRI & WCPM data is not available) Summer Enrichment Camp Attendance	to April. -Sept. 2014: 54 out of 59 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A assessment. -April 2015: 45 out of 59 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake assessment. Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
Math	Students with Disabilities	• EM Online • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	Linkit Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014 0% of students with disabilities scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 15.6% of students with disabilities scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
ELA	Homeless (5 documented students)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless (5 documented students)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	ELLs	• Kidbiz • Treasures Online • Lexia • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	LinkIt Assessments (because SRI & WCPM data is not available) Summer Enrichment Camp Attendance	There were 10% less failures from September to April. -Sept. 2014: 40 out of 42 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A assessment. -April 2015: 33 out of 42 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake assessment. Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
Math	ELLs	• EM Online • Summer Enrichment Camp	No	Linkit Assessments	18.9% of ELL students scored 80% or higher in September 2014 and April 2015 on the Linkit Form A assessment. Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• Kidbiz • Treasures Online • Lexia • Summer Enrichment Camp	No	LinkIt Assessments (because SRI & WCPM data is not available) Summer Enrichment Camp Attendance	Sept. 2014: 30% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). April 2015: 32% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year). Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• EM Online • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	Linkit Assessments	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 2.9% of Economically disadvantaged students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					April 2015: 22.4% of Economically disadvantaged students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment. Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
ELA	Schoolwide	• Kidbiz • Treasures Online • Lexia • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	LinkIt Assessments (because SRI & WCPM data is not available) Summer Enrichment Camp Attendance	There were 10% less failures from September to April. -Sept. 2014: 17.5% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). -April 2015: 39% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year). Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.
Math	Schoolwide	• EM Online • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	Linkit Assessment Data	There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 3.5% of total students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 40.8% of total students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment. Summer Enrichment data TBD for Summer 2015.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
ELA	Homeless (5 documented students)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless (5 documented students)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	ELLs	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
ELA	Economically	• Content area	Yes	• Sign in sheets	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	Disadvantaged	training • PLCs		• Log of PD hours	PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
ELA	Schoolwide	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	Schoolwide	• Content area training • PLCs	Yes	• Sign in sheets • Log of PD hours	95% of staff attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.

Family and Community Engagement **Implemented in 2014-2015**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless (5 documented	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
	students)				
Math	Homeless (5 documented students)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Schoolwide	• Back to School Night • Parent/Teacher Conferences • Parent Visits • Family Science Night	No	Parent Surveys Sign in sheets	Back to School Night 56.5% of families attended Back to School Night. This is a 9.5% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Teacher Conferences 75% of parents attended Spring Conferences. This is a 9% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Visits 95% of classes had at least 4 parents attend at least one parent visit during the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					Family Science Night 55.3% of families attended Family Science Night. This is a 17.3% increase from last year.
Math	Schoolwide	• Back to School Night • Parent/Teacher Conferences • Parent Visits • Family Science Night	No	Parent Surveys Sign in sheets	Back to School Night 56.5% of families attended Back to School Night. This is a 9.5% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Teacher Conferences 75% of parents attended Spring Conferences. This is a 9% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Visits 95% of classes had at least 4 parents attend at least one parent visit during the school year. Family Science Night 55.3% of families attended Family Science Night. This is a 17.3% increase from last year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

❑ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

_____	_____	_____
Principal's Name (Print)	**Principal's Signature**	**Date**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2014-2015

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	• Developmental Reading Assessment (Gr 1) • Scholastic Reading Inventory (Gr 2-5) • LinkIt Assessments (Gr 1-5)	DRA • Sept. 2014: 40% of students were proficient on the DRA. • June 2014: TBD SRI • Sept. 2014: 32% of students were proficient on the baseline SRI. • June 2014: TBD LinkIt • Sept. 2014: 17.5% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). • April 2015: 39% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year).
Academic Achievement – Writing	Treasures Writing Unit Assessments	Data will be collected schoolwide beginning September 2015 school year.
Academic Achievement – Mathematics	Everyday Math Unit Assessments Linkit Assessments	Everyday Math Unit Assessments • 81.6% of grade 1 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 58.2% of grade 2 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 35.4% of grade 3 students scored 80% or better on EM unit

