

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 ***not*** identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

| DISTRICT INFORMATION | SCHOOL INFORMATION |
|--|--|
| District: Long Branch | School: George L. Catrambone School |
| Chief School Administrator: Michael Salvatore | Address: 240 Park Avenue, Long Branch NJ 07740 |
| Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us | Grade Levels: Kindergarten- 5 |
| Title I Contact: Bridgette Burt | Principal: Chris Volpe |
| Title I Contact E-mail: bburt@longbranch.k12.nj.us | Principal's E-mail: cvolpe@longbranch.k12.nj.us |
| Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-571-2868 | Principal's Phone Number: 732-222-3215 |

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.

Chris Volpe

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held 8 (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ 8,068,733 , which comprised 96.42 % of the school’s budget in 2016-2017.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$ 7,870,038, which will comprise 96.48 % 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 Tutors & Supplies | Priority Problems 1 , 2, 3 & 4 | Extended Learning Time and Extended Day | 100-100 & 100-600 | \$7,000.84 |
| Parent Involvement | Priority Problems 1 , 2, 3 & 4 | Family & Community Engagement | 200-800 | \$2,179.00 |
| ESSA Improvement Leader | Priority Problems 1, 2, 3 & 4 | Extended Learning Opportunities & Family & Community Engagement | 200-100 | \$2,750 |
| Professional Development | Priority Problems 1 , 2, 3 & 4 | Professional Development to enhance student practice and | 200-300 | \$10,000 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | proficiency and also provide intervention strategies | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

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 cannot be affiliated with the school.

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 |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Christopher Volpe | School Staff-Administrator GLC | X | X | X | |
| Joy Daniels | School Staff-Administrator GLC | X | X | X | |
| Toniane Lisanti | School Staff-Student Advisor GLC | X | X | X | |
| Carlos Villacres | School Staff-Student Advisor GLC | X | X | X | |
| Victoria De Loreto | School Staff- Classroom Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Laurie Demuro | School Staff- Classroom | X | X | X | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | Teacher GLC | | | | |
| Elizabeth Kaeli | School Staff- ELL Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Catarina Lopes | School Staff- Classroom Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Robert Luehman | School Staff- Classroom Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Robyn Silberstein | School Staff- Classroom Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Kalliopi Stavrakis | School Staff- Classroom Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Laura Tracey | School Staff- Classroom Teacher GLC | X | X | X | |
| Mirveta Feratovic | Parent | X | X | X | |

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(II)

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:

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

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

| Date | Location | Topic | Agenda on File | | Minutes on File | |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----|-----------------|----|
| | | | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| September 15, 2016 | GLC Conference Room | Comprehensive Needs Assessment | X | | X | |
| October 27, 2016 | GLC Conference Room | Schoolwide Plan Development | X | | X | |
| November 16, 2016 | GLC Conference Room | Program Evaluation | X | | X | |
| December 8, 2016 | GLC Conference Room | Perception Surveys | X | | X | |
| January 18, 2017 | GLC Conference Room | Survey Results Analysis | X | | X | |
| February 21, 2017 | GLC Conference Room | Program Implementation | X | | X | |
| March 16, 2017 | GLC Conference Room | Data Review | X | | X | |
| April 6, 2017 | GLC Conference Room | Vision, Goals & Plan | X | | X | |

**Add rows as necessary.*

4 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? **Programs were implemented as planned. Being in its fifth year of implementation, Treasures continued to provide ELA teachers with more opportunities to differentiate their instruction to meet students' reading needs. Teachers not only continued to be provided with Treasures training, but also extensive guided reading training to maximize best practices during small/whole group instruction. The mathematical program, Everyday Math was in its seventh year of implementation, along with a district-wide emphasis of basic facts mastery. Parent Involvement consisted of parental visitation days both in reading and math and a school-wide math game night, Open House, spring and fall parent teacher conferences, and special evening activities for families and students. In addition, online PD resources were available for teachers to view during PLC times. All online Treasures, Everyday Math, and Kid Biz programs were accessible from home and parents were given student login information to personalize student learning.**
2. What were the strengths of the implementation process? **The strength of the implementation process was the provision of Professional Learning Community meetings where teachers could gather, discuss, evaluate and analyze the Treasures reading program and the New Jersey Student Learning Standards and standards-based report cards. This focus on standards helped teachers become more aware of what concepts and skills that students would be held accountable to master.**
3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter? **The barriers or challenges during the implementation process were refining the implementation of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards to their full potential. Due to the wealth of material offered in all of our programs, teachers expressed that they were struggling to decide on how to best select specific items from ELA/Math material which would offer differentiated instruction, but still meet the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. Also, a concern was minimal support staff to assist in the school's daily functions.**
4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation? **The strengths of the implementation were the collaborative leadership style of the school administration and the communication between all stakeholders in**

the program. Also, since the ELA teachers have become very familiar and confident after sustained use of the Treasures reading program, there was time for more of a focus on differentiation and enhancement of guided reading instruction.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs? **The buy-in was not very difficult because most of the initiatives were district-wide and being implemented throughout the school district and supported by central office administration. The school also distributed information regarding the programs and aligned standards-based report cards through the student handbook and school webpage.**

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions? **The staff was excited about the continued implementation of the ELA core reading program. A program aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards was needed to help in student mastery of the standards. With the program came a large amount of planning time needed. This was a challenge for staff members. The staff also faced challenges with PLC's being more teacher-driven. They perceived PLCs as adding even more to their workload and dedicated little of their time to the planning of what needed to be addressed, discussed, and planned during this time. The Everyday Math program continues to receive a positive perception from the majority of the staff. Although there continues to be challenges with the amount of time needed for planning, familiarity with the standards and mathematics goals and objectives increased as well as the alignment to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. Staff surveys were used throughout the district to determine their perceptions. The School Climate Survey suggested that scheduling continues to be an issue by staff members.**

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions? **Perceptions of the community were collected through an online parent survey during parent conference week. The survey suggested overall positive results in school leadership, school climate, and academic performance. Overall, the community was pleased with the teaching staff and their efforts to provide positive student achievement. They were pleased with the availability of Spanish and Portuguese materials**

aligned with the New Jersey Student Learning Standards, and the availability of bilingual tutorials and translations.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)? **In order to enhance teacher training for the Treasures Literacy Program, professional development opportunities were made available to teachers during PD days throughout the school year. Professional Learning Communities were used to continue teacher growth in research-based literacy strategies that improve student literacy. Feedback was provided to staff through administrative data walks and through immediate oral and written feedback from the reading and math supervisors and principals. The Treasures Reading program utilizes whole group instruction, small group guided reading instruction, and center activities. For our ELL population, the Spanish and Portuguese versions of Treasures was used. The Everyday Math program utilized whole group instruction, mental math, partner and team work, center activities and independent work. Treasures online technology was used during computer lab time and also at home for students who have internet compatibility. Students also utilized LinkIt to read fiction and non-fiction texts and answered various questions that covered a multitude of standards and reading strategies. The KidBiz computer program was used during computer lab time and also in the classroom to enhance skills. ConnectEd was used by students during class time and at home to enhance math and literacy skills and practice various concepts.**
9. How did the school structure the interventions? **Instructional intervention took place on a daily basis during ELA and math instruction. These programs were structured in such a way as to provide interventions at small group and centers every day. At-risk students were provided with tutoring, extended-day and extended-year learning opportunities, mentoring, and support from the I&RS team. Students were placed in after-school tutorial programs, which provided extra help in the areas of reading and math that were tailored to the**

students' needs. English Language Learners took part in the after-school program, which provided ELLs with additional assistance in language acquisition and phonics skills. Students who were referred to the I&RS team during the school year took part in the After School Program, where individual academic goals were established and measured weekly for effectiveness. Title I Math and LAL intervention programs targeted below grade level students in grades kindergarten through five two days per week after school. Students were given homework assistance and instructed with teacher guidance on Kizlits and TenMarks computer programs to enhance reading and math skills. At the beginning of the school year, "at-risk" students were also identified and tutors pushed in and pulled out during instruction to provide small group assistance on identified ELA or Math skills. In addition, all parents were given students' usernames and passwords for ConnectEd, KidBiz and Everyday Mathematics to practice targeted weaker academic areas at home.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions? **Instructional interventions were received by students daily through teacher-led differentiation activities and instruction. Students needing a higher level of interventions would be brought to the attention of the I&RS team and/or would be entered into the after school tutorial. Students would receive this intervention two times a week for an hour and a half after school. All students had access to extra help through their online login that they could use at home as well.**
11. What technologies did the school use to support the program? **The research-based ConnectEd Treasures and ConnectEd Everyday Math programs allowed all students access at home and at school to practice the common core state standards for reading and mathematics. 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. A standards-based report card also helped identify students' strengths and weaknesses pertaining to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards mastery level. Tablets were also available to students in third through fifth grade to use for Treasures, Everyday Math, ConnectED and other educational apps. The Everyday Math program had e-presentations for each**

lesson. This software enabled students to see visual manipulatives, algorithm, and gain visual instructional support. The program also had a differentiation system which tracked students' proficiency on summative and formative assessments. Teachers could then gather more activities to help remediate weak areas. The Treasures program also offered online support in ways of leveled books for students. Students practiced reading and math skills on LinkIt and also completed reading and math tests on the LinkIt website. LinkIt allotted students with multiple opportunities to explore technological navigational tools and interactive learning. The program also allowed students to immediately check their answers and realize their individual strengths and weaknesses. Students enhanced their understanding of math and reading standards and also gained familiarity with computer navigation throughout the course of the school year.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how? **Technology did contribute to the success of the program. Technology provided additional resources to customize student learning in reading and math. The Treasures, Everyday Math, Google Classroom, ConnectED and LinkIt programs gave students more practice on the New Jersey Student Learning Standards and concepts in both subject areas. In Treasures, the online Progress Reporter feature allows teachers to assess, grade, generate reports and receive enhancement and remediation suggestions, which could be used for the entire group or for each student, individually based upon proficiency of content or skill. Everyday Math also utilized technology to customize student learning with an online e-suite assessment management feature. This feature allowed teachers to assess, grade, generate reports and receive enhancement and remediation suggestions aimed at targeting student learning preferences including but, not limited to language translation for students with language differences. The LinkIt programs gave students more practice on the New Jersey Student Learning Standards skills and concepts in both reading and math. Google Classroom allowed students to connect with teachers and classmates online and engage in interactive activities and also practice their typing and research skills. These technology programs helped supply extra practice for New Jersey Student Learning**

Standards. The visuals from both the Treasures and Everyday Math program supported best teaching practices. These programs were used through student computers and tablets. Students were enthusiastic to complete assignments on their tablets. Often at times, students would be willing to continue classroom assignments on their own personal computers and iphones at home.

**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 and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

| English Language Arts | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | Interventions Provided | Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Grade 4 PARCC | 148 | TBD – pending PARCC results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scientifically research based Language Arts program: Treasures ● In-class support using support staff for small group reading instruction with NCLB tutors ● Reading & Homework incentives ● Job-embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings, lesson studies, demo lessons, and data chats ● Common planning periods for all grade level reading/writing teachers ● Monthly professional development in best practices related to ELA content area ● Kidbiz 3000 ● Incorporation of literacy centers designed to meet targeted literacy goals ● Targeted guided reading groups ● Differentiated teaching | <p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Specific professional development focusing on literacy best practices and differentiated instruction needs to be regularly addressed ● Professional development is required to refine and improve teaching strategies so teachers can master the delivery of the Treasures program ● Further differentiation of instruction ● Professional development to support staff in the areas of data analysis and using data to drive instruction ● Expanding the integration of technology and making tablets more purposeful to engage students as well as extend the learning day/year ● Linkit tools are providing support for student literacy. Consistent practice needs to be developed in all classrooms. |

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Linkit ● After school tutoring program ● Daily ELL support | |
| Grade 5 PARCC | 108 | TBD – pending PARCC results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scientifically research based Language Arts program: Treasures ● In-class support using support staff for small group reading instruction with NCLB tutors ● Reading & Homework incentives ● Job-embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings, lesson studies, demo lessons, and data chats ● Common planning periods for all grade level reading/writing teachers ● Monthly professional development in best practices related to ELA content area ● Kidbiz 3000 ● Incorporation of literacy centers designed to meet targeted literacy goals ● Targeted guided reading groups ● Differentiated teaching ● Linkit ● After school tutoring program ● Daily ELL support | <p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Specific professional development focusing on literacy best practices and differentiated instruction needs to be regularly addressed ● Professional development is required to refine and improve teaching strategies so teachers can master the delivery of the Treasures program ● Further differentiation of instruction ● Professional development to support staff in the areas of data analysis and using data to drive instruction ● Expanding the integration of technology and making tablets more purposeful to engage students as well as extend the learning day/year ● Linkit tools are providing support for student literacy. Consistent practice needs to be developed in all classrooms. |
| 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 <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Grade 4 PARCC | 139 | TBD – pending PARCC results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Push-In Math Support in classrooms with the most partially proficient students ● Common planning periods for all grade level mathematic teachers. ● Professional development in implementation and mathematical concepts presented by education consultants from Everyday Mathematics, and Head Teacher. ● Facts Mastery incentives ● Job-embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings, lesson studies, demo lessons, and data chats ● Differentiated teaching ● Linkit ● Prodigy online math website ● After school tutoring program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The use of the Everyday Math curriculum is in its sixth year of implementation. Teachers are more familiar with the material. Teachers received professional development and support to incorporate Active Inspire and Everyday Math differentiation system into math instruction. ● The emphasis on facts has improved students’ rote mastery. ● Specific professional development focusing on math best practices and differentiated instruction needs to be regularly addressed ● Professional development is required to refine and improve teaching strategies so teachers can master the delivery of the Everyday Math program ● Further differentiation of instruction ● Professional development to support staff in the areas of data analysis and using data to drive instruction ● Expanding the integration of technology and making tablets more purposeful to engage students as well as extend the learning day/year ● Linkit tools are providing support for student math concepts. Consistent practice needs to be developed in all classrooms. |
| Grade 5 PARCC | 104 | TBD – pending PARCC results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Push-In Math Support in classrooms with the most partially proficient students ● Common planning periods for all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The use of the Everyday Math curriculum is in its sixth year of implementation. Teachers are more familiar with the material. Teachers received professional development and support to |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>grade level mathematic teachers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional development in implementation and mathematical concepts presented by education consultants from Everyday Mathematics, and Head Teacher. ● Facts Mastery incentives ● Job-embedded professional development in ELA through PLC meetings, lesson studies, demo lessons, and data chats ● Differentiated teaching ● Linkit ● Prodigy online math website ● After school tutoring program | <p>incorporate Active Inspire and Everyday Math differentiation system into math instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The emphasis on facts has improved students' rote mastery. ● Specific professional development focusing on math best practices and differentiated instruction needs to be regularly addressed ● Professional development is required to refine and improve teaching strategies so teachers can master the delivery of the Everyday Math program ● Further differentiation of instruction ● Professional development to support staff in the areas of data analysis and using data to drive instruction ● Expanding the integration of technology and making tablets more purposeful to engage students as well as extend the learning day/year ● Linkit tools are providing support for student math concepts. Consistent practice needs to be developed in all classrooms. |
| 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 <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|---|---|
| Pre-Kindergarten | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Kindergarten | 20 | TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use of Treasures Literacy Program to provide small group guided instruction, which allows for focused instruction and interventions targeting the specific needs of at-risk students ● After administering the Linkit Benchmarks, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Linkit and Treasures online programs to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create interventions for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons. ● Common planning time for all kindergarten teachers ● Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student products and student data and plan interventions for weak skills ● Quarterly goal setting/action planning ● Differentiated small group instruction ● Differentiated homework assignments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This program is in the fifth year of its implementation. Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to master all elements of the program. While improvement was made, professional development focusing on literacy best practices and differentiated instruction could improve. ● Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Continued teacher support is required to effectively analyze student data, and develop small group/differentiated lessons to support student strengths and weaknesses. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----|---|---|
| Grade 1 LinkIt Assessment | 68 | TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use of Treasures Literacy Program to provide small group guided instruction, which allows for focused instruction and interventions targeting the specific needs of at-risk students ● After administering the LinkIt Benchmarks, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the LinkIt and Treasures online programs to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create interventions for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons. ● Common planning time for all 1st grade teachers ● Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student products and student data and plan interventions for weak skills ● Quarterly goal setting/action planning ● Differentiated small group instruction ● Differentiated homework assignments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This program is in the fifth year of its implementation. Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to master all elements of the program. While improvement was made, professional development focusing on literacy best practices and differentiated instruction could improve. ● Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Continued teacher support is required to effectively analyze student data, and develop small group/differentiated lessons to support student strengths and weaknesses. |
| Grade 2 LinkIt Assessment | 56 | TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use of Treasures Literacy Program to provide small group guided instruction, which allows for focused instruction and interventions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This program is in the fifth year of its implementation. Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to master all elements of |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>targeting the specific needs of at-risk students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After administering the Linkit Benchmarks, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Linkit and Treasures online programs to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create interventions for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons. • Common planning time for all 2nd grade teachers • Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student products and student data and plan interventions for weak skills • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments | <p>the program. While improvement was made, professional development focusing on literacy best practices and differentiated instruction could improve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. • Continued teacher support is required to effectively analyze student data, and develop small group/differentiated lessons to support student strengths and weaknesses. |
| Grade 9 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Grade 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Mathematics | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | Interventions Provided | Describe why the interventions provided <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|------------------|-----------|-----------|--|---|
| Pre-Kindergarten | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Kindergarten | 15 | TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyday Math Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Everyday Math Assessment Differentiation |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|----|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>Differentiation System, which provided teachers with interventions for individual students based on student weakness of mathematical content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After administering the Linkit Benchmarks, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Linkit and Everyday Math online programs to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create interventions for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons. • Common planning time for all kindergarten teachers • Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student data and plan interventions for weak skills • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments | <p>System was introduced to the teachers effectively. However, additional support is needed in data interpretation and using the data to guide instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to master all elements of the program. While improvement was made, professional development focusing on math best practices and differentiated instruction could improve. • Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. • Continued teacher support is required to effectively analyze student data, and develop small group/differentiated lessons to support student strengths and weaknesses. |
| Grade 1 LinkIt Assessment | 81 | TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyday Math Assessment Differentiation System, which provided teachers with interventions for individual students based on student weakness of mathematical content. • After administering the Linkit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Everyday Math Assessment Differentiation System was introduced to the teachers effectively. However, additional support is needed in data interpretation and using the data to guide instruction. • Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|----|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>Benchmarks, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Linkit and Everyday Math online programs to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create interventions for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Common planning time for all 1st grade teachers ● Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student data and plan interventions for weak skills ● Quarterly goal setting/action planning ● Differentiated small group instruction ● Differentiated homework assignments | <p>to master all elements of the program. While improvement was made, professional development focusing on math best practices and differentiated instruction could improve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Continued teacher support is required to effectively analyze student data, and develop small group/differentiated lessons to support student strengths and weaknesses. |
| Grade 2 LinkIt Assessment | 56 | TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Everyday Math Assessment Differentiation System, which provided teachers with interventions for individual students based on student weakness of mathematical content. ● After administering the Linkit Benchmarks, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Linkit and Everyday Math online programs to develop activities and guide small group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Everyday Math Assessment Differentiation System was introduced to the teachers effectively. However, additional support is needed in data interpretation and using the data to guide instruction. ● Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to master all elements of the program. While improvement was made, professional development focusing on math best practices and differentiated instruction could improve. ● Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>instruction. Teachers used the data to create interventions for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common planning time for all 2nd grade teachers • Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student data and plan interventions for weak skills • Quarterly goal setting/action planning • Differentiated small group instruction • Differentiated homework assignments | <p>instruction and more closely connected to the standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued teacher support is required to effectively analyze student data, and develop small group/differentiated lessons to support student strengths and weaknesses. |
| 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 | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable) |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| ELA | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued Implementation of Treasures Reading Program | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkit Benchmark *End of Year Data is TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sept. 2016: The third grade student scored 23% on Linkit Form A Assessment. December 2016: The third grade student scored 32% on Linkit Form B Assessment. |
| Math | Homeless | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued Implementation of Common Core Aligned Everyday Math Program | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkit Benchmark *End of Year Data is TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sept. 2016: The third grade student scored 37% on Linkit Form A Assessment. December 2016: The third grade student scored 30% on Linkit Form B Assessment. |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued Implementation of Treasures Reading | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRA Benchmarks Linkit Benchmarks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the |

| | | | | | |
|------|------|--|----|---|---|
| | | <p>Program in self contained and pull-out classroom setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELL Treasures Intervention Handbook | | *End-of-Year Data is TBD | <p>Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to the next band. • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 23% and Linkit Form B was 27%, which resulted in a 4% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 22% and Linkit Form B was 29%, which resulted in a 7% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 25% and Linkit Form B was 24%, which resulted in a -1% decrease in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 24% and Linkit Form B was 25%, which resulted in a 1% increase in the proficiency level. |
| Math | ELLs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Implementation of Common Core Aligned Everyday Math Program in self contained and | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band. • The average score of Grade 1 students |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--|----|---|---|
| | | <p>pull-out classroom setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELL Everyday Math Intervention Handbook | | | <p>on Linkit Form A was 43% and Linkit Form B was 73%, which resulted in a 30% increase in the proficiency level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 28% and Linkit Form B was 46%, which resulted in a 18% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 23% and Linkit Form B was 31%, which resulted in a 8% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 19% and Linkit Form B was 33%, which resulted in a 14% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 28% and Linkit Form B was 56%, which resulted in a 28% increase in the proficiency level. |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Implementation of Treasures Reading Program | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA Benchmarks • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band. • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---|----|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 30% and Linkit Form B was 35%, which resulted in a 5% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 30% and Linkit Form B was 42%, which resulted in a 12% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 37% and Linkit Form B was 36%, which resulted in a -1% decrease in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 41% and Linkit Form B was 45%, which resulted in a 5% increase in the proficiency level. |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Implementation of Common Core Aligned Everyday Math Program | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band. • The average score of Grade 1 students on Linkit Form A was 46% and Linkit Form B was 74%, which resulted in a 29% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 39% and Linkit Form B was 58%, which resulted in a 19% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------|---|----|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>on Linkit Form A was 28% and Linkit Form B was 45%, which resulted in a 17% increase in the proficiency level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 29% and Linkit Form B was 50%, which resulted in a 21% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 35% and Linkit Form B was 55%, which resulted in a 20% increase in the proficiency level. |
| ELA | Schoolwide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Implementation of Treasures Reading Program | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA Benchmarks • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band. • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to the next band. • 71 Grade 2 students scored Below Basic on the 2nd Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 84 students scored Below Basic on the 2nd Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 13 students advancing to the next band. |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|---|----|---|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75 students scored Below Basic on the 3rd Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 58 students scored Below Basic on the 3rd Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 17 students advancing to the next band. • 94 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 101 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 7 students advancing to the next band. • 92 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 75 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 17 students advancing to the next band. |
| Math | Schoolwide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Implementation of Common Core Aligned Everyday Math Program | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band. • 44 of Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 6 of Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 38 students advancing to the next band. • 85 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 28 of Grade 2 students |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 57 students advancing to the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 114 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 61 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 53 students advancing to the next band. • 137 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 51 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 86 students advancing to the next band. • 108 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 19 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 89 students advancing to the next band. |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

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

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

| 1 Content | 2 Group | 3 Intervention | 4 Effective Yes-No | 5 Documentation of Effectiveness | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable) |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| ELA | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Homeless | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | ESL Afterschool Program (Kidzlit program) Targeted ELA Strategies Guided Reading Leveled Libraries Reading A-Z | Yes | Kizlit online program Anecdotal Notes RAZKIDS Data Report Kidbiz3000 report *End-of-Year Data is TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of K-5 students who participated in the ESL Afterschool program made consistent online progress, according to RAZKIDS and Kizlit reports. • According to anecdotal notes, 100% of all students in the afterschool program showed improvement in ELA skills. • 100% of students were able to access Kidbiz during after school hours. |
| Math | ELLs | Everyday Math Online Targeted Math Skills | YES | Teacher Data Report Unit Test Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of K-5 students who participated in the ESL Afterschool |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---|-----|--|---|
| | | After School Tutorial | | Anecdotal Notes Weekly Logs *End-of-Year Data is TBD | <p>program made consistent online progress, according to individual teacher program data reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of students completed at least one Everyday Math Online activity weekly. |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Title I Intervention Targeted ELA Skills Guided Reading Leveled Libraries | YES | Kizlit online program Anecdotal Notes RAZKIDS Data Report Kidbiz3000 report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of K-5 students who participated in the ESL Afterschool program made consistent online progress, according to RAZKIDS and Kizlit reports. According to anecdotal notes, 100% of all students in the afterschool program showed improvement in ELA skills. 100% of students were able to access Kidbiz during after school hours. |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | Title I Intervention Everyday Math Online Targeted Math Skills After School Tutorial | YES | Tutorial Report Program Data Report TenMarks Data Report Weekly Logs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16 out of 19 students in the Title I after school program showed improvement in multiplication and/or fraction skills, based on the April 4 and April 20 Tenmarks report. 100% of students completed at least one math online activity weekly. |
| ELA | Schoolwide | Title I Intervention Targeted ELA Skills Guided Reading Leveled Libraries | YES | A-Z Learning Tutorial Report Weekly Test Results Anecdotal Notes SRI Scores/Lexile Levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of all students in the Title I after school program showed improvement in reading fluency, based on word count per minute according to the April 6 A-Z Learning report. 100% of students completed at least one reading online activity weekly. |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|---|-----|---|---|
| Math | Schoolwide | Title I Intervention Everyday Math Online Targeted Math Skills After School Tutorial | YES | Tutorial Report Program Data Report TenMarks Data Report Weekly Logs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 out of 19 students in the Title I after school program showed improvement in multiplication and/or fraction skills, based on the April 4 and April 20 Tenmarks report. • 100% of students completed at least one math online activity weekly. |
|------|------------|---|-----|---|---|

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

Professional Development – Implemented in 2016-2017

| 1 Content | 2 Group | 3 Intervention | 4 Effective Yes-No | 5 Documentation of Effectiveness | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable) |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| ELA | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning Communities Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours Agenda ELA Supervisor/Principal Data Walks SRI Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, ELL strategies, data analysis, and the teacher evaluation process. ELA Supervisor and principals initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |
| Math | Homeless | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning Communities Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda/Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours Math Supervisor/Principal Data Walks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, math strategies, data analysis and the teacher evaluation process. Math Supervisor and Principal initiated observations and data walks, |

| | | | | | |
|------|--------------|--|-----|---|--|
| | | | | | then provided individual teacher feedback. |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning Communities Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours Agenda ELA Supervisor/Principal Data Walks SRI Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, ELL strategies, data analysis, and the teacher evaluation process. ELA Supervisor and principals initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |
| Math | ELLs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning Communities Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda/Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours Math Supervisor/Principal Data Walks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, math strategies, data analysis and the teacher evaluation process. Math Supervisor and Principal initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |
| ELA | Economically | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--|-----|---|--|
| | Disadvantaged | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities Content Area Training | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda ELA Supervisor/Principal Data Walks SRI Results | <p>analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, ELL strategies, data analysis, and the teacher evaluation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELA Supervisor and principals initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning Communities Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda/Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours Math Supervisor/Principal Data Walks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, math strategies, data analysis and the teacher evaluation process. Math Supervisor and Principal initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |
| ELA | Schoolwide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning Communities Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign-In Sheets Log of PD Hours Agenda ELA Supervisor/Principal Data Walks SRI Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, ELL strategies, data analysis, and the teacher evaluation process. ELA Supervisor and principals initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|--|-----|--|--|
| Math | Schoolwide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional Learning Communities ● Content Area Training | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agenda/Sign-In Sheets ● Log of PD Hours ● Math Supervisor/Principal Data Walks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PLC meetings were provided during contractual time for teachers to analyze and share best practices to enhance classroom effectiveness, focusing on teacher leadership, SGOs, lesson components, math strategies, data analysis and the teacher evaluation process. ● Math Supervisor and Principal initiated observations and data walks, then provided individual teacher feedback. |
|------|------------|--|-----|--|--|

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

Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2016-2017

| 1 Content | 2 Group | 3 Intervention | 4 Effective Yes-No | 5 Documentation of Effectiveness | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable) |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| ELA | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival Library Community Partnership Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Writers Workshop Author Celebration Car Show/Movie Night | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | 100% of homeless students and their families were invited to this event. |
| Math | Homeless | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival | NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | 100% of homeless students and their families were invited to this event. |

| | | | | | |
|------|---------|---|-----|---|--|
| | | Library Community Partnership Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Car Show/Movie Night | | | |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival Library Community Partnership Literacy Visitation Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Writers Workshop Author Celebration Car Show/Movie Night | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 89% of parents attended Back to School Night ● 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. ● Approximately 80% of parents attended the Halloween Parade ● Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. ● 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership ● 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast ● 215 students attended the Holiday Craft ● 32% of families attended Maker Space Night ● 200 people attended the K-5 Dance ● 80 people attended the P.E. Class |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--|-----|---|--|
| | | Kindergarten Celebration | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 40% of parents attended Writers Workshop Author Celebration ● 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |
| Math | ELLs | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival Library Community Partnership Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Car Show/Movie Night | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 89% of parents attended Back to School Night ● 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. ● Approximately 80% of parents attended the Halloween Parade ● Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. ● 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership ● 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast ● 215 students attended the Holiday Craft ● 32% of families attended Maker Space Night ● 200 people attended the K-5 Dance ● 80 people attended the P.E. Class ● 40% of parents attended Writers Workshop Author Celebration ● 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 89% of parents attended Back to School Night ● 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. ● Approximately 80% of parents |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---|-----|---|--|
| | | <p>Library Community Partnership Literacy Visitation Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Writers Workshop Author Celebration Car Show/Movie Night</p> | | | <p>attended the Halloween Parade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast 215 students attended the Holiday Craft 32% of families attended Maker Space Night 200 people attended the K-5 Dance 80 people attended the P.E. Class 40% of parents attended Writers Workshop Author Celebration 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | <p>Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival Library Community Partnership Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Car Show/Movie Night</p> | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sign-In Sheets Parent Feedback Online Parent Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 89% of parents attended Back to School Night 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. Approximately 80% of parents attended the Halloween Parade Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast 215 students attended the Holiday Craft 32% of families attended Maker Space Night 200 people attended the K-5 Dance |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|---|-----|---|--|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 80 people attended the P.E. Class ● 40% of parents attended Writers Workshop Author Celebration ● 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |
| ELA | Schoolwide | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade Harvest Festival Library Community Partnership Literacy Visitation Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Writers Workshop Author Celebration Car Show/Movie Night | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 89% of parents attended Back to School Night ● 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. ● Approximately 80% of parents attended the Halloween Parade ● Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. ● 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership ● 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast ● 215 students attended the Holiday Craft ● 32% of families attended Maker Space Night ● 200 people attended the K-5 Dance ● 80 people attended the P.E. Class ● 40% of parents attended Writers Workshop Author Celebration ● 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |
| Math | Schoolwide | Back to School Night Parent-Teacher Conferences Halloween Parade | YES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign-In Sheets ● Parent Feedback ● Online Parent Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 89% of parents attended Back to School Night ● 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Harvest Festival Library Community Partnership Thanksgiving Feast Holiday Craft Maker Space Night K-5 Dance P.E. Class Car Show/Movie Night</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approximately 80% of parents attended the Halloween Parade ● Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. ● 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership ● 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast ● 215 students attended the Holiday Craft ● 32% of families attended Maker Space Night ● 200 people attended the K-5 Dance ● 80 people attended the P.E. Class ● 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(III)
Principal's Certification

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

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

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

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 | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| Academic Achievement – Reading | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Linkit Benchmarks ● Treasures Unit Assessments ● Kindergarten Baseline/Mid-Year Assessments ● DRA2 Proficiency Scores ● SRI <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Kindergarten Baseline Assessment. 1 Grade K student scored below 40% on the Mid-Year Assessment, which resulted in 19 students advancing to the next band. • 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band. • 0 Grade 1 student scored below 40% on the Treasures Unit 1 Assessment. 1 Grade 1 student scored below 40% on the Treasures Unit 4 Assessment, which resulted in 1 student not advancing to the next band. • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to the next band. • 113 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 109 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 4 students advancing to the next band. • 99 Grade 2 students scored At-Risk on the 2nd Grade September Baseline SRI Assessment. The number of 2nd grade students that |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>scored At-Risk on the 2nd Grade March SRI Assessment was 51, which resulted in 48 students moving to the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 115 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 65 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 50 students advancing to the next band. • 75 students scored Below Basic on the 3rd Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 58 students scored Below Basic on the 3rd Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 17 students advancing to the next band. • 94 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 101 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 7 students not advancing to the next band. • 92 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 75 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 17 students advancing to the next band. |
| Academic Achievement - Writing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit Assessments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By June 2017, 60% of total students will score proficient (using the standards based rubric score of 3 or higher) on the final unit writing assessment. • By June 2017, 60% of total students will score proficient (using the standards based rubric score of 3 or higher) on the open-ended questions of the weekly unit assessments. |
| Academic Achievement - Mathematics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band. • 44 of Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Assessment. 6 of Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 38 students advancing to the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 28 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 57 students advancing to the next band. • 114 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 61 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 53 students advancing to the next band. • 137 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 51 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 86 students advancing to the next band. • 108 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 19 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 89 students advancing to the next band. |
| <p>Family and Community Engagement</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign in Sheets to record attendance • Attendance to events both during the school day and evening activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 89% of parents attended Back to School Night • 100% of parents attended Parent-Teacher Conference or participated in a phone conference. • Approximately 80% of parents attended the Halloween Parade • Approximately 300 people attended the Harvest Festival. • 30% of parents attended the Library Community Partnership • 45% of parents attended or contributed to the Thanksgiving Feast • 215 students attended the Holiday Craft • 32% of families attended Maker Space Night • 200 people attended the K-5 Dance • 80 people attended the P.E. Class • 40% of parents attended Writers Workshop Author Celebration • 100% of participants' parents or family members attended Car Show/Movie Night |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Professional Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sign in Sheets for weekly PLC Meetings ● District-wide Professional Development Days included in school calendar | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PLC meetings were provided for teachers throughout the school year on a weekly basis to ensure opportunities for staff/head teacher coaching, support and mentoring in LAL and Math programs. ● Two full days and five half days were built into school calendar to provide teachers with workshops targeted at enhancing specific teaching practices. |
| Leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School Climate Survey: School-wide domain predicated off of leadership in building | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Domain score of 76.7% in category of Leadership Support as perceived by GLC Staff |
| School Climate and Culture | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NJ School Climate Perception Survey | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Domain score of 72.5% in category of Teaching and Learning as perceived by GLC Staff ● Domain score of 77.4% in category of Morale in the School Community as perceived by GLC Staff ● Domain score of 74.9% in category of Relationships as perceived by GLC Staff ● Domain score of 72.7% in category of Emotional Environment as perceived by GLC Staff |
| School-Based Youth Services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School wide referrals to district youth based services ● Requests for behavioral assistance referrals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 12 students received YMCA counseling ● 40 students received individual and group schoolwide guidance counseling for social skills, grief management, and self-esteem ● Weekly Character Education lessons in classrooms at all grade levels |
| Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A |
| Homeless Students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Linkit Benchmarks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sept. 2016: The single third grade homeless student scored 23% on Linkit Form A Assessment. ● December 2016: The single third grade homeless student scored 32% on Linkit Form B Assessment. ● Sept. 2016: The single third grade homeless student scored 37% on Linkit Form A Assessment. ● December 2016: The single third grade homeless student scored 30% on Linkit Form B Assessment. |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | |
| Migrant Students | N/A | N/A |
| English Language Learners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <p>ELA Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band. • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to the next band. • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 23% and Linkit Form B was 27%, which resulted in a 4% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 22% and Linkit Form B was 29%, which resulted in a 7% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 25% and Linkit Form B was 24%, which resulted in a -1% decrease in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 24% and Linkit Form B was 25%, which resulted in a 1% increase in the proficiency level. <p>Math Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band. • The average score of Grade 1 students on Linkit Form A was 43% and Linkit Form B was 73%, which resulted in a 30% increase in the proficiency level. |

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 28% and Linkit Form B was 46%, which resulted in a 18% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 23% and Linkit Form B was 31%, which resulted in a 8% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 19% and Linkit Form B was 33%, which resulted in a 14% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 28% and Linkit Form B was 56%, which resulted in a 28% increase in the proficiency level. |
| Economically Disadvantaged | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkit Benchmarks <p>*End-of-Year Data is TBD</p> | <p>ELA Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band. • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to the next band. • The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 30% and Linkit Form B was 35%, which resulted in a 5% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 30% and Linkit Form B was 42%, which resulted in a 12% increase in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 37% and Linkit Form B was 36%, which resulted in a -1% decrease in the proficiency level. • The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 41% and Linkit Form B was 45%, which resulted in a 4% increase in the |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>proficiency level.</p> <p>Math Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band.• The average score of Grade 1 students on Linkit Form A was 46% and Linkit Form B was 74%, which resulted in a 28% increase in the proficiency level.• The average score of Grade 2 students on Linkit Form A was 39% and Linkit Form B was 58%, which resulted in a 19% increase in the proficiency level.• The average score of Grade 3 students on Linkit Form A was 28% and Linkit Form B was 45%, which resulted in a 17% increase in the proficiency level.• The average score of Grade 4 students on Linkit Form A was 29% and Linkit Form B was 50%, which resulted in a 21% increase in the proficiency level.• The average score of Grade 5 students on Linkit Form A was 35% and Linkit Form B was 55%, which resulted in a 20% increase in the proficiency level. |
|--|--|--|

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?

Our school conducted a comprehensive needs assessment using teacher perception surveys, standardized assessments, and local assessments. The Title I Committee analyzed data gathered. Results from the surveys along with all 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 Language Arts Literacy and Mathematics. The report also addresses the needs of specialized populations as identified in the information gathered. In October the NCLB committee reviewed the school's Mission and Vision and presented the statements at the faculty meeting for input and feedback. Data necessary to complete the tables was discussed and members of the teams were assigned specific data to gather and present to the team throughout the year. Programs and initiatives related to goals were discussed to assure that we are following through with our 2016-2017 plan. December's monthly meeting focused on professional development plans with the school Professional Development Committee. Data from tables of our 2016-2017 Title I Schoolwide Plan was presented by members and discussed to reflect. During January, data from the Benchmark Assessment was reviewed and perception surveys were distributed to all teachers. Extended Learning Programs were implemented and data was discussed. In February, Extended Day programs were discussed and planned based on data results. Results of the perception survey were discussed. Data was updated and presented. The month of March focused on data gathering; review data needed to complete Unified plan for the upcoming school year. In April the team completed evaluation of the 2016 plan and began writing and data analysis of the 2017 plan. In May and June, writing continued and priority problems were identified based on data. The month of June will conclude writing the plan with a peer review of plan. Throughout the school year at faculty meetings Principal Volpe discussed comprehensive needs with staff members and all stakeholders involved.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

Data collected for Language Arts Literacy were the Treasures unit assessments, kindergarten baseline and mid-year assessments, Scholastic Reading Inventory, and LinkIt Language Arts benchmark tests. Data collected for mathematics were the math unit assessments and the mathematics benchmarks, as well as achievement in Tenmarks. Data collected for both language arts and mathematics was attendance data, professional development feedback surveys, perception survey data, as well as teacher observations and evaluations and curriculum supervisor feedback from learning walks and coaching sessions.

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 research based surveys used to collect qualitative data are both established and reliable (NJ School Climate Perception Surveys). For example, the Scholastic Reading inventory (SRI) has been the subject of many scientific validation studies. The SRI research ranges from a norm 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?

In LAL, data gathered from weekly and benchmark assessments showed a high percentage of students reading below grade level and scoring below proficiency. Hispanic and Limited English Proficient students are among the subgroups with the lowest number of students performing on grade level. Teachers may benefit from additional professional development assisting them with differentiating their instruction to reach needs of all students, with an increased focus on our Limited English Proficient and Hispanic population.

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?

Data analysis suggests that professional development in the previous year(s) was short term and generalized and may not have focused on specific needs of students. Therefore many professional development programs in the district are now long term. Active learning programs with more prescriptive professional development programs are embedded throughout the school year to help better the needs of students as well as teachers. Professional development offered supports student achievement, specifically; job-embedded professional development opportunities, such as professional learning communities, data analysis, lesson study and peer coaching.

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

Standardized assessment data, quarterly benchmark assessments, weekly and unit tests from the Treasures Reading Program in ELA, math unit assessments, facts mastery data, standards-based report cards per quarter, student portfolios in ELA and Math, observations by teachers, reading and math supervisors, weekly attendance data, and discipline referrals are used to identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner. This data helped teachers, curriculum supervisors, student facilitators, and administrators to assess students and identify them for support.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?

Multiple opportunities were available for academically at-risk students, such as daily small group reading tutorial pull-out and push-in services, extended day/year programs such as Title I and ELL After School tutorials for math and language arts literacy, and the district academic summer camp program. Students with attendance concerns are placed in a morning Breakfast Club. All students are instructed using research-based programs. Parents are invited to various workshops that offer information to better assist their children at home.

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

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students?

There was one homeless student at George L. Catrambone this year. The student's teacher reached out to the child's family on multiple occasions throughout the school year to offer guidance and support. Guidance counselors and school based youth services are available throughout the district

to homeless students.

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

Grade-level representatives and elected members of the teaching staff serve on the No Child Left Behind committee as well as the Professional Development committee. At these committee meetings, data is gathered, presented and utilized to determine school wide goals and implementation of new programs to reach these goals. All classroom teachers are a part of professional learning communities that analyze data and make informed instructional decisions based on their analysis.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?

Professional Learning Community is in place for kindergarten teachers. Also, preschool students and teachers are able to visit kindergarten classrooms in the spring of their four-year-old year to assist with the acclimation process. The district director of early childhood holds parent workshops on transition as well as communicates needs for smooth social and academic transition to staff. In order to familiarize students with the middle school environment and assist in the acclimation process, several middle school visits are scheduled for fifth grade students. Fifth grade teachers collaborate at PLC meetings throughout the school year to discuss ways to instill in their students skills necessary for middle school, such as self-advocating, timeliness, homework submission, organization and independent learning. The district communicates needs for smooth social and academic transition to fifth grade teachers, students and parents.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2017-2018 schoolwide plan?

Data, from a variety of sources such as the surveys, benchmark assessments, Scholastic Reading Inventory, and PARCC was gathered and carefully analyzed by the Schoolwide Title I Committee. Progress was continuously monitored throughout the school year during

committee meetings. The team carefully selected the priority problems and discussed possible root causes. All stakeholders were in agreement of the priority problems.

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 | Language Arts Literacy | Mathematics |
| Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources | <p>Students continue to need interventions to strengthen ELA skills and strategies to improve reading comprehension in all standard areas.</p> <p>Based on the data from the 2016-2017 school year: (*End-of-Year Data is TBD)</p> <p>DRA, Linkit and Treasures Unit Assessment Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Kindergarten Baseline Assessment. 1 Grade K student scored below 40% on the Mid-Year Assessment, which resulted in 19 students advancing to the next band. • 12 Grade K students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Baseline DRA Assessment. Two students scored Below Basic on the Kindergarten Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 10 students advancing to the next band. • 0 Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Treasures Unit 1 Assessment. 1 Grade 1 student scored below 40% on the Treasures Unit 4 Assessment, which resulted in 1 student not | <p>Students continue to need interventions to strengthen math skills and strategies to improve reading comprehension in all standard areas.</p> <p>Based on the data from the 2016-2017 school year: (*End-of-Year Data is TBD)</p> <p>Linkit Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 3 of Grade K students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 12 students advancing to the next band. • 44 of Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 6 of Grade 1 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 38 students advancing to the next band. • 85 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 28 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 57 students |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>advancing to the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67 Grade 1 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 16 students scored Below Basic on the 1st Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 51 students advancing to the next band. • 113 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 109 of Grade 2 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 4 students advancing to the next band. • 99 Grade 2 students scored At-Risk on the 2nd Grade September Baseline SRI Assessment. The number of 2nd grade students that scored At-Risk on the 2nd Grade March SRI Assessment was 51, which resulted in 48 students moving to the next band. • 115 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 65 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 50 students advancing to the next band. • 75 students scored Below Basic on the 3rd Grade Baseline DRA Assessment. 58 students scored Below Basic on the 3rd Grade Mid Year DRA Assessment, which resulted in 17 students advancing to the next band. • 94 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 101 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 7 students not advancing to the next band. • 92 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 75 of Grade 5 | <p>advancing to the next band.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 114 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 61 of Grade 3 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 53 students advancing to the next band. • 137 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 51 of Grade 4 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 86 students advancing to the next band. • 108 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form A Linkit Assessment. 19 of Grade 5 students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 89 students advancing to the next band. <p>Mathematics Unit Assessment Data:</p> <p><u>Grade 1 Average Score Per Unit</u></p> <p>Unit 1: 89.3%</p> <p>Unit 2: 86.5%</p> <p>Unit 3: 89.7%</p> <p>Unit 4: 91.1%</p> <p>Unit 5: 83.7%</p> <p>Unit 6: 85.8%</p> <p>Unit 7: 87.3%</p> <p><u>Grade 2 Average Score Per Unit</u></p> <p>Unit 1: 88.3%</p> <p>Unit 2: 89.8%</p> <p>Unit 3: 88.3%</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>students scored below 40% on the Form B Assessment, which resulted in 17 students advancing to the next band.</p> | <p>Unit 4: 82.3% Unit 5: 87.9% Unit 6: 83.8% Unit 7: 85%</p> <p><u>Grade 3 Average Score Per Unit</u> Unit 1: 71.9% Unit 2: 72.5% Unit 3: 74.1% Unit 4: 74.5% Unit 5: 80.7% Unit 6: 75.1% Unit 7: 72.4%</p> <p><u>Grade 4 Average Score Per Unit</u> Unit 1: 74.7% Unit 2: 78.5% Unit 3: 81.6% Unit 4: 77.5% Unit 5: 77.1% Unit 6: 54.2%</p> <p><u>Grade 5 Average Score Per Unit</u> Unit 1: 78.3% Unit 2: 73.5% Unit 3: 70.9 % Unit 4: 82.5 % Unit 5: 70.7% Unit 6: 71.6 %</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Describe the root causes of the problem | Teachers need PD on the core elements of literacy and how to differentiate their instruction to focus on those core elements. | Teachers need targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic mathematical knowledge; stronger classroom management to gain more time on task; improve school/parent communication. |
| Subgroups or populations addressed | All students | All students |
| Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics) | English Language Arts | Mathematics |
| Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems | Treasures Reading LinkIt ELL Intervention After School Program | Everyday Mathematics Differentiation System Link It Math Intervention After School Program |
| How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards? | <p>Macmillan/McGraw-Hill's Treasures is aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. This leading program offers the correct balance of fiction/nonfiction literature, explicit instruction and ample practice to ensure that students learn and grow as lifelong readers and writers. A New Jersey Student Learning Standards alignment document and a New Jersey Student Learning Standards e-handbook that offers additional exercises are available for each grade level. These materials will support teachers as they transition to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards.</p> <p>The Link It Dashboard program is fully aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. The program gives detailed item analysis, from the district level to the individual student, longitude data tracking, intervention grouping, and a pacing guide. It tracks performance by school, grade, level, subject, teacher, class and is able to disaggregate results by race, gender and special</p> | <p>Everyday Math 2015 Edition is fully aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards in grades pre K-6. It is a comprehensive PreK-6th mathematics curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project and published by McGraw Hill Education.</p> <p>The Link it Dashboard program is fully aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. The program gives detailed item analysis, from the district level to the individual student, longitude data tracking, intervention grouping, and a pacing guide. It tracks performance by school, grade, level, subject, teacher, class and is able to disaggregate results by race, gender and special programs. Link it benchmarks are fully aligned to grade level New Jersey Student Learning Standards.</p> <p>The after school Intervention program is a customized academic intervention plan to address math issues for</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>programs. Link It benchmarks are fully aligned to grade level New Jersey Student Learning Standards.</p> <p>The after school Intervention program is a customized academic intervention plan to address reading issues for struggling learners. Through 2-hour sessions twice weekly after school, students work on individual smart goal activities, along with extra help on current classwork aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards.</p> | <p>struggling learners. Through 2-hour sessions twice weekly sessions after school, students work on individual smart goal activities, along with extra help on current classwork aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards.</p> <p>Everyday Math computerized instruction is designed to help students master the content specified in the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. Everyday Math provides content for math in grades K-12 aligned to PARCC items and New Jersey Student Learning Standards.</p> |
|--|---|--|

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 | Writing Skills |
| Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources | Based on our parent perception survey results, parents have expressed an interest in attending workshops to better equip them in assisting and supporting their children academically. Academic-based activities are less attended than other social activities. | Based on writing samples, students need to improve writing skills. Narrative, persuasive, research and expository writing, and open-ended responses need improvement at all grade levels. Keyboarding skills also need improvement. |
| Describe the root causes of the problem | <p>Work Schedule, New Teaching Methodology, Limited English Proficiency, Lack of Transportation</p> <p>To address these problems, we must vary the times in which workshops are offered in order to reach our target. Workshops should be geared towards engaging parents and empowering them to understand new teaching methods and programs. Parents should be invited into classrooms for exposure to learning environment. We must also recognize our growing population of ELL students and ensure that workshops offer sessions in the native languages of parents. Shuttle buses should continue to be offered to all school-sponsored workshops in order to enable attendance of all families.</p> | Students are not spending enough time practicing writing, nor do they have adequate keyboard typing skills. Students also need more individual teacher assistance and practice with the writing process in its entirety. The district will add more teacher professional development workshops, specifically targeting the area of guided reading within the current Treasures Reading program. |
| Subgroups or populations addressed | All students | All students |

| Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics) | N/A | N/A |
|---|---|--|
| Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems | Research based curriculum, research based surveys, outreach and communication programs, such as curriculum nights and tutorial programs, are interventions that will be used to address priority problems. Instruction will be based off of common core standards. Teacher evaluations will be based off of McRel’s evaluation tool. | <p>Treasures Literacy Program – Writing Component</p> <p>Treasures is a research based, comprehensive Reading Language Arts program for grades K-6 that gives educators the resources they need to help all students succeed. High quality literature coupled with explicit instruction and ample practice ensures that students grow as life-long readers and writers.</p> <p>http://www.macmillanmh.com/reading/</p> <p>Macmillan/McGraw-Hill’s Treasures is aligned to the Common Core State Standards. This leading program offers the correct balance of fiction/nonfiction literature, explicit instruction and ample practice to ensure that students learn and grow as lifelong readers and writers. A Common Core State Standards alignment document and a Common Core e-handbook that offers additional exercises are available for each grade level. These materials will support teachers as they implement the Common Core State Standards.</p> |
| How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards? | <p>Standard 9.1- 21st-Century Life and Careers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating an inviting and encouraging atmosphere to encourage parent/guardian and family participation with curriculum changes • Plan parent teacher conferences, open houses and other family forums to foster support for students to successfully complete homework | <p>Standard W.01 Writing</p> <p>With guidance and support from adults, students will produce writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task and purpose. Students will also develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning revising and editing.</p> |

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 . . . “

2017-2018 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

| <i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i> | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| 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 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | Treasures Reading Program | -Classroom Teacher -ELA Head Teacher -ELA Supervisor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of targeted students will score 71% or better on weekly assessments. 100% of students will increase 40 Lexile points on their quarterly SRI Assessment from September to June. | Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RTI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf |
| Math | Homeless | Everyday Mathematics | -Classroom Teacher -Math Head Teacher -Math Supervisor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of students will score proficient or better on part A of unit math tests. | IES Practice Guide: will score proficient or better on part A on each of the unit assessments http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf “ http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf ” |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | _092909.pdf" nit grad |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | Treasures Reading Program | -Teacher -Tutors -ELA Head Teacher -ELL Head Teacher | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of targeted students will score 71% or better on weekly assessments. 80% of students will increase 40 Lexile points on their quarterly SRI Assessment from September to June. | August, D., Beck, I. L., Calder, M., Francis, D. J., Lesaux, N. K., Shanahan, T., Erickson, F., & Siegel, L. S. (2008). Instruction and professional development. In D. August, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), Developing reading and writing in second-language learners: Lessons from the Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth (pp. 131-250). New York: Routledge. |
| Math | ELLs | Everyday Mathematics | -Teacher -Tutors -Math Head Teacher -Math | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of students will score proficient or better on part A of unit math tests. | IES Practice Guide: will score proficient or better on part A on each of the unit assessments http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Treasures Reading Program | -Teacher -Tutors -ELA Head Teacher | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of targeted students will score 71% or better on weekly assessments. 80% of students will increase 40 Lexile points on their quarterly SRI Assessment from September to June. | Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RTI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | pdf |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | Everyday Mathematics | -Teacher -Tutors -Math Head Teacher -Math | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of students will score proficient or better on part A of unit math tests. | <p>IES Practice Guide: will score proficient or better on part A on each of the unit assessments</p> <p>http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf</p> |
| ELA | Schoolwide | Treasures Reading Program | -Teacher -Tutors -ELA Head Teacher | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of targeted students will score 71% or better on weekly assessments. 80% of students will increase 40 Lexile points on their quarterly SRI Assessment from September to June. | <p>Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: 12/07</p> <p>Students who read with understanding at an early age gain access to a broader range of texts, knowledge, and educational opportunities, making early reading comprehension instruction particularly critical. This guide recommends five specific steps that teachers, reading coaches, and principals can take to successfully improve reading comprehension for young readers</p> <p>http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/readingcomp_pg_092810.pdf</p> <p>Effective Comprehension Instruction: 2011</p> <p>Students need to be taught a set of procedures or strategies that they can use on their own when they read text, especially when they encounter difficulties.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/assets/extras/0000/2675/Dole2_Auth_or_paper.pdf |
| Math | Schoolwide | Everyday Mathematics | -Teacher -Tutors -Math Head Teacher -Math | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of students will score proficient or better on part A of unit math tests. | <p>IES Practice Guide: will score proficient or better on part A on each of the unit assessments</p> <p>http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf</p> |

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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)(1)(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 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | N/A | N/A | N/A | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |
| Math | Homeless | N/A | N/A | N/A | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | ELL Intervention Programs Title I ELA Intervention | -Teacher -ELA Head Teacher -ELL Head | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% of students for ELA will score proficient or advanced proficient based upon the weekly | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | Programs | Teacher -ELA Supervisor -Principal -Title I Tutors | assessments. ● 70% of students for ELA will show growth from the program's baseline test to post-tests, which will be administered bi-weekly and input on data forms. | cticeguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |
| Math | ELLs | Title I Math Intervention Programs | -Teacher -Math Head Teacher -ELL Head Teacher -Math Supervisor -Principal -Title I Tutors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 70% of students for Math will score proficient or advanced proficient based upon the weekly assessments. ● 70% of students for Math will show growth from the program's baseline test to post-tests, which will be administered bi-weekly and input on data forms. | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Title I ELA Intervention Programs | -Teacher -ELA Head Teacher -ELA Supervisor -Principal -Title I Tutors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 70% of students for ELA will score proficient or advanced proficient based upon the weekly assessments. ● 70% of students for ELA | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | will show growth from the program's baseline test to post-tests, which will be administered bi-weekly and input on data forms. | |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | Title I Math Intervention Programs | Teacher -Math Head Teacher -Math Supervisor -Principal -Title I Tutors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% of students for Math will score proficient or advanced proficient based upon the weekly assessments. 70% of students for Math will show growth from the program's baseline test to post-tests, which will be administered bi-weekly and input on data forms. | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |
| ELA | Schoolwide | Title I ELA Intervention Programs | -Teacher -ELA Head Teacher -ELA Supervisor -Principal -Title I Tutors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% of students for ELA will score proficient or advanced proficient based upon the weekly assessments. 70% of students for ELA will show growth from the program's baseline test to post-tests, which will be administered | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | bi-weekly and input on data forms. | |
| Math | Schoolwide | Title I Math Intervention Programs | Teacher -Math Head Teacher -Math Supervisor -Principal -Title I Tutors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 70% of students for Math will score proficient or advanced proficient based upon the weekly assessments. ● 70% of students for Math will show growth from the program's baseline test to post-tests, which will be administered bi-weekly and input on data forms. | IES Practice Guide: ELA and 50% Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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 ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

| Content Area Focus | Target Population(s) | Name of Strategy | Person Responsible | Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes) | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|
| ELA | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education, 1(2)</i> , 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| Math | Homeless | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education, 1(2)</i> , 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | w/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education, 1</i> (2), 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| Math | ELLs | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education, 1</i> (2), 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education, 1</i> (2), 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--|----------|---|---|
| | | | | sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | w/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education</i> , 1(2), 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| ELA | Schoolwide | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education</i> , 1(2), 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |
| Math | Schoolwide | Professional Learning Committees (Job-embedded professional development) | Teachers | During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will be offered program-specific weekly PLC trainings, specific to academic areas, including, but not limited to Reading, Writing, and Math as noted in sign in sheets and teacher lesson plans. | Rismark, M., & Solvberg, A. M. (2011). Knowledge sharing in schools: A key to developing professional learning communities. <i>World Journal of Education</i> , 1(2), 150-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1030087823?accountid=28180 |

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

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

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program* **(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 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 2017-2018? 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 school wide program monthly at Title I Committee meetings and it will be conducted internally.
2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process? A lack of up-to-date technology for students in kindergarten, first and second grades; along with the alignment of instruction with New Jersey Student Learning Standards poses a challenge to schools.
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 throughout the year where every stakeholder is involved and provide professional development and/or informational sessions. In addition, continued support through data walks and PLC Meetings will be provided.
4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff? The NJ School Climate Survey will be used to gauge the perceptions of the staff.
5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community? The NJ School Climate Survey will be used to gauge the perceptions of the parents.
6. How will the school structure interventions? Interventions are structured according to students' individual needs. I&RS teams will meet weekly to create action plans.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions? Students will receive instructional interventions on a daily basis. Weekly assessments will be reviewed by the teacher and shared at PLCs and common planning times to identify both class and grade-level strengths and weaknesses.
8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program? Tablets for every student in grades 3-5 and two computer labs available for use by all students will be utilized to support the schoolwide program. Learning opportunities to support ELA and math will be infused by the use of technology daily through use of teacher Smart Slates and interactive websites. Online programs, such as Kidbiz, Achieve3000, TenMarks, and ConnectEd will be implemented daily. Research-based projects will be an integral component in achieving productivity in classrooms and building 21st century skills. Differentiated data-driven lessons and targeted instruction will continue. In addition, online professional development and weekly PLC meetings supporting both curriculum and best practices will be utilized.
9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided? Weekly and unit assessments, along with standardized test scores and anecdotal notes from teacher observation during small group instruction will be used. Additionally, quarterly benchmarks and diagnostic assessments will be referenced.
10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? The school will disseminate results of the schoolwide program through staff, committee and PLC meