NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I



2017-2018 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: LONG BRANCH	School: Amerigo A. Anastasia
Chief School Administrator: DR. MICHAEL SALVATORE	Address: 92 7th Avenue, Long Branch, NJ 07740
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: K-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.

Francisco E. Rodriguez	Francisco E. Rodriquez	<u>May 23, 2017</u>
Principal's Name (Print)	Principal's Signature	Date

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held ____9_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$6,127,083, which comprised 96.90% of the school's budget in 2016-2017.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$6,123,576, which will comprise 97.03% of the school's budget in 2017-2018.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2017-2018 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Extended Day Learning Program	1&2	Extended Learning	100-100	\$29,622.16
Tutors &		Time and		
Supplies		Extended Day	100-600	
Professional Development	1&2	Content Specific	200-300	\$10,000
		Staff Training		
ESSA Improvement Leader	1,2&3	Extended Learning	200-100	\$2,750
		Time and		
		Extended Day &		
		Family		
		Community		
		Engagement		
Parent Involvement	3	Family and	200-800	\$2,200
		Community		
		Engagement		

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. Parents/Families and Community Members <u>cannot be affiliated with the school</u>. 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	
Lois Alston	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 5	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 Falco	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Judith Louis	School Staff- Classroom Teacher, Grade 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Erin Hennelly	School Staff – Classroom Teacher, Grade 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lauren Sweet	Community Groups	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Denise Woolley	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	Торіс	Agenda	a on File	Minute	s on File
			Yes	No	Yes	No
9/20/2016	AAA Conference Room	*Establish Stakeholders/Schoolwide Title 1 Committee & discuss/identify roles for team members *E-mail/provide a copy of the last year's Title 1 Plan to committee members to be reviewed *Coordinate monthly meeting dates *Identify Parent Advisory Council Members/select Teacher Representatives *Review school wide goals with the committee *Present the schoolwide goals at one of the	Yes		Yes	

				1	,
		monthly PLC meetings			
		*Prepare a list of data			
		measures you will collect			
		and analyze to assess the			
		2016-2017 plan and to			
		develop the 2017-2018			
		Title 1 plan. (Examples:			
		parent involvement data,			
		survey data, attendance			
		data, discipline data,			
		extended day/year data,			
		math data, reading data,			
		benchmarks, etc.)			
10/17/2016	AAA Library	* Discuss the school's	Yes	Yes	
-, ,		plan and progress in			
		implementing the			
		programs and initiatives			
		related to the schoolwide			
		goals			
		*Professional			
		Development-Discuss			
		professional			
		development initiatives			
		to address priority			
		problems			
		*Review if all			
		stakeholders are			
		following through with			
		the implementation of			
		interventions, strategies,			
		programs, and initiatives			
		identified in the report			
		with fidelity			
		with nuelity			

11/30/2016	AAA Library	 * Review all data measures-Are the interventions, strategies, programs, and initiatives effective? * Allocation of Funds-Are programs properly funded to support implementation? *Select student focus groups to discuss important issues within the school. Obtain student feedback to celebrate what is working and ways to improve what's not. 	Yes	Yes	
12/21/2016	AAA library	*Review data assessment result (Benchmark results Form B, SRI, etc) *Analyze all data-review benchmark data, attendance, reading data, math data, afterschool program data, technology data, etc. *Brainstorm with the committee how you plan to review school wide goals and findings with data analysis with the staff	Yes	Yes	
1/17/2017	AAA library	*Comprehensive Needs	Yes	Yes	

		Assessment *Data assessment results (Data Chats, Action Plans, PD, Afterschool Programs) *Administer research			
		based perception surveys to parents, students, and teachers			
2/28/2017	Room 310	*Comprehensive Needs Assessment *Analyze all survey results *Share overall survey results with the staff *Continue to review and discuss data noted in the Title 1 Plan. If after analyzing the data it is identified a strategy or intervention is not working, what can we do differently?	Yes	Yes	
3/21/2017	AAA Conference Room	 * Program Evaluation *Schoolwide Plan Development *Discuss programs and initiatives that will be implemented for the remainder of the school year. (Programs from the start of the school yr 	Yes	Yes	

		reviewed and discussed. Also possibilities of programs that students could benefit from based on all of the student data) * Review data- attendance? Parent Involvement? *Parent program reviewed			
		*Attendance/tardy issues discussed			
4/18/2017	Room 310	*Program Evaluation *Schoolwide Plan Development * Review and collect data needed to complete the 2017-2018 plan. Discuss what team members will be responsible for gathering the data. *Evaluate goals and report results.	Yes	Yes	
5/16/2017	Library	*Program Evaluation *Schoolwide Plan Development * Review and collect data needed to complete the 2017-2018 plan. Discuss what team members will be responsible for	Yes	Yes	

gathering the data.	gathering the data.
---------------------	---------------------

*Add rows as necessary.

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 2016-2017 Schoolwide Program * (For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2016-2017, or earlier)

- 1. Did the school implement the program 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. The research based mathematics program, Everyday Math, continued to be implemented to address the mathematics priority problem. Also, a variety of parent involvement activities were offered throughout the school year during and after school hours.
- 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/barrier was that Achieve3000 was not available for all of Grade 2-5 students; it was limited to only Grade 3 students this year, so not all students received this additional resource. Although professional development was offered, there was a limited amount focused in on guided reading instruction. Even with school staff working together to ensure students attendance, student tardiness/absenteeism provides challenges to academic success.
- 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. PLCs would meet weekly and sometimes daily to provide opportunities to discuss lesson planning that would focus on specific grade level concerns. The next step was to use additional faculty meetings to analyze data and determine best strategies to effectively implement Everyday Math and Treasures. Professional development days were built into the 2016-2017 calendar to provide teachers with opportunities to improve their teaching techniques and strategies. 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, which included referring students to the I&RS team in a timely manner. The weaknesses included the understaffing for tutoring during school and/or before/after school and lack of access to a school wide resources to support the current curriculum, such as Kidbiz3000 that was previously used.

- 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 all of the initiatives were district wide and being implemented throughout the school district and supported by central office administration. Having administrators, curriculum 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? The Anastasia school staff was administered the NJ School Climate Survey. The results of the survey indicate a healthy school climate with the majority

of responses being agree and strongly agree.

- 7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions? Amerigo A. Anastasia School parents and students were administered the New Jersey School Climate Survey. Results for the surveys were calculated into domain scores with a higher domain score depicting a healthier school climate. Parent survey results are as follows: Physical Environment 84.3%, Teaching and Learning 83.5%, Morale in the School Community 79.4%, Relationships 83.4%, Parental Support & Engagement 82.3%, and Safety- Emotional Environment 81.1%. Student survey results are as follows: Physical Environment 76.9%, Teaching and Learning 79%, Morale in the School Community 78.3%, Student Relationships 57.9%, Parental Support 93.5%, Safety 81.5%, and Emotional Environment 69.6%.
- 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 included teachers following the whole group, small group, and 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 additional resources to address the individual needs of struggling student populations. In mathematics, 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 the differentiated activities to address the individual needs of struggling student populations.
- 9. How did the school structure the interventions? Teachers were required to differentiate their teaching as per the programs' lay

out and tutors provided additional intervention to specific students in specific grades. 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 student's usernames and passwords for Treasures, Everyday Mathematics, and additional resources as per each individual teacher to practice targeted academic areas at home.

- 10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions? Students received instructional interventions on a daily basis within the classroom, guided by differentiated activities and programs. Students needing a higher level of interventions were brought to the attention of the I&RS team for further support.
- 11. What technologies did the school use to support the program? Technology utilized to support the program were Treasures online, Everyday Math online, Achieve3000, teacher web pages, Google Classroom, and the use of tablets/Ipads. The researched based program, Achieve3000 allowed students in Grade 3 access at home and at school on practice of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards for reading and writing. Teacher web pages also provided the community and parents with homework and other activities that students were doing in class based on the New Jersey Student Learning 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, while Ipads were available for grades 1-2 students to use. Teachers were able to use smart boards and Google Classroom (Grades 3-5) with their instruction.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how? Yes. All students and staff in grades 3-5 had access to tablets which helped increase their access to online curriculum and resources, such as Google Classroom. Additionally, Grade 1 and 2 students participated in the Blended Learning Grant for Digital Stories which helped in developing writing skills, such as elements of a story, graphic organizers, and number stories. Staff and students utilized ConnectED for Treasures and Everyday Math. The researched based program, Achieve 3000 (Kidbiz3000), allowed students in Grade 3 access at home and at school on practice of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards for reading. Teacher web pages, ClassDojo, and district/school level social media provided the community and parents with information and other activities that were going on in the school and/or district. The Anastasia School houses a student computer lab with 24 workstations to support our programs. All teachers have access to a smart slate to enhance and support the curriculum.

*Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(III)

Evaluation of 2016-2017 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	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <u>did or did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	Based on PARCC – Exceeding: 0 % Meeting: 22% Approachi ng: 26% Partially Meeting: 29% Not Meeting: 23%	Not available at this time.	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level ELA teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Treasures reading program and resources Schoolwide writing program and resources Platooning Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons 	 The data is unavailable at this time, but staff actively used data from all interventions throughout the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation, which led to student growth (Scholastic Reading Inventory September Baseline was 35% proficiency and March MidYear was 55% proficiency).
Grade 5	Based on PARCC – Exceeding: 3% Meeting: 26%	Not available at this time.	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level ELA teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction 	 The data is unavailable at this time, but staff actively used data from all interventions throughout the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation, which led to student growth (Scholastic Reading Inventory September Baseline was 54% proficiency and March MidYear was 62%

English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

	Approachi		Differentiated homework	proficiency).
	ng: 42%		 Treasures reading program and 	
	Partially		resources	
	Meeting:		 READ180 reading program and 	
	16%		resources	
	Not		 Schoolwide writing program and 	
	Meeting:		resources	
	13%		Platooning	
			 Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis 	
			 Teachers used daily assessment data 	
			to create intervention groups for small	
			group targeted instruction and to	
			support whole group lessons	
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	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <u>did or did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	64 students	Not available at this time.	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Everyday Math program and resources ConnectEd resources Platooning 	• The data is unavailable at this time, but staff actively used data from all interventions throughout the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation, which led to student growth (LinkIt Benchmark September Baseline was 30.1% proficiency and December MidYear was 53.9% proficiency).

Grade 5	106 students	Not available at this time.	 Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Online professional development through the Virtual Learning Community of the University of Chicago Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Everyday Math program and resources ConnectEd resources Platooning Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Online professional development through the Virtual Learning Community of the University of Chicago Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons 	 The data is unavailable at this time, but staff actively used data from all interventions throughout the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation, which led to student growth (Linklt September Baseline was 38.3% proficiency and December MidYear was 55.5% proficiency).
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 2016-2017 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 Arts	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <u>did or did not</u> result in 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	N/A	Fall DRA Advanced Proficient: 7 Proficient: 12 Basic: 26 Below Basic:64 MidYear DRA AP: 8 P: 20 B: 22 BB: 49 EOY DRA Not available at this time.	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level ELA teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Treasures reading program and resources Schoolwide writing program and resources Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons 	• Staff actively used data from all interventions the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation.

Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	EOY DRA Advanced Proficient: 27 Proficient: 42 Basic: 14 Below Basic: 39	Fall DRA Advanced Proficient: 22 Proficient: 36 Basic: 25 Below Basic: 41 MidYear DRA AP: 23 P: 23 B: 24 BB: 55 EOY DRA Not available at this time.	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level ELA teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Treasures reading program and resources Schoolwide writing program and resources Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons 	• Staff actively used data from all interventions the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation.

Mathematics	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <u>did or did not</u> result in 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	N/A	93 students scored	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers 	 Staff actively used data from all interventions the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation.

		below 60% based on Linkit A (Septemb er baseline) 26 students below 60% based on Linkit Form B (Decembe r) EOY Linkit C Not available at this time	 Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Everyday Math program and resources ConnectEd resources Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Online professional development through the Virtual Learning Community of the University of Chicago Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons 	
Grade 2	83 *based on Linkit Form C Assessmen t	107 students scored below 60% based on Linkit A (Septemb er baseline) 59 students scored below	 Common planning periods/PLC meetings for all grade level Math teachers Job embedded professional development Differentiated small group instruction Differentiated homework Everyday Math program and resources ConnectEd resources Quarterly Goal Setting/Data Analysis Online professional development through the Virtual Learning Community of the University of Chicago 	 Staff actively used data from all interventions the year to provide prescriptive instruction, differentiation, and remediation.

		60% based on Linkit Form B (Decembe r) EOY form C Not available at this time	 Teachers used daily assessment data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and to support whole group lessons 	
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 2016-2017 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – Implemented in 2016-2017

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness		Measurable	5 e Outcomes : be quantif	
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Treasures program and READ180	No	LinkIt Benchmark Assessments	LinkIt! CC El growth: Grade 3	LA TEI AG F	orm A to Fo	rm C
					Proficiency	# of students	# of students	# of students

		Form A September 16 students	Form B December 17 students	Form C
	Exceeding	0 scored 80%+	0 scored 89%+	-
	Meeting	2 scored 51-79%	2 scored 62-88%	Not available at this time scored 70%+
	Bubble	0 scored 41-50%	0 scored 52-61%	Not available at this time scored 60-69%
	Approachin g	6 scored 25-40%	3 scored 37-51%	Not available at this time scored 43-59%
	Partial	7 scored 9-24%	8 scored 22-38%	Not available at this time scored 26-42%
	Not Meeting	1 scored less than 9%	4 scored less than 22%	Not available at this time scored less than 26%
	Grade 4			
	Proficiency	# of students Form A	# of students Form B	# of students Form C

	December 24 students	September 27 students	
Not available at this time scored 82%+	0 scored 73%+	1 scored 71%+	Exceeding
Not available at this time scored 61-81%	0 scored 55-72%	0 scored 55-70%	Meeting
Not available at this time scored 51-60%	1 scored 45-54%	2 scored 45-54%	Bubble
Not available at this time scored 31-50%	8 scored 27-44%	10 scored 28-44%	Approachin g
Not available at this time scored 12-30%	14 scored 10-26%	14 scored 12-27%	Partial
Not available at this time scored less than 12%	1 scored less than 10%	0 scored less than 12%	Not Meeting
			Grade 5
# of students	# of students	# of students	Proficiency

						Form A September 21 students	Form B December 24 students	Form C
					Exceeding	0 scored 90%+	0 scored 97%+	Not available at this time scored 95%+
					Meeting	0 scored 60-89%	2 scored 65-96%	Not available at this time scored 63-94%
					Bubble	2 scored 50-59%	1 scored 55-64%	Not available at this time scored 53-62%
					Approachin g	13 scored 30-49%	12 scored 34-54%	Not available at this time scored 32-52%
					Partial	6 scored 10-29%	9 scored 13-33%	Not available at this time scored 11-31%
					Not Meeting	0 scored less than 10%	0 scored less than 13%	Not available at this time scored less than 11%
Math	Students with Disabilities	Everyday Math program	Yes	Linkit Assessments	LinkIt! CC N growth:	1ath TEI AG	Form A to I	Form C

		Grade 3			
		Proficien cy	# of students Form A 16 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
		Exceeding	0 scored 65%+	0 scored 85%+	N/A
		Meeting	3 scored 46%-64%	1 scored 67%-84%	Not available at this time scored 81%+
		Bubble	3 scored 36%-45%	3 scored 57%-66%	Not available at this time scored 71%-80%
		Approachin g	5 scored 19%-35%	7 scored 40%-56%	Not available at this time scored 53%-70%
		Partial	5 scored 1%-18%	1 scored 23%-39%	Not available at this time scored 35%-52%
		Not Meeting	0 scored <1%	5 scored <23%	Not available at this time scored <35%
		Grade 4:	I	I	1

		Proficien cy	# of students Form A 27 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
		Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	0	N/A
		Meeting	0 scored 55%-78%	5 scored 67%-89%	Not available at this time scored 83%+
		Bubble	1 scored 45%-54%	3 scored 57%-66%	Not available at this time scored 73%-82%
		Approachin g	9 scored 26%-44%	7 scored 39%-56%	Not available a this time scored 51%-72%
		Partial	17 scored 7%-25%	7 scored 21%-38%	Not available at this time scored 30%-50%
		Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	2 scored <21%	Not available at this time scored <30%
		Grade 5:	1	1	1
		Proficien	# of	# of	# of

					су	students Form A	students Form B December	students Form C
					Exceeding	0 scored 74%+	0 scored 92%+	N/A
					Meeting	3 scored 52%-73%	1 scored 71%-91%	Not available at this time scored 82%+
					Bubble	7 scored 42%-51%	4 scored 61%-70%	Not available at this time scored 72%-81%
					Approachin g	11 scored 22%-41%	18 scored 42%-60%	Not available at this time scored 52%-71%
					Partial	0 scored 2%-21%	1 scored 23%-41%	Not available at this time scored 31%-51%
					Not Meeting	0 scored <2%	0	Not available at this time scored <31%
ELA	Homeless	Treasures program	Yes	LinkIt Benchmark Assessments	LinkIt! CC E growth: Grade 3	LA TEI AG F	Form A to Fc	orm C

		Proficiency	# of students Form A September 2 students	# of students Form B December 2 students	# of students Form C
		Exceeding	0 scored 80%+	0	-
		Meeting	0 scored 51-79%	0	Not available at this time scored 70%+
		Bubble	0 scored 41-50%	0	Not available at this time scored 60-69%
		Approachin g	0 scored 25-40%	1 scored 37-51%	Not available at this time scored 43-59%
		Partial	2 scored 9-24%	1 scored 22-38%	Not available at this time scored 26-42%
		Not Meeting	0 scored less than 9%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 26%
		Grade 4			
		Proficiency	# of	# of	# of

			students Form A September 1 student	students Form B December 2 students	students Form C
		Exceeding	0 scored 71%+	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+
		Meeting	1 scored 55-70%	0	Not available at this time scored 61-81%
		Bubble	0 scored 45-54%	1 scored 45-54%	Not available at this time scored 51-60%
		Approachin g	0 scored 28-44%	1 scored 27-44%	Not available at this time scored 31-50%
		Partial	0 scored 12-27%	0	Not available at this time scored 12-30%
		Not Meeting	0 scored less than 12%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 12%
		Grade 5	1	1	1

					Proficiency	# of students Form A September 3 students	# of students Form B December 3 students	# of students Form C
					Exceeding	0 scored 90%+	0	Not available at this time scored 95%+
					Meeting	1 scored 60-89%	2 scored 65-96%	Not available at this time scored 63-94%
					Bubble	2 scored 50-59%	0	Not available at this time scored 53-62%
					Approachin g	0 scored 30-49%	1 scored 34-54%	Not available at this time scored 32-52%
					Partial	0 scored 10-29%	0	Not available at this time scored 11-31%
					Not Meeting	0 scored less than 10%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 11%
Math	Homeless	Everyday Math	Yes	Linkit Assessments	LinkIt! CC N	1ath TEI AG	Form A to I	Form C

	program		growth:			
	-		Grade 3:			
			Proficiency	# of students Form A 2 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
			Exceeding	0 scored 65%+	0	-
			Meeting	0 scored 46%-64%	0	Not available at this time scored 81%+
			Bubble	0 scored 36%-45%	0	Not available at this time scored 71%-80%
			Approachin g	1 scored 19%-35%	1 scored 40-56%	Not available at this time scored 53%-70%
			Partial	1 scored 1%-18%	0	Not available at this time scored 35%-52%
			Not Meeting	0 scored <1%	1 scored <23%	Not available at this time scored <35%
			Grade 4:		1	·

			Proficiency	# of students Form A 1 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
			Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	0	N/A
			Meeting	1 scored 55%-78%	1 scored 67%-89%	Not available a this time scored 83%+
			Bubble	0 scored 45%-54%	0	Not available a this time scored 73%-82%
			Approachin g	0 scored 26%-44%	0	Not available a this time scored 51%-72%
			Partial	0 scored 7%-25%	1 scored 21%-38%	Not available a this time scored 30%-50%
			Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	0	Not available a this time scored <30%
			Grade 5:	1	1	1

					Proficiency	# of students Form A 3 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
					Exceeding	0 scored 74%+	0	N/A
					Meeting	0 scored 52%-73%	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+
					Bubble	1 scored 42%-51%	1 scored 61%-70%	Not available at this time scored 72%-81%
					Approachin g	2 scored 22%-41%	2 scored 42%-60%	Not available at this time scored 52%-71%
					Partial	0 scored 2%-21%	0	Not available at this time scored 31%-51%
					Not Meeting	0 scored <2%	0	Not available at this time scored <31%
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

ELA	ELLS	Treasures program	Yes	Linklt Benchmark Assessments	LinkIt! CC EI growth: Grade 3: N/ Grade 4		orm A to Fo	rm C
					Proficiency	# of students Form A September 2 students	# of students Form B December 2 students	# of students Form C
					Exceeding	0 scored 71%+	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+
					Meeting	0 scored 55-70%	0	Not available at this time scored 61-81%
					Bubble	0 scored 45-54%	0	Not available at this time scored 51-60%
					Approachin g	0 scored 28-44%	0	Not available at this time scored 31-50%
					Partial	2 scored 12-27%	2 scored 22-38%	Not available at this time scored 12-30%
					Not	0 scored less than	0	Not available at

					Meeting	12%		this time scored less than 12%
					Grade 5: N	/A		
Math	ELLs	Everyday Math program	Yes	Linkit Assessments	LinkIt! CC I growth:	Math TEI AG	Form A to	Form C
					Grade 3: N	/A		
					Grade 4:			
					Proficiency	# of students Form A 1 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
					Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	0	N/A
					Meeting	0 scored 55%-78%	0	Not available at this time scored 83%+
					Bubble	0 scored 45%-54%	0	Not available at this time scored 73%-82%
					Approachin g	1 scored 26%-44%	1 scored 39%-56%	Not available at this time scored 51%-72%
					Partial	0 scored 7%-25%	0	Not available at this time

					Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	0	scored 30%-50% Not available at this time scored <30%
					Grade 5: N	Ά		
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures program	Yes	LinkIt Benchmark Assessments	LinkIt! CC E growth: Grade 3	LA TEI AG F	orm A to Fo	rm C
			Proficiency	# of students Form A September 70 students	# of students Form B December 70 students	# of students Form A		
					Exceeding	0 scored 80%+	0	-
			Meeting	5 scored 51-79%	7 scored 62-88%	Not available at this time scored 70%+		
					Bubble	7 scored 41-50%	19 scored 52-61%	Not available at this time scored 60-69%
					Approachin g	22 scored 25-40%	14 scored 27-44%	Not available at this time scored 43-59%

		Partial Not Meeting	32 scored 9-24% 4 scored less than 9%	24 scored 10-26% 6 scored less than	Not available at this time scored 26-42% Not available at
				10%	this time scored less than 26%
		Grade 4 Proficiency	# of students Form A September 111 students	# of students Form B December 102 students	# of students Form C
		Exceeding	3 scored 71%+	5 scored 73%+	Not available at this time scored 82%+
		Meeting	12 scored 55-70%	5 scored 55-72%	Not available at this time scored 61-81%
		Bubble	24 scored 45-54%	19 scored 45-54%	Not available at this time scored 51-60%
		Approachin g	47 scored 28-44%	51 scored 27-44%	Not available at this time

scored 31-50%			
	22 scored 10-26%	25 scored 12-27%	Partial
Not available at this time scored less than 12%	0	0 scored less than 12%	Not Meeting
			Grade 5
Form C er	# of students Form B December 101 students	# of students Form A September 102 students	Proficiency
Not available at this time scored 95%+	0	0 scored 90%+	Exceeding
	22 scored 65-96%	27 scored 60-89%	Meeting
	6 scored 55-64%	14 scored 50-59%	Bubble

					Approachin g	42 scored 30-49%	46 scored 34-54%	Not available at this time scored 32-52%	
					Partial	19 scored 10-29%	27 scored 13-33%	Not available at this time scored 11-31%	
					Not Meeting	0 scored less than 10%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 11%	
Math	EconomicallyEveryday MathYesDisadvantagedprogram		Yes	Linkit Assessments	LinkIt! CC Math TEI AG Form A to Form C growth: Grade 3:				
					Proficiency	# of students Form A 70 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C	
					Exceeding	0 scored 65%+	0	N/A	
					Meeting	6 scored 46%-64%	13 scored 67%-84%	Not available at this time scored 81%+	
					Bubble	11 scored 36%-45%	10 scored 57%-66%	Not available at this time scored 71%-80%	

Approachin 38 scored 25 scored Not g 19%-35% 40%-56% avail this t score 53%	
Partial 15 scored 16 scored avail 1%-18% 23%-39% avail this t score 35%	
Not Meeting0 scored <1%6 scored <23%Not avail this t score <35%	
Grade 4:	
Proficiency# of students# of students# of studentsForm AForm BFor 	
Exceeding 0 scored 4 scored N/A 79%+ 90%+	
Meeting 5 scored 24 scored Not 55%-78% 67%-89% avail this t score 83%	
Bubble 9 scored 22 scored Not 45%-54% 57-66% avail this t score 73%-	
Approachin g55 scored 26%-44%32 scored 39%-56%Not avail	

this time scored 51%-72%			
Not available at this time scored 30%-50%	16 scored 21%-38%	42 scored 7%-25%	Partial
Not available at this time scored <30%	5 scored <21%	0 scored <7%	Not Meeting
			Grade 5:
Form C	# of students Form B December	# of students Form A 102 students	Proficiency
N/A	0	0 scored 74%+	Exceeding
Not available at this time scored 82%+	12	13 scored 52%-73%	Meeting
Not available at this time scored 72%-81%	16	27 scored 42%-51%	Bubble
Not available at this time scored	58	58 scored 22%-41%	Approachin g

								52%-71%
					Partial	4 scored 2%-21%	15	Not available at this time scored 31%-51%
					Not Meeting	0 scored <2%	0	Not available at this time scored <31%
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(III)

Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2016-2017 to Address Academic Deficiencies

1	2	3	4	5	6
Content	Group	Intervention	Effective	Documentation of	Measurable Outcomes
			Yes-No	Effectiveness	(Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with	Summer Enrichment	No	LinkIt Benchmark	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth
	Disabilities	Camp		Assessment	Grade 3
					Proficiency Form A September
					16 total students
					Meeting: 2 scored 51-79%
					Approaching: 6 scored 25-40%
					Partial: 7 scored 9-24%
					Not Meeting: 1 scored less than 9%

	Proficiency Form B December
	17 total students
	Meeting: 2 scored 62-88%
	Approaching: 3 scored 37-51%
	Partial: 8 scored 22-38%
	Not Meeting: 4 scored less than 22%
	Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
	this time.
	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth
	Grade 4
	Proficiency Form A September
	27 total students
	Exceeding: 1 scored 71%+
	Bubble: 2 scored 45-54%
	Approaching: 10 scored 28-44%
	Partial: 14 scored 12-27%
	Proficiency Form B December
	24 total students
	Bubble: 1 scored 45-54%
	Approaching: 8 scored 27-44%
	Partial: 14 scored 10-26%
	Not Meeting: 1 scored less than 10%
	Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
	this time.

		LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth
		Grade 5
		Proficiency Form A September
		21 total students
		Bubble: 2 scored 50-59%
		Approaching: 13 scored 30-49%
		Partial: 6 scored 10-29%
		Proficiency Form B December
		24 total students
		Meeting: 2 scored 65-96%
		Bubble: 1 scored 55-64%
		Approaching: 12 scored 34-54%
		Partial: 9 scored 13-33%
		Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
		this time.

Math	Students with Disabilities	Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	Link it	LinkIt! CC Math TEI AG Form A to Form C growth:
					Grade 3:
					September Form A:
					3 scored 46%-64%
					3 scored 36%-45%
					5 scored 19%-35%
					5 scored 19%-35%
					5 scored 1%-18%
					December Form B:
					1 scored 67%-84%
					3 scored 57%-66%
					7 scored 40%-56%
					1 scored 23%-39%
					5 scored <23%
					May Form C: not available at this time
					Grade 4:
					September Form A:
					1 scored 45%-54%
					9 scored 26%-44%
					17 scored 7%-25%
					December Form B:
					5 scored 67%-89%
					3 scored 57%-66%
					7 scored 39%-56%
					7 scored 21%-38%

ELA	Homeless	Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	LinkIt Benchmark Assessments	 Linklt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 3 Proficiency Form A September 2 total students Partial: 2 scored 9-24% Proficiency Form B December 2 total students Approaching: 1 scored 37-51% Partial: 1 scored 22-38% Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time. Linklt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 4 Proficiency Form A September 1 total student Meeting: 1 scored 55-70%

					Proficiency Form B December
					2 total students
					Bubble: 1 scored 45-54%
					Approaching: 1 scored 27-44%
					Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
					this time.
					LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth
					Grade 5
					Proficiency Form A September
					3 total students
					Meeting: 1 scored 60-89%
					Bubble: 2 scored 50-59%
					Proficiency Form B December
					3 total students
					Meeting: 2 scored 65-96%
					Approaching: 1 scored 34-54%
					Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
					this time.
Math	Homeless	Summer Enrichment	Yes	LinkIt	LinkIt! CC Math TEI AG Form A to Form C
		Camp			growth:
					Grade 3:
					September Form A:
					1 scored 19%-35%
					1 scored 1%-18%
					December Form B:

					1 scored 40%-56% 1 scored <21%
					May Form C: Not available at this time
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	Yes	Linklt Benchmark Assessments	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 4 Proficiency Form A September 2 total students Partial: 2 scored 12-27% Proficiency Form B December 2 total students Partial: 2 scored 22-38% Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
Math	ELLS	Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	LinkIt	LinkIt! CC Math TEI AG Form A to Form C growth: Grade 3: N/A Grade 4: September Form A: 1 scored 26%-44% December Form B: 1 scored 39%-56% May Form C: not available at this time Grade 5: N/A

ELA	Economically	Summer Enrichment	Yes	LinkIt Benchmark	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growt
	Disadvantaged	Camp		Assessments	Grade 3
					Proficiency Form A September
					70 total students
					Meeting: 5 scored 51-79%
					Bubble: 7 scored 41-50%
					Approaching: 22 scored 25-40%
					Partial: 32 scored 9-24%
					Not Meeting: 4 scored less than 9%
					Proficiency Form B December
					70 total students
					Meeting: 7 scored 62-88%
					Bubble: 19 scored 52-61%
					Approaching: 14 scored 27-44%
					Partial: 24 scored 10-26%
					Not Meeting: 6 scored less than 10%
					Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
					this time.
					LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growt
					Grade 4
					Proficiency Form A September
					111 total students
					Exceeding: 3 scored 71%+
					Meeting: 12 scored 55-70%
					Bubble: 24 scored 45-54%
					Approaching: 47 scored 28-44%

<u>г</u>		Deutiel, 25 accured 4.2, 270/
		Partial: 25 scored 12-27%
		Proficiency Form B December
		102 total students
		Exceeding: 5 scored 73%+
		Meeting: 5 scored 55-72%
		Bubble: 19 scored 45-54%
		Approaching: 51 scored 27-44%
		Partial: 22 scored 10-26%
		Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
		this time.
		LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth
		Grade 5
		Proficiency Form A September
		102 total students
		Meeting: 27 scored 60-89%
		Bubble: 14 scored 50-59%
		Approaching: 42 scored 30-49%
		Partial: 19 scored 10-29%
		Proficiency Form B December
		101 total students
		Meeting: 22 scored 65-96%
		Bubble: 6 scored 55-64%
		Approaching: 46 scored 34-54%
		Partial: 27 scored 13-33%
		Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at
		this time.

Math	Economically	Summer Enrichment	Yes	LinkIt	LinkIt! CC Math TEI AG Form A to Form C
	Disadvantaged	Camp			growth:
					Grade 3:
					September Form A:
					6 scored 46%-64%
					11 scored 36%-45%
					38 scored 19%-35%
					15 scored 1%-18%
					December Form B:
					13 scored 67%-84%
					10 scored 57%-66%
					25 scored 40%-56%
					16 scored 23%-39%
					6 scored <23%
					May Form C: not available at this time
					Grade 4:
					September Form A:
					5 scored 55%-78%
					9 scored 45%-54%
					55 scored 26%-44%
					42 scored 7%-25%
					December Form B:
					4 scored 90%+
					24 scored 67%-89%
					22 scored 57-66%
					32 scored 39%-56%
					16 scored 21%-38%
					5 scored <21%

					May Form C: Not available at this time
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(III) Evaluation of 2016-2017 Interventions and Strategies

<u>Professional Development</u> – Implemented in 2016-2017

1	2	3	4	5	6
Content	Group	Intervention	Effective Yes-No	Documentation of Effectiveness	Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Yes	PLC AgendaQuarterly goalsLog of PD hours	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	Students with Disabilities	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Yes	 PLC Agendas Quarterly goals Log of PD hours 	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
ELA	Homeless	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Yes	PLC AgendasQuarterly goalsLog of PD hours	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	Homeless	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Yes	 PLC Agendas Quarterly goals Log of PD hours 	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
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	Yes	PLC AgendasQuarterly goalsLog of PD hours	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	ELLs	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats	Yes	PLC Agendas	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended

		with goal setting		Quarterly goalsLog of PD hours	specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Yes	PLC AgendasQuarterly goalsLog of PD hours	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC Meetings Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Yes	 PLC Agendas Quarterly goals Log of PD hours 	100% of teachers were offered opportunities to analyze data, establish goals and attended specific PD trainings, PLCs, and faculty meetings during the school year.
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(III)

Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2016-2017

1	2	3	4	5	6	
Content	Group	Intervention	Effective	Documentation of	Measurable Outcomes	
			Yes-No	Effectiveness	(Outcomes must be quantifiable)	
ELA	Students with	Parent Visitation	Yes	Sign-In Sheets	Parent Visitation Days/Night:	
	Disabilities	Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent		Parent feedback/surveys	Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)	
		Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers				Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)
					Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.	
					Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit	

		Dev
		Day
		Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day
		Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents
		attended
		Talented Presentation Family Attendance:
		September 11th performance:10 families
		1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families
		Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50
		families
		3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families
		Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200
		families
		Martin Luther King Performance Band and
		Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20
		families
		Monmouth University Dance Performance:30
		families
		4th Grade Sharing Day:
		5th Grade SHaring day: 120 families
		Spring Concert: 250 families
		Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus
		and Dance: 35 families
		Back to School Night:
		372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back
		to School Night.
		Parent Teacher Conferences:
		100% of parents were made aware of
		conferences, and 83% attended.
		PTO Fundraisers:
		Halloween Dance- 150 students attended

				Supper with Santa-125 families attended Fall movie night- 100 families attended Spring movie night- 50 families attended
Students with	Parent Visitation	Yes	Sign-In Sheets	Parent Visitation Days/Night:
Disabilities	Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent		Parent feedback/surveys	Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)
	Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers			Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)
				Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.
				Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit Day
				Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day
				Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents attended
				Talented Presentation Family Attendance:
				 September 11th performance:10 families 1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families 3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 families Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus
	Students with Disabilities	Disabilities Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences,	Disabilities Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences,	Disabilities Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, Parent feedback/surveys

					Back to School Night: 372 families out of 599 students (62%) attended Back to School Night Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended. PTO Fundraisers: Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
ELA	Homeless	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Yes	Sign-In Sheets Parent feedback/surveys	Parent Visitation Days/Night:Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 familiesattended Sharing Day (Fall)Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 familiesattended Sharing Day (Winter)Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 ParentVisit Day.Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent VisitDayGrade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island DayTitle I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parentsattendedTalented Presentation Family Attendance:September 11th performance:10 families1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 familiesBoard of Education Meeting Performance: 50families3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 familiesWinter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200

					families Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus and Dance: 35 families Back to School Night: 372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night. Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended. PTO Fundraisers: Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
Math	Homeless	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Yes	Sign-In Sheets Parent feedback/surveys	Parent Visitation Days/Night: Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall) Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter) Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day. Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit Day

					Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents attended Talented Presentation Family Attendance: September 11th performance:10 families 1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families 3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 families Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance: 30 families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus and Dance: 35 families Back to School Night: 372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night. Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended. PTO Fundraisers: Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
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, Back to School Night, Parent	Yes	Sign-In Sheets Parent feedback/surveys	Parent Visitation Days/Night: Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)
		Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers			Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)
					Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.
					Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit Day
					Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day
					Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents attended
					Talented Presentation Family Attendance:
					September 11th performance:10 families 1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families 3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 families Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20
					families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30
					families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus and Dance: 35 families

					Back to School Night:
					372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night.
					Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended.
					PTO Fundraisers:
					Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
Math	ELLS	Parent Visitation	Yes	Sign-In Sheets	Parent Visitation Days/Night:
		Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent		Parent feedback/surveys	Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)
		Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers			Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)
					Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.
					Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit Day
					Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day
					Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents attended
					Talented Presentation Family Attendance:
					September 11th performance:10 families 1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families 3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 families

					Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus and Dance: 35 families
					Back to School Night:
					372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night.
					Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended.
					PTO Fundraisers:
					Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
ELA	Economically	Parent Visitation	Yes	Sign-In Sheets	Parent Visitation Days/Night:
	Disadvantaged	Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent		Parent feedback/surveys	Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)
		Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers			Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)
					Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.
					Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit Day
					Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day
					Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents

					attended
					Talented Presentation Family Attendance:
					September 11th performance:10 families 1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families 3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 families Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus
					and Dance: 35 families
					Back to School Night: 372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night.
					Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended.
					PTO Fundraisers:
					Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
Math	Economically	Parent Visitation	Yes	Sign-In Sheets	Parent Visitation Days/Night:
	Disadvantaged	Days/Nights, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences,		Parent feedback/surveys	Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)

PTO Fundraisers	Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)
	Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.
	Grade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit Day
	Grade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island Day
	Title I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents attended
	Talented Presentation Family Attendance:
	September 11th performance:10 families 1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 families Board of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families
	3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 families Winter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 families
	Martin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30 families
	Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families
	Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families
	Spring Concert: 250 families
	Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus and Dance: 35 families
	Back to School Night:
	372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night.
	Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended.

					PTO Fundraisers:
					Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

Francisco E. Rodriguez

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

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). "

2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2017-2018

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed							nd Outcomes e quantifiable)	
Academic Achievement – Reading	 Diagnostic Reading Assessment Scholastic Reading Inventory Linklt Assessments 	• Sc	o I	eading As Proficien Baseline: Mid-year End-of-ye	ssessme cy 17% (18 : 27% (2 ear: not a	nt 7/104) 7/99) available	at this ti	ime June not available at this time not available at this time not available at	
			Grade 4	35%	43%	48%	57%	this time not	

						available at this time
	Grade 5	45%	48%	57%	63%	not available at this time
Lin	nklt Assess	sments 60	1% Prof	ficiency +		
		Sept - For	rm A	Dec - For	m B	May - Form C
G	Grade 1	N/A		N/A		N/A
G	Grade 2	6% (8/12	28)	13% (13/2	124)	not available at this time
G	Grade 3	5% (4/8	34)	17% (14/	84)	not available at this time
G	Grade 4	11% (14/	182)	8% (11/129)		not available at this time
G	Grade 5	26% (30/	117)	30% (36/2	118)	not available at this time
ELA	A Econom	nically Disa	advant	taged		
		-		A to Form	C growt	h Grade 3
	oficiency I					
70	total stud	dents				
	eeting: 5 s					
	ıbble: 7 sc					
Ap	proachin	g: 22 score	ed 25-4	40%		

Partial: 32 scored 9-24%
Not Meeting: 4 scored less than 9%
Proficiency Form B December
70 total students
Meeting: 7 scored 62-88%
Bubble: 19 scored 52-61%
Approaching: 14 scored 27-44%
Partial: 24 scored 10-26%
Not Meeting: 6 scored less than 10%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 4
Proficiency Form A September
111 total students
Exceeding: 3 scored 71%+
Meeting: 12 scored 55-70%
Bubble: 24 scored 45-54%
Approaching: 47 scored 28-44%
Partial: 25 scored 12-27%
Proficiency Form B December
102 total students
Exceeding: 5 scored 73%+
Meeting: 5 scored 55-72%
Bubble: 19 scored 45-54%
Approaching: 51 scored 27-44%
Partial: 22 scored 10-26%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.

LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 5
Proficiency Form A September
102 total students
Meeting: 27 scored 60-89%
Bubble: 14 scored 50-59%
Approaching: 42 scored 30-49%
Partial: 19 scored 10-29%
Proficiency Form B December
101 total students
Meeting: 22 scored 65-96%
Bubble: 6 scored 55-64%
Approaching: 46 scored 34-54%
Partial: 27 scored 13-33%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
ELA Students with Disabilities
LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 3
Proficiency Form A September
16 total students
Meeting: 2 scored 51-79%
Approaching: 6 scored 25-40%
Partial: 7 scored 9-24%
Not Meeting: 1 scored less than 9%
Proficiency Form B December
17 total students
Meeting: 2 scored 62-88%
Approaching: 3 scored 37-51%

Partial: 8 scored 22-38%
Not Meeting: 4 scored less than 22%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 4
Proficiency Form A September
27 total students
Exceeding: 1 scored 71%+
Bubble: 2 scored 45-54%
Approaching: 10 scored 28-44%
Partial: 14 scored 12-27%
Proficiency Form B December
24 total students
Bubble: 1 scored 45-54%
Approaching: 8 scored 27-44%
Partial: 14 scored 10-26%
Not Meeting: 1 scored less than 10%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 5
Proficiency Form A September
21 total students
Bubble: 2 scored 50-59%
Approaching: 13 scored 30-49%
Partial: 6 scored 10-29%
Proficiency Form B December
24 total students

Meeting: 2 scored 65-96%
Bubble: 1 scored 55-64%
Approaching: 12 scored 34-54%
Partial: 9 scored 13-33%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
ELA ELLS
LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 4
Proficiency Form A September
2 total students
Partial: 2 scored 12-27%
Proficiency Form B December
2 total students
Partial: 2 scored 22-38%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
ELA Homeless
LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 3
Proficiency Form A September
2 total students
Partial: 2 scored 9-24%
Proficiency Form B December
2 total students
Approaching: 1 scored 37-51%
Partial: 1 scored 22-38%
Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.

		LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 4 Proficiency Form A September 1 total student Meeting: 1 scored 55-70%
		Proficiency Form B December
		2 total students
		Bubble: 1 scored 45-54%
		Approaching: 1 scored 27-44%
		Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
		LinkIt! CC ELA TEI AG Form A to Form C growth Grade 5
		Proficiency Form A September
		3 total students
		Meeting: 1 scored 60-89%
		Bubble: 2 scored 50-59%
		Proficiency Form B December
		3 total students
		Meeting: 2 scored 65-96%
		Approaching: 1 scored 34-54%
		Proficiency Form C May: Data not available at this time.
Academic Achievement - Writing	Schoolwide Writing Tasks	 Grade 1: 50% of students scored proficient or higher on the writing tasks.
		• Grade 2: 57% of students scored proficient or higher on the writing tasks.
		• Grade 3: 36% of students scored proficient or higher on the writing tasks.

	 Grade 4: 49% of students scored proficient or higher on the tasks. Grade 5: 59% of students scored proficient or higher on the tasks. 									-
Academic Achievement -	LinkIt Assessments	Linklt Asses	sments	60% Pro	oficienc	;y +				
Mathematics	 Everyday Math Unit Assessments 		Sept - F	Form A	Dec -	Form B	May -	Form C		
		Grade 1						vailable is time		
		Grade 2	16% (2	1/128)	52%(64/123)		vailable is time		
		Grade 3	0%(0	0%(0/85) 31% (26/84) not available at this time						
		Grade 4		not available at this time						
		Grade 5	4% (5,	/117)	44% (52/118)		vailable is time		
		Everyday M	1ath Unit	t Assess	ment 8	0% Profi	ciency +	-		
				Unit 6	Unit 7					
		Grade 1	60%	60%	64%	77%	61%	74%	78%	
		Grade 2	80%	66%	82%	60%	79%	69%	68%	
		Grade 3	43%	48%	39%	38%	59%	45%	45%	
		Grade 4	41%	47%	73%	59%	52%	46%	not	

									availa ble at this time	
		Grade 5	64%	55%	56%	79%	61%	56%	not availa ble at this time	
Family and Community	Sign In Sheets	Parent Visit	tation D	ays/Ni	ght:					
Engagement		Grade 1&2	Sharing	Day: 10	00 famil	ies atten	ded Sha	ring Day	(Fall)	
		Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)								
		Grade 3: 29	familie	s attend	ded Gra	de 3 Pare	ent Visit	Day.		
		Grade 4: 40	Familie	s atten	ded Par	ent Visit	Day			
		Grade 5: 28	familie	s attend	ded Ellis	Island D	ау			
		Title I Parer	nt Works	shop: 1	8/18 pa	rents att	ended			
		Talented Pr	ented Presentation Family Attendance:							
		September 11th performance:10 families								
		1st and 2nd Board of Ed	-	-	•		50 fami	lioc		
		3rd Grade C			-			lies		
		Winter Con	cert/Bai	nd Chor	rus/Dan	ce: 200 f	amilies			
		Martin Luth	-					30 fami	lies	
		Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families								
		Spring Cond		-			.50 1411	11103		
		Count Basie				ith Chor	us and [Dance: 3	5 families	
		Back to Sch	ool Nigl	ht:						

		372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night.
		Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended.
		PTO Fundraisers:
		Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families
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 Survey	100% of staff was administered the NJ School Climate Survey.
School Climate and Culture	Survey, Referrals, PBIS	NJ School Climate Survey results for students:
	participation	76.9% Physical Environment -This domain addresses scheduling, the use of the building, and attitudes toward the building.
		79% Teaching & Learning- This domain focuses on the academic climate of the school and probes support for student development, levels of instructional challenge and relevance, and learning and personal pride in successfully achieving academic objectives by students of learning and teachers of teaching. It also includes general attitudinal measures of satisfaction with the school's overall instructional quality.
		78.3% Morale in the School Community -This domain addresses "pride of place" as ownership and identification with the school's central character, as well as a call to all stakeholders for "belonging" to the school. By considering the school as a "common cause," this domain assesses the school leadership's ability to support and rally the school community to healthy and

		positive outcomes.				
			een students are op rather than negative	en, honest, and res e, preventable outc	pectful and lead to	
		 93.5% Parental Support- This domain is concerned with the degree to whe parents and community members are incorporated into both the social at academic fabric of the school. This includes assessing the efficacy of school-home communications and an assessment of the degree of home support for learning. 81.5% Safety- This domain addresses attitudes toward the individual's see of physical safety in and around the school. 69.6% Emotional Environment - This domain addresses attitudes toward social environment. This includes perceptions of how the average studer ought to, and does, behave as well as the general fairness of the school. 36 students went through the I & RS referral process 				
School-Based Youth Services	Attendance of students/families		hrough the I & RS re	•		
Students with Disabilities	Linklt Assessments	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI A	0	•		
		Grade 3				
		Proficiency	# of students Form A September 16 students	# of students Form B December 17 students	# of students Form C May	
		Exceeding	0 scored 80%+	0	-	
		Meeting	2 scored 51-79%	2	Not available at this time scored 70%+	
		Bubble	0 scored 41-50%	0	Not available at this time scored 60-69%	
		Approaching	6 scored 25-40%	3	Not available at this time scored 43-59%	

	· · ·		1
Partial	7 scored 9-24%	8	Not available at this time scored 26-42%
Not Meeting	1 scored less than 9%	4	Not available at this time scored less than 26%
Grade 4			
Proficiency	# of students Form A September 27 students	# of students Form B December 24 students	# of students Form C May
Exceeding	1 scored 71%+	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+
Meeting	0 scored 55-70%	0	Not available at this time scored 61-81%
Bubble	2 scored 45-54%	1	Not available at this time scored 51-60%
Approaching	10 scored 28-44%	8	Not available at this time scored 31-50%
Partial	14 scored 12-27%	14	Not available at this time scored 12-30%
Not Meeting	0 scored less than 12%	1	Not available at this time scored less than 12%
Grade 5			
Proficiency	# of students Form A September 21 students	# of students Form B December 24 students	# of students Form C May
Exceeding	0 scored 90%+	0	Not available at this time scored 95%+

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	Meeting	0 scored 60-89%	2	Not available at this time scored 63-94%
	Bubble	2 scored 50-59%	1	Not available at this time scored 53-62%
	Approaching	13 scored 30-49%	12	Not available at this time scored 32-52%
	Partial	6 scored 10-29%	9	Not available at this time scored 11-31%
	Not Meeting	0 scored less than 10%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 11%
		I AG Form A to Forr	n C growth:	
	Grade 3			
	Proficiency	# of students Form A 16 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
	Exceeding	0 scored 65%+	0	N/A
	Meeting	3 scored 46%-64%	1 scored 85%+	Not available at this time scored 81%+
	Bubble	3 scored 36%-45%	3 scored 57-66%	Not available at this time scored 71%-80%
	Approaching	5 scored 19%-35%	7 scored 40-56%	Not available at this time scored 53%-70%
	Partial	5 scored 1%-18%	1 scored 23-39%	Not available at this time scored 35%-52%
	Not Meeting	0 scored <1%	5 scored <23%	Not available at this

			time scored <35%
Grade 4:			
Proficiency	# of students Form A 27 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	0	N/A
Meeting	0 scored 55%-78%	5 scored 67-89%	Not available at this time scored 83%+
Bubble	1 scored 45%-54%	3 scored 57-66%	Not available at this time scored 73%-82%
Approaching	9 scored 26%-44%	7 scored 39-56%	Not available at this time scored 51%-72%
Partial	17 scored 7%-25%	7 scored 21-38%	Not available at this time scored 30%-50%
Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	2 scored	Not available at this time scored <30%
Grade 5:			
Proficiency	# of students Form A	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
Exceeding	scored 74%+	0	N/A
Meeting	scored 52%-73%	1 scored 71-91%	Not available at this time scored 82%+
Bubble	scored 42%-51%	4 scored 61-70%	Not available at this

					time scored 72%-81%
		Approaching	scored 22%-41%	18 scored 42-60%	Not available at this time scored 52%-71%
		Partial	scored 2%-21%	1 scored 23-41%	Not available at this time scored 31%-51%
		Not Meeting	scored <2%	0	Not available at this time scored <31%
Homeless Students	LinkIt Assessments	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI	AG Form A to Form C	growth:	
		Grade 3	Grade 3		
		Proficiency	# of students	# of students	# of students
			Form A September	Form B December	Form C May
			2 students	2 students	
		Exceeding	0 scored 80%+	0	-
		Meeting	0 scored 51-79%	0	Not available at this time scored 70%+
		Bubble	0 scored 41-50%	0	Not available at this time scored 60-69%
		Approaching	0 scored 25-40%	1 scored 40-56%	Not available at this time scored 43-59%
		Partial	2 scored 9-24%	1 scored 23-39%	Not available at this time scored 26-42%
		Not Meeting	0 scored less than 9%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 26%
			+		

Grade 4			
Proficiency	# of students Form A September 1 student	# of students Form B December 2 student	# of students Form C May
Exceeding	0 scored 71%+	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+
Meeting	1 scored 55-70%	0	Not available at this time scored 61-81%
Bubble	0 scored 45-54%	1 scored 57-66%	Not available at this time scored 51-60%
Approaching	0 scored 28-44%	1 scored 39-56%	Not available at this time scored 31-50%
Partial	0 scored 12-27%	0	Not available at this time scored 12-30%
Not Meeting	0 scored less than 12%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 12%
Grade 5			
Proficiency	# of students Form A September 3 students	# of students Form B December 3 students	# of students Form C May
Exceeding	0 scored 90%+	0	Not available at this time scored 95%+
Meeting	1 scored 60-89%	2 scored 71-91%	Not available at this time scored 63-94%
Bubble	2 scored 50-59%	0	Not available at this time scored 53-62%

Approaching	0 scored 30-49%	1 scored 42-60%	Not available at this time scored 32-52%
Partial	0 scored 10-29%	0	Not available at this time scored 11-31%
Not Meeting	0 scored less than 10%	0	Not available at this time scored less thar 11%
LinkIt! CC Math TEI	AG Form A to Form	C growth:	
Proficiency	# of students Form A 2 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
Exceeding	0 scored 65%+	0	-
Meeting	0 scored 46%-64%	0	Not available at this time scored 81%+
Bubble	0 scored 36%-45%	0	Not available at this time scored 71%-80%
Approaching	1 scored 19%-35%	1 scored 40-56%	Not available at this time scored 53%-70%
Partial	1 scored 1%-18%	0	Not available at this time scored 35%-52%
Not Meeting	0 scored <1%	1 scored <23%	Not available at this time scored <35%
Grade 4:			
Proficiency	# of students Form A	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C

[]		1	1	1
		1 students		
	Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	0	N/A
	Meeting	1 scored 55%-78%	1 scored 67%-89%	Not available at this time scored 83%+
	Bubble	0 scored 45%-54%	0	Not available at this time scored 73%-82%
	Approaching	0 scored 26%-44%	0	Not available at this time scored 51%-72%
	Partial	0 scored 7%-25%	1 scored 21%-38%	Not available at this time scored 30%-50%
	Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	0	Not available at this time scored <30%
	Grade 5:			
	Proficiency	# of students Form A 3 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
	Exceeding	0 scored 74%+	0	N/A
	Meeting	0 scored 52%-73%	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+
	Bubble	1 scored 42%-51%	1 scored 61%-70%	Not available at this time scored 72%-81%
	Approaching	2 scored 22%-41%	2 scored 42%-60%	Not available at this time scored 52%-71%
	Partial	0 scored 2%-21%	0	Not available at this time scored 31%-51%

		Not Meeting	0 scored <2%	0	Not available at this time scored <31%			
Aigrant Students	N/A	N/A						
English Language Learners	Linklt Assessments	-	AG Form A to Form (arowth:				
Inglish Language Learners		Grade 3: N/A	AG FORM A LO FORM (- growth.				
		Grade 4						
		Proficiency	# of students Form A September 2 students	# of students Form B December 2 students	# of students Form C May			
	Exceeding	0 scored 71%+	0	Not available at this time scored 82%+				
		Meeting	0 scored 55-70%	0	Not available at this time scored 61-81%			
		Bubble	0 scored 45-54%	0	Not available at this time scored 51-60%			
		Approaching	0 scored 28-44%	0	Not available at this time scored 31-50%			
		Partial	2 scored 12-27%	2	Not available at this time scored 12-30%			
		Not Meeting	0 scored less than 12%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 12%			
		Grade 5: N/A						
		LinkIt! CC Math TEI AG Form A to Form C growth:						
		Grade 3: N/A						
		Grade 4:						

		Proficiency	# of students Form A 1 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
		Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	0	N/A
		Meeting	0 scored 55%-78%	0	Not available at this time scored 83%+
		Bubble	0 scored 45%-54%	0	Not available at this time scored 73%-82%
		Approaching	1 scored 26%-44%	1 scored 39%-56%	Not available at this time scored 51%-72%
		Partial	0 scored 7%-25%	0	Not available at this time scored 30%-50%
		Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	0	Not available at this time scored <30%
		Grade 5: N/A			
Economically Disadvantaged	LinkIt Assessments	LinkIt! CC ELA TEI A Grade 3	G Form A to Form C	growth:	
		Proficiency	# of students Form A September 70 students	# of students Form B December 70 students	# of students Form C May
		Exceeding	0 scored 80%+	0	-
		Meeting	5 scored 51-79%	7	Not available at this time scored 70%+
		Bubble	7 scored 41-50%	19	Not available at this time scored 60-69%
		Approaching	22 scored 25-40%	14	Not available at this time scored 43-59%

			1
Partial	32 scored 9-24%	24	Not available at this time scored 26-42%
Not Meeting	4 scored less than 9%	6	Not available at this time scored less than 26%
Grade 4			
Proficiency	# of students	# of students	# of students
	Form A September	Form B December	Form C May
	111 students	102 students	
Exceeding	3 scored 71%+	5	Not available at this time scored 82%+
Meeting	12 scored 55-70%	5	Not available at this time scored 61-81%
Bubble	24 scored 45-54%	19	Not available at this time scored 51-60%
Approaching	47 scored 28-44%	51	Not available at this time scored 31-50%
Partial	25 scored 12-27%	22	Not available at this time scored 12-30%
Not Meeting	0 scored less than 12%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 12%
]]
Grade 5			
Proficiency	# of students	# of students	# of students
	Form A September	Form B December	Form C May
	102 students	101 students	
Exceeding	0 scored 90%+	0	Not available at this

			time scored 95%+
Meeting	27 scored 60-89%	22	Not available at this time scored 63-94%
Bubble	14 scored 50-59%	6	Not available at this time scored 53-62%
Approaching	42 scored 30-49%	46	Not available at this time scored 32-52%
Partial	19 scored 10-29%	27	Not available at this time scored 11-31%
Not Meeting	0 scored less than 10%	0	Not available at this time scored less than 11%
LinkIt! CC Math TEI Grade 3	AG Form A to Form	C growth:	
Proficiency	# of students Form A 70 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
Exceeding	0 scored 65%+	0	N/A
Meeting	6 scored 46%-64%	13 scored 67%-84%	Not available at this time scored 81%+
Bubble	11 scored 36%-45%	10 scored 57%-66%	Not available at this time scored 71%-80%
Approaching	38 scored 19%-35%	25 scored 40%-56%	Not available at this time scored 53%-70%
Partial	15 scored 1%-18%	16 scored 23%-39%	Not available at this time scored 35%-52%

Not Meeting	0 scored <1%	6 scored <23%	Not available at this time scored <35%
Grade 4:			
Proficiency	# of students Form A 111 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
Exceeding	0 scored 79%+	4 scored 90%+	N/A
Meeting	5 scored 55%-78%	24 scored 67%-89%	Not available at this time scored 83%+
Bubble	9 scored 45%-54%	22 scored 57-66%	Not available at this time scored 73%-82%
Approaching	55 scored 26%-44%	32 scored 39%-56%	Not available at this time scored 51%-72%
Partial	42 scored 7%-25%	16 scored 21%-38%	Not available at this time scored 30%-50%
Not Meeting	0 scored <7%	5 scored <21%	Not available at this time scored <30%
Grade 5:			
Proficiency	# of students Form A 102 students	# of students Form B December	# of students Form C
Exceeding	0 scored 74%+	0	N/A
Meeting	13 scored 52%-73%	12 scored 71-91%	Not available at this time scored 82%+
Bubble	27 scored 42%-51%	16 scored 61-70%	Not available at this time scored 72%-81%

Approaching	58 scored 22%-41%	58 scored 42-60%	Not available at this time scored 52%-71%
Partial	4 scored 2%-21%	15 scored 23-41%	Not available at this time scored 31%-51%
Not Meeting	0 scored <2%	0	Not available at this time scored <31%
	•	•	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT -ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A) 2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process* *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 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, Mathematics and School Climate and Culture.
- 2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups? District administrators, building administrators, curriculum supervisors, and teachers analyze 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 New Jersey Student Learning Standards rigorous expectations. Classroom instruction is improving as teachers gain familiarity and ownership of using data, standards, and curriculum to drive prescriptive instruction.
- 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 development 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, whether it be through modified instruction, afterschool tutorial, or I&RS.
- 7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students? Educationally at-risk students are provided with effective assistance by receiving differentiated, small group instruction in the classroom, as well as extended day and year programs, & 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 in ELA include 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 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? Transportation is provided as needed for each individual student. Additionally, the school's family support team provides resources throughout the school year.
- 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 Title I committee as well as the Professional Development and School Improvement 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 student's transition from kindergarten to first grade, elementary to middle school through articulation meetings with the Early Childhood learning centers and the middle school during entry and exit of students through Anastasia. The school makes sure to evaluate students' growth on the state standards along with the designed curricula spiral in both ELA and mathematics. On-going articulation between the kindergarten and first grade teachers support seamless transition between the two programs. Professional Development for teachers in these grade levels provides insight of program components and how they are implemented. The Treasures program seamlessly creates a bridge from the kindergarten 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 2017-2018 schoolwide plan? A Comprehensive Needs Assessment was conducted and all stakeholder participated to identify the priority problems. All available data was collected, shared and analyzed by the NCLB Committee. From this process we identified the top three 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)

2017-2018 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						Mathem	atics						
	• Grade 1 o	o Baseline: 17% (18/104)						ficiency	/ +	ssessme				
				available	e at this t	time		Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7
	Scholastic Re	eading In Sept	ventory Nov	% Profici Jan	ent Mar	June	Grade 1	60%	60%	64%	77%	61%	74%	78%
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not availabl e at this	Grade 2	80%	66%	82%	60%	79%	69%	68%
						time	Grade	43%	48%	39%	38%	59%	45%	45%
	Grade 2	16%	26%	37%	47%	Not availabl e at this time	Grade 4	41%	47%	73%	59%	52%	46%	not available at this time
	Grade 3	16%	26%	30%	39%	Not availabl e at this time	Grade 5	64%	55%	56%	79%	61%	56%	Not available at this time
		<u> </u>	ļ	<u> </u>	ļ	<u> </u>	Linklt As	sessme	ents					

	Grade 4 Grade 5	35%	43%	6 57%	57%	Not availabl e at this time Not availabl e at this time	 Linklt Assessments 60% Proficiency + Grade 1 Sept. Form A 14% (15/108) Dec. Form B 73% (71/97) May Form C not available at this time Grade 2 Sept. Form A 16% (21/128)
	LinkIt Asses	Sept - Fo		oficiency + Dec - Forr		May - Form C	 Dec. Form B 52%(64/123) May Form C not available at this time Grade 3
	Grade 1	N/A		N/A		N/A	Sept. Form A 0%(0/85) Dec. Form B 31% (26/84)
	Grade 2	6% (8/1	28)	13% (13/1	124)	Not available at this time	 May Form C not available at this time Grade 4 Sept. Form A 3% (4/135)
	Grade 3	5% (4/8	34)	17% (14/	84)	Not available at this time	 Dec. Form B 41% (54/131) May Form C not available at this time Grade 5
	Grade 4	11% (14/	182)	8% (11/1	29)	Not available at this time	 Grade 5 Sept. Form A 4% (5/117) Dec. Form B 44% (52/118) May Form C not available at this time
	Grade 5	26% (30/	117)	30% (36/1	118)	Not available at this time	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Due to soci disadvanta of the popu	ges, and n	on-En	glish speaki	ing hom		Areas of concern include students who are not performing on grade level in basic skills and students are who are reading below grade level.

	background knowledge and exposure to foundational skills for reading, such as phonics and word recognition. These challenges affect many students, which results in lower reading proficiency. Teachers received professional development through job embedded trainings, reviewed data to modify instruction, and attended PLC meetings in an effort to address the educational needs of historically underserved populations. However, teachers are continuing to refine their best practices as they also try new research-based practices to aid instruction.	Targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic mathematical knowledge; stronger ability to differentiate instruction to student's needs.
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 Reading Program Schoolwide Writing Program Kidbiz3000 READ180 	 Everyday Math Link It
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Treasures Reading Program, Schoolwide Writing Program, Kidbiz3000, and READ180 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 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)

2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Parent Involvement	N/A
Name of priority problem Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Parent Visitation Days/Night:Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 100 families attended Sharing Day (Fall)Grade 1&2 Sharing Day: 105 families attended Sharing Day (Winter)Grade 3: 29 families attended Grade 3 Parent Visit Day.Grade 3: 29 families attended Parent Visit DayGrade 4: 40 Families attended Parent Visit DayGrade 5: 28 families attended Ellis Island DayTitle I Parent Workshop: 18/18 parents attendedTalented Presentation Family Attendance:September 11th performance:10 families1st and 2nd grade sharing day: 50 familiesBoard of Education Meeting Performance: 50 families3rd Grade City Hall Performance: 35 familiesWinter Concert/Band Chorus/Dance: 200 familiesMartin Luther King Performance Band and Chorus:30families	N/A
	Monmouth Mall Dance Performance: 20 families Monmouth University Dance Performance:30 families Spring Concert: 250 families Count Basie Grant Performance with Chorus and Dance:	

	35 families	
	Back to School Night:	
	372 out of 599 families(62%) attended Back to School Night.	
	Parent Teacher Conferences: 100% of parents were made aware of conferences, and 83% attended.	
	PTO Fundraisers:	
	Halloween Dance- 150 students Supper with Santa-125 families Fall movie night- 100 families Spring movie night- 50 families	
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.	N/A
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	N/A
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA, Mathematics, and Visual and Performing Arts	N/A
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Reliable and valid parent surveys Parent newsletters, outreach and communication programs	N/A
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Through the New Jersey Standards for Teachers and School Leaders, staff will build relationships with parents, guardians, families, and agencies to support students' learning and well-being (standard 9). Teachers engage in activities to: 9.7 Identify and utilize family and community resources to foster student learning and provide opportunities for parents to share skills and talents that enrich learning experiences; 9.8 Establish respectful and productive relationships and to develop cooperative partnerships with	N/A

diverse families, educators and others in the community	
in support of student learning and wellbeing; and	
9.9 Institute parent/family involvement practices that	
support meaningful communication, parenting skills,	
enriched student learning, volunteer and	
decision-making opportunities at school and	
collaboration to strengthen the teaching and learning	
environment of the school.	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES -ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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

	ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) <u>strengthen the core academic program in the school</u> ;						
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, READ 180	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team, Supervisors, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides.		
Math	Students with Disabilities	Everyday Math	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team,	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals.	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide,		

2017-2018 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

			Supervisors, Administrat ors	At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice Guide.aspx?sid=2
ELA	Homeless	Treasures, READ 180	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team, Supervisors, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides.
Math	Homeless	Everyday Math	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team, Supervisors,	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement

			Administrat ors	instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-ed ucation-data.pdf
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLS	Treasures, READ 180	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team, Supervisors, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides. Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J.,

Math	ELLS	Everyday Math	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team, Supervisors, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publicat ions_reviews.aspx Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice Guide.aspx?sid=2
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures, READ 180	Classroom teachers, Child Study Team, Supervisors, Administrat	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

			ors	the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides.
					Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publicat ions_reviews.aspx
Math	Economically	Everyday Math	Classroom teachers,	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be given the	US Department of Education, 2010,

	Disadvantaged		Child Study Team, Supervisors, Administrat ors	opportunity to meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will be given the opportunity to meet in their PLC's to share data, identify students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement <u>http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t</u> <u>ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-ed</u> <u>ucation-data.pdf</u> Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, 2015
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES -ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

2017-2018 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	Afterschool programs	Administrators, Instructional Staff	Based on the 2016-2017 Benchmark Cutoff Points, expected student growth is as follows	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

		Grade 3			
		Proficiency	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading
		Exceeding	80%+	-	comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide
		Meeting	51-79%	70%+	(NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education
		Bubble	41-50%	60-69 %	Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S.
		Approachin	g 25-40%	43-59 %	Department of Education. Retrieved from
		Partial	9-24%	26-42 %	whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides.
		Not Meeting	g less than 9%	less than 26%	
		Grade 4			
		Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Exceeding	71%+	82%+	
		Meeting	55-70%	61-81%	
		Bubble	45-54%	51-60%	
		Approachi ng	28-44%	31-50%	
		Partial	12-27%	12-30%	
		Not	less than	less than	

		[T			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
				Meeting	12%	12%	
				Grade 5			
				Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
				Exceeding	90%+	95%+	
				Meeting	60-89%	63-94%	
				Bubble	50-59%	53-62%	
				Approachi ng	30-49%	32-52%	
				Partial	10-29%	11-31%	
				Not Meeting	less than 10%	less than 11%	
Math	Students with Disabilities	Afterschool programs	Administrators, Instructional Staff	Grade 3: Based on the 2016-2017 LinkIt Benchmark Cutoff Points , expected student growth is as follows		utoff udent	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009)
				Proficienc Y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice Guide.aspx?sid=2
				Exceeding	65%+	-	
				Meeting	46%-64%	81%+	
				Bubble	36%-45%	71%-80%	

r		1			1
		Approachi ng	19%-35%	53%-70%	
		Partial	1%-18%	35%-52%	
		Not Meeting	<1%	<35%	
		Grade 4:			
		Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Exceeding	79%+	N/A	
		Meeting	55%-78%	83%+	
		Bubble	45%-54%	73%-82%	
		Approachi ng	26%-44%	51%-72%	
		Partial	7%-25%	30%-50%	
		Not Meeting	<7%	<30%	
		Grade 5:			
		Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Exceeding	74%+	N/A	
		Meeting	52%-73%	82%+	
		Bubble	42%-51%	72%-81%	

				Approachi ng Partial Not Meeting	22%-41% 2%-21% <2%	52%-71% 31%-51% <31%	
ELA	Homeless		Administrators, Instructional Staff	Based on t Benchmar expected s follows Grade 3	k Cutoff P	oints,	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
				Proficiency	Cutoff Scores Form A	Scores	Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J.
		Afterschool programs		Exceeding Meeting	80%+	- 70%+	(2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide
				Bubble	41-50%	5 60-69 %	(NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance,
				Approachin	g 25-40%	6 43-59 %	Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved
				Partial	9-24%	26-42 %	from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides.
				Not Meetin	g less tha 9%	n less than 26%	liceguldes.
				Grade 4			

1	ГГ				
		Proficienc Y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Exceeding	71%+	82%+	
		Meeting	55-70%	61-81%	
		Bubble	45-54%	51-60%	
		Approachi ng	28-44%	31-50%	
		Partial	12-27%	12-30%	
		Not Meeting	less than 12%	less than 12%	
		Grade 5			
		Proficienc Y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Exceeding	90%+	95%+	
		Meeting	60-89%	63-94%	
		Bubble	50-59%	53-62%	
		Approachi ng	30-49%	32-52%	
		Partial	10-29%	11-31%	
		Not Meeting	less than 10%	less than 11%	
		•			

Math	Homeless		Administrators,	Grade 3:			Assisting Students Struggling with
			Instructional	Based on the 2016-2017 LinkIt Benchmark Cutoff Points , expected student growth is as follows			Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide,
			Staff				
							April 2009)
						http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice	
				Proficienc	Cutoff	Cutoff	Guide.aspx?sid=2
				У	Scores Form A	Scores Form C	
					FOITITA	FOILITC	
				Exceeding	65%+	-	
				Meeting	46%-64%	81%+	
				Bubble	36%-45%	71%-80%	
		Afterschool programs		Approachi ng	19%-35%	53%-70%	
				Partial	1%-18%	35%-52%	
				Not Meeting	<1%	<35%	
				Grade 4:	4	·	
				Proficienc	Cutoff	Cutoff	
				У	Scores	Scores	
					Form A	Form C	
				Exceeding	79%+	N/A	
				Meeting	55%-78%	83%+	
				Bubble	45%-54%	73%-82%	
			Approachi ng	26%-44%	51%-72%		

ELA Math	Migrant Migrant	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	Approachi ng Partial Not Meeting N/A N/A	22%-41% 2%-21% <2%	52%-71% 31%-51% <31%	N/A N/A
Math ELA	ELLs	N/A Afterschool programs	N/A Administrators, Instructional Staff			oints,	N/A Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

	Proficiency	Cutoff Scores Form A 80%+	Cutoff Scores Form C	Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten
	Meeting	51-79%	70%+	through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC:
	Bubble	41-50%	60-69 %	National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S.
	Approaching	g 25-40%	43-59 %	Department of Education. Retrieved from
	Partial	9-24%	26-42 %	whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides.
	Not Meeting	g less than 9%	less than 26%	Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J.,
	Grade 4			Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M.
	Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in
	Exceeding	71%+	82%+	elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC:
	Meeting	55-70%	61-81%	National Center for Education
	Bubble	45-54%	51-60%	Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education
	Approachi ng	28-44%	31-50%	Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website:
	Partial	12-27%	12-30%	http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publica
	Not Meeting	less than 12%	less than 12%	tions_reviews.aspx

				Grade 5			
				Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
				Exceeding	90%+	95%+	
				Meeting	60-89%	63-94%	
				Bubble	50-59%	53-62%	
				Approachi ng	30-49%	32-52%	
				Partial	10-29%	11-31%	
				Not Meeting	less than 10%	less than 11%	
Math	ELLs		Administrators, Instructional Staff	Grade 3: Based on the 2016-2017 LinkIt Benchmark Cutoff Points , expected student growth is as follows			Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice
		Afterschool programs		Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	Guide.aspx?sid=2
				Exceeding	65%+	-	
				Meeting	46%-64%	81%+	
				Bubble	36%-45%	71%-80%	
				Approachi	19%-35%	53%-70%	

1	1	1			
		ng			
		Partial	1%-18%	35%-52%	
		Not Meeting	<1%	<35%	
		Grade 4:			
		Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores	Cutoff Scores	
			Form A	Form C	
		Exceeding	79%+	N/A	
		Meeting	55%-78%	83%+	
		Bubble	45%-54%	73%-82%	
		Approachi ng	26%-44%	51%-72%	
		Partial	7%-25%	30%-50%	
		Not Meeting	<7%	<30%	
		Grade 5:			
		Proficienc Y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Exceeding	74%+	N/A	
		Meeting	52%-73%	82%+	
		Bubble	42%-51%	72%-81%	

				Approachi ng Partial Not Meeting	22%-41% 2%-21% <2%	52%-71% 31%-51% <31%	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Afterschool programs	Administrators, Instructional Staff				Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/prac ticeguides. Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M.

							J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publica tions_reviews.aspx
Math	Economically Disadvantaged		Administrators, Instructional	Grade 3: Based on	the 2016-2	2017	Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to
			Staff	LinkIt Ben	chmark Cu	utoff	Intervention for Elementary and
				Points , ex	•		Middle School (IES Practice Guide,
				growth is	as follows		April 2009)
							http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice Guide.aspx?sid=2
				Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
		Afterschool programs		Exceeding	65%+	-	
				Meeting	46%-64%	81%+	
				Bubble	36%-45%	71%-80%	
				Approachi ng	19%-35%	53%-70%	
				Partial	1%-18%	35%-52%	
				Not	<1%	<35%	

	Meeting			
	Grade 4:			
	Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
	Exceeding	79%+	N/A	
	Meeting	55%-78%	83%+	
	Bubble	45%-54%	73%-82%	
	Approachi ng	26%-44%	51%-72%	
	Partial	7%-25%	30%-50%	
	Not Meeting	<7%	<30%	
	Grade 5:	I	IJ	
	Proficienc y	Cutoff Scores Form A	Cutoff Scores Form C	
	Exceeding	74%+	N/A	
	Meeting	52%-73%	82%+	
	Bubble	42%-51%	72%-81%	
	Approachi ng	22%-41%	52%-71%	
	Partial	2%-21%	31%-51%	

				Not Meeting	<2%	<31%	
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES -ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

2017-2018 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 <u>ongoing professional development</u> 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, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance,

					Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/pra cticeguides.
					US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement <u>http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t</u> <u>ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e</u> <u>ducation-data.pdf</u> Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in
Math	Students with Disabilities	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Elementary and Middle School, 2015 US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement <u>http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t</u> <u>ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e</u> <u>ducation-data.pdf</u> Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in

					Elementary and Middle School, 2015
ELA	Homeless	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Elementary and Middle School, 2015 Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/pra cticeguides.
					US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local
					Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement
					http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e ducation-data.pdf
					Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What

Math	Homeless	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, 2015 US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e ducation-data.pdf Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, 2015
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, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten

	through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/pra cticeguides.
	Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publica tions_reviews.aspx.
	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement <u>http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t</u>

					ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e ducation-data.pdf Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, 2015
Math	ELLS	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publica tions_reviews.aspx. US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local
					Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e

					ducation-data.pdf
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	ducation-data.pdf Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). <u>Preventing misguided</u> <u>reading: New strategies for guided</u> <u>reading teachers</u> . Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, 2015 Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education
					Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from
					whatworks.ed.gov/publications/pra cticeguides. Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J.,
					Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M.

					J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publica tions_reviews.aspx. US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e ducation-data.pdf
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC meetings, Quarterly data chats with goal setting	Teachers, Administrat ors	During the 2017-2018 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 students needing assistance, 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 <u>http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/t</u> <u>ech/use-of-education-data/use-of-e</u> <u>ducation-data.pdf</u> Professional Learning Communities Facilitator's Guide for the What

					Works Clearinghouse Practice Guide: Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School, 2015
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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 2017-2018 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.

- 1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2016-2017? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place? The Title I Schoolwide committee will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program and it will be conducted internally through monthly committee meetings.
- 2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process? A limited availability of 1-1 technology for students in grades 1 and 2, restricted access to online resources for all grades, and alignment of instruction with best teaching practices.
- 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 continue to use tablets (grades 3-5), computer lab and IPads (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.
- 10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? Parent achievement data will be reported to the public via the school report card and a board agenda meeting open to the public.

*Provide a separate response for each question.

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

SEA §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.

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	Administratos, Instructional Staff, Non-instructio nal Staff, Parent/Family	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
Math	Students with Disabilities	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Administratos, Instructional Staff, Non-instructio nal Staff, Parent/Family	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
ELA	Homeless	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Administratos, Instructional Staff, Non-instructio nal Staff, Parent/Family	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
Math	Homeless	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher	Administratos, Instructional Staff, Non-instructio	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from

2017-2018 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Pr	oblems
---	--------

		Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	nal Staff, Parent/Family		http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
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	Staff	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
Math	ELLS	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Administratos, Instructional Staff, Non-instructio nal Staff, Parent/Family	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Visitation Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Administratos, Instructional Staff, Non-instructio nal Staff, Parent/Family	100% of students will be made aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
Math	Economically	Parent Visitation	Administratos,	100% of students will be made	Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Educational

	Disadvantaged	Days/Nights, Talented Events, Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conferences, PTO Fundraisers	Instructional Staff, Non-instructio nal Staff, Parent/Family	aware through flyers/announcements for all events.	Leadership: School, Families, Communities: Involvement or Engagement? Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/e ducational-leadership/may11/vol68 /num08/Involvement-or-Engageme nt%C2%A2.aspx
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2017-2018 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 will be implemented during and after school hours. To seek and encourage parental involvement further, teachers will continue to create and maintain web pages/alternate communication (ClassDojo) 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 sent 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 meetings to discuss the development of the policy.

- **3.** How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? The school will distribute it's 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.
- 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 Title I monthly meetings and through 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.
- 11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2017-2018 parent involvement funds? The Anastasia School will use the 2017-2018 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 New Jersey Student Learning Standards, and recognition of student achievement. Parents will be invited to all events.

*Provide a separate response for each question.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: 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,	54	Teachers will be offered professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and management,
consistent with Title II-A	100%	family involvement and discipline.
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications	0	
for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0%	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the	16	Instructional Assistants will be offered professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and
qualifications required by ESEA (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	100%	management, family involvement and supporting teachers within the classroom.
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications	0	
required by ESEA (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	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 COMPONENT: 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.	Primarily the Assistant Superintendent for Pupil Personnel Services in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff and Principals.