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		assessments • 56.7% of grade 4 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 61.3% of grade 5 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments LinkIt Assessments **Grade 1** Sept. 2014 5.4% (5 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 80.8% (76 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 2** Sept. 2014 3% (4 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 40.3% (52 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 3** Sept. 2014 0.9% (1 student) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 9.4% (10 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 4** Sept. 2014 0.7% (1 student) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 42.1% (54 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 5** Sept. 2014 8.6% (9 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Assessment. April 2015 35.9% (37 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment
Family and Community Engagement	Parent Surveys	Back to School Night: 56.5% of families attended Back to School Night. This is a 9.5% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Teacher Conferences: 75% of parents attended Spring Conferences. This is a 9% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Visits: 95% of classes had at least 4 parents attend at least one parent visit during the school year. Family Science Night: 55.3% of families attended Family Science Night. This is a 17.3% increase from last year.
Professional Development	PLC meetings Professional Development Surveys	100% of staff was offered weekly Professional Learning Community time during common planning periods 100% of teachers were offered specific PD trainings in order to increase student test scores in ELA and Math 100% of staff were asked to participate in Professional Development Surveys
Leadership	Principal Leadership Network Meetings Personal PD Plans	100% of Leadership PD was reflected in Staff PLCs and Staff Meetings. 100% of Leadership PD was reflected within teacher evaluation and student growth.
School Climate and Culture	Teacher Perception Survey	The domain scores are as follows with a higher domain score depicting a healthier school climate: • Physical environment 70.6%, • Teaching and Learning 72.4% • Morale in the School Community 72.4% • Relationships 74.6% • Parental Support and Engagement 67.4% • Safety 86.4, Emotional Environment 70.1%

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		• Administration Support 76.6%
School-Based Youth Services	Attendance of students/families	90% of students/families invited to events will attend (Thanksgiving Dinner, Success Dinner, Gr 1 Parent Workshop)
Students with Disabilities	LinkIt Assessments	**ELA:** There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 54 out of 59 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A assessment. April 2015: 45 out of 59 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake assessment. **Math:** There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014 0% of students with disabilities scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 15.6% of students with disabilities scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment.
Homeless Students	DRA LinkIt Assessments	**ELA:** DRA -Sept. 2014: 1 out of 1 students scored proficient on the DRA (1 was not in school yet). -June 2014: TBD LinkIt -Sept. 2014: 0 out of 2 students scored 60% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment. (1 was not in the school yet). -April 2015: 1 out of 3 of students scored 60% or higher on Linkit Form A Retake assessment. **Math:** Sept. 2014 2 out of 5 homeless students scored 80% or higher on Linkit

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		Form A assessment. April 2015 2 out of 5 homeless students scored 80% or higher on Linkit Form A assessment.
Migrant Students	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	LinkIt Assessments	**ELA:** There were 10% less failures from September to April. -Sept. 2014: 40 out of 42 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A assessment. -April 2015: 33 out of 42 students scored below 60% proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake assessment. **Math**: 18.9% of ELL students scored 80% or higher in September 2014 and April 2015 on the Linkit Form A assessment.
Economically Disadvantaged	LinkIt Assessments	**ELA:** Sept. 2014: 30% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). April 2015: 32% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year). **Math:** There were 10% less failures from September to April. Sept. 2014: 2.9% of Economically disadvantaged students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment. April 2015: 22.4% of Economically disadvantaged students scored 80% or higher on the Linkit Form A assessment.

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment? The Anastasia School conducted a comprehensive needs assessment using teacher surveys, standardized assessment data, and local assessment data. The committee analyzed the data gathered. Results from the surveys along with standardized assessments and students' achievement on local assessments were analyzed and discussed at PLC and faculty meetings. This report focuses on goals in the area of English Language Arts and Mathematics. The report also addresses the needs of specialized populations as identified in the information gathered.
2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups? District administrators, building administrators, supervisors, and teachers analyzed results from State Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, and curriculum based assessments. These data are disaggregated by all subgroups. Once disaggregated, data are used to create action plans with regards to professional development and curriculum revision in an effort to address marked areas of strengths and weaknesses.
3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)? The quantitative data from the collection methods is valid and reliable because the assessment tools measure what they intend to measure and the assessments will yield same results on repeated occasions as proven through research. The surveys used to collect qualitative data are both established and reliable. For example, the Scholastic Reading inventory (SRI) has been the subject of many scientific validation studies. The SRI research ranges from a norming study with a sample of 512,224 students to an analysis of gender, race, and ethnic differences among 19,000 fourth through ninth grade students.
4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction? The data analysis revealed that most of the interventions are contributing to an increase in student achievement; however, because of the large achievement gap, data is not meeting the Common Core State Standards' rigorous expectations. Classroom instruction is improving as teachers gain familiarity and ownership of using data, standards, and curriculum to drive prescriptive instruction.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)? There has been an increased focus on job-embedded professional develop opportunities. The data showed that there is some evidence that implementation of learned strategies has been carried over into classroom instruction.

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner? Students identified through standardized assessment data, quarterly benchmarks, unit assessments, and/or local assessments, interim reports, teacher recommendation, observation conducted by student facilitators, weekly attendance data, and discipline referrals. These data help student facilitators and teachers identify and place students in proper intervention programs as well as help to monitor their progress and length of participation in them.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students? Educationally at-risk students are provided with effective assistance by receiving tutoring support, as well as extended day and year programs, such as Achieve3000, Lexia, and RTI tutoring, focusing on areas in need of academic assistance. Weekly and quarterly data is reviewed to provide specific support. In addition, the ELA and Math programs have built in differentiation activities, which include ELL and Tier 2 interventions. Students with attendance concerns are identified with on-going family contact and support given to assist these students in improving their attendance. All students are instructed using research based programs. Parents are invited to various workshops which offer information so that they can assist their children at home. The School I&RS team addresses all at risk students referred to the team for wither academic, attendance, or behavior concerns.

8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students? N/A

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students? Because the homeless students were included within the total population, all interventions provided for the total population were also provided for this subgroup. Additionally, student facilitators provided support throughout the school year as needed.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program? Grade level representatives and elected members of the teaching staff serve on the No Child Left Behind committee as well as the Professional Development committee. At these committee meetings, data is gathered, presented and utilized to determine school wide goals and implementation of new programs to reach these goals. All classroom teachers are a part of professional learning communities that analyze data and make informed instructional decisions based on their analysis.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school? The school helps students' transition from elementary to middle school through articulation meetings the middle school during entry and exit of students through Anastasia School. The school makes sure to evaluate student's growth on the common core state standards along with the designed curricula spiral in both ELA and mathematics. The Treasures program seamlessly creates a bridge from the primary curriculum preparing students to transition to the upper grades with consistent language, strategies and exposure to literature. Students transitioning from elementary to middle school attend assemblies and visit the middle school to better understand what to expect in the upcoming year. A summer reading assignment is also presented to students to complete which may assist in preparing them in completing a typical middle school assignment. These strategies may make the transition to the middle school less stressful.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan? All available data was collected, shared and analyzed by the NCLB Committee. From this process we identified the top four priority problems and explored their possible root causes.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	ELA	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	LinkIt Assessments • Sept. 2014: 17.5% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A (baseline). • April 2015: 39% of students were 60%+ proficient on LinkIt Form A Retake (end of year). SRI • Sept. 2014: 32% of students were proficient on the baseline SRI. • June 2014: TBD	Everyday Math Unit Assessments • 81.6% of grade 1 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 58.2% of grade 2 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 35.4% of grade 3 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 56.7% of grade 4 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments • 61.3% of grade 5 students scored 80% or better on EM unit assessments LinkIt Assessments **Grade 1** Sept. 2014 5.4% (5 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 80.8% (76 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 2** Sept. 2014 3% (4 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 40.3% (52 students) scored 80% or better on

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

		the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 3** Sept. 2014 0.9% (1 student) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 9.4% (10 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 4** Sept. 2014 0.7% (1 student) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 42.1% (54 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment **Grade 5** Sept. 2014 8.6% (9 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment. April 2015 35.9% (37 students) scored 80% or better on the Linkit Form A Assessment
Describe the root causes of the problem	Teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how they are connected to reading/writing standards. They are also continuing to work on using data and professional development to drive instruction.	Targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic mathematical knowledge; stronger ability to differentiate instruction to student's needs. Students who are not performing on grade level in basic skills Teachers continue to work on using data and professional development to drive instruction.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	All
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English Language Arts	Mathematics
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Treasures Kidbiz3000 Lexia	Everyday Math LinkIt

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Treasures Reading/Writing Program, Kidbiz3000, and Lexia are aligned with the Common Core State Standards: Reading Standards for Literature K–5 Reading Standards for Informational Text K–5 Reading Standards: Foundational Skills K–5 15 College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing Writing Standards K–5 Speaking and Listening Standards K–5 Language Standards K–5 Standard 10: Range, Quality, and Complexity of Student Reading K–5 Staying on Topic Within a Grade and Across Grades	Everyday Mathematics has fully incorporated the skills and processes described in the Standards for Mathematical Practice. As a school using Everyday Mathematics. Everyday Mathematics and the CCSS have a shared origin in decades of research and authoritative opinion. Everyday Mathematics was built and is constantly revised using an ever-growing body of research in the learning sciences, authoritative recommendations such as those from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the National Mathematics Advisory Panel, and the professional judgment of the authors. The CCSS are built on the same foundation. So, as a result, good alignment between CCSS and Everyday Mathematics is evident. Everyday Mathematics has produced grade level correlation charts for Kindergarten through Grade 6 to show how the lessons in Everyday Mathematics align to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(A)

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Parent Involvement	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Back to School Night 56.5% of families attended Back to School Night. This is a 9.5% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Teacher Conferences 75% of parents attended Spring Conferences. This is a 9% decrease and the goal was not met. Parent Visits 95% of classes had at least 4 parents attend at least one parent visit during the school year. Family Science Night 55.3% of families attended Family Science Night. This is a 17.3% increase from last year. The goal was met.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Conflicts between school events and home/work schedules (i.e. childcare, transportation, work), lack of connection/follow-up between school and home	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	N/A	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	McRel Teaching Standards Reliable and valid parent surveys Parent newsletters, outreach and communication	

	programs	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	McRel STANDARD II: Teachers establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students through 5. Teachers work collaboratively with the families and significant adults in the lives of their students.	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . "

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Treasures, Lexia	Teachers, Administrators, CST Team	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf
Math	Students with Disabilities	Everyday Math	Teachers, Administrators, CST Team	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=2
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	ELLs	Treasures, Lexia	Teachers, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	What Works Clearinghouse: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, Practice Guide, April 2014
Math	ELLs	Everyday Math	Teachers, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=2
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures, Lexia	Teachers, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Everyday Math	Teachers, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=2
ELA	Schoolwide	Treasures, Lexia	Teachers, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf
Math	Schoolwide	Everyday Math	Teachers, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=2

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

***Use an asterisk to denote new programs**.

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Summer Enrichment Camp	Teachers, Camp Faciltiators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides
Math	Students with Disabilities	Summer Enrichment Camp	Teachers, Camp Faciltiators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Summer Enrichment Camp	Teachers, Camp Facilitators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides
Math	ELLs	Summer Enrichment Camp	Teachers, Camp Facilitators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Afterschool Tutoring	Tutors, Administrators	10% less failures on	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Afterschool Tutoring	Tutors, Administrators	10% less failures on LinkIt Assessment data in comparison to 2014-2015 school year.	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=2
ELA	Schoolwide	Kidbiz3000	Teachers, Administrators	ELA Scholastic Reading Inventory	Achieve3000: National Elementary School, Lexile Study http://www.achieve3000.com/research/gated/2 Achieve3000: State of New Jersey, Lexile Study http://www.achieve3000.com/research/gated/30
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Strategy**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Strategy** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting,	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf
Math	Students with Disabilities	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting,	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf
Math	ELLs	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC meetings, Quarterly data	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level :

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		chats with goal setting,		meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf
ELA	Schoolwide	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting,	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students,	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	data.pdf
Math	Schoolwide	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrators	During the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf

****Use an asterisk to denote new programs***.

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (*Evaluation*). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place? The Title I School wide committee will be responsible for evaluating the school wide program and it will be conducted internally through bi-monthly committee meetings.
2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process? A lack of up-to-date technology for students grades 1 and 2, alignment of instruction with common core standards, and availability of staff for extended day/year programs.
3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)? To gain stakeholder support, the school will hold monthly meetings and provide professional development and/or informational sessions. In addition, continued support through PLC meetings and professional development will be provided.
4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff? New Jersey School Climate survey was used to gauge perceptions of the staff.
5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community? New Jersey School Climate survey was used to gauge perceptions of the community.
6. How will the school structure interventions? Interventions will be structured according to students' individual needs.
7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions? Students will receive instructional interventions based on the needs identified through daily/weekly/quarterly data.
8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program? The school will use tablets (grades 3-5), computer lab (grades 1-2), and SmartSlate to utilize online programs, tools, and resources on a daily/weekly basis dependent on data, best practices, and differentiation.
9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided? Assessment data from diagnostic, weekly, unit, and quarterly assessments will be utilized to measure the effectiveness of the interventions.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? Parent achievement data are reported to the public via the school report card, board meetings, and notifications sent home.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
Math	Students with Disabilities	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
ELA	Homeless	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers, Food/Clothing Drives	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
Math	Homeless	Parent Visitation	Staff	100% of students will be made	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers, Food/Clothing Drives		aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	(2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers, Language Courses, Translated Flyers/Announcements	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
Math	ELLs	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers, Language Courses, Translated Flyers/Announcements	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Fundraisers, Food/Clothing Drives		10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	*International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers, Food/Clothing Drives	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events. 10% increase in attendance in schoolwide events.	Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7.*
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment? To increase parental involvement in the school and to strengthen the home-school connection, parental involvement activities in Math and English Language Arts will be implemented. To seek and encourage parental involvement further, teachers will continue to create and maintain web pages to remain in daily contact with all families to encourage positive participation in their child's education. In addition, HomeLinks and Home Connection newsletters provided by the ELA and Mathematics programs to inform parents of the content being learned during that time period in school will be send home.
2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy? Parents will serve on the Schoolwide committee. In addition, parents may be given surveys or questionnaires or may attend meeting to discuss the development of the policy.
3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? The school will distribute its written parent involvement policy through the school-parent compact being sent home with students and posted on the school's website.
4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact? The school will engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact as a result of parents involved as stakeholders on the Advisory Committee.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact? Parents are asked to sign the document and return it to school. Teachers and Student Advisors follow up, by way of phone calls, and if necessary, home visits, to ensure a compact is returned by every student.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community? Parent achievement data are reported to the public via the school report card, board meetings, and notifications sent home.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III? If the district has not met their annual measurable objectives for Title III, parents are notified by letter.

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results? The school will inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results via the school report card. Additionally, central office presents a public agenda meeting to address these results.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan? The school involves families and community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide plan by having parent representatives attend NCLB monthly meetings and through yearly parent surveys.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children? When received from the testing company, individual student assessment reports are sent home via the U.S. mail from the school. Parents of students at risk or failing are contacted through phone calls and permission letters home to invite students to attend extended day tutorial services.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114 (b)(1)(F)

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds? The Anastasia School will use the 2015-2016 parental involvement funds in multitude of ways. The funds will be allocated to hold several events that are intended to promote a positive school culture and climate that promote student achievement, promote the awareness of curriculum and common core state standards, and recognition of student achievement.

Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	54 100%	Teachers will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and management, family involvement and discipline.
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0 0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	17 100%	Instructional Assistants will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and management, family involvement and supporting teachers within the classroom.
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0 0	

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA* §(b)(1)(E)

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
The Personnel Director and District Administrators attend college and university fairs to recruit highly qualified teachers. Job openings are also posted in the local newspapers and on the district's website. The district offers a high-quality mentoring program for new teachers, as well as an extensive new teacher induction program. This program is conducted throughout the school year and attendance is mandatory for all new teachers. Highly qualified specialists and district personnel are used to help new teachers achieve success in their classroom. Every new teacher is assigned a veteran teacher to help them with the routine problems and concerns that face new teachers. This program coupled with an extensive interview process has helped the district to retain highly qualified teachers. Teachers are afforded the opportunity to advance their studies by attending in-services, workshops and conferences in and out of the district. Every Instructional Assistant in the district has met the NCLB requirement. With the onset of the new legislation, Long Branch entered into an agreement with Brookdale Community College to offer courses to all of the paraprofessionals in the district. This was done at the expense of the district and enabled many paraprofessionals to receive their Associate of Arts Degree and become highly qualified. Those who did not attend Brookdale courses attended prep sessions so that they were able to take the Para-Pro test. Portfolio assessment was not an option in Long Branch. Retention rate of paraprofessionals is high in the Long Branch School District.	Primarily the District Manager of Personnel and Special Projects in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff and Principals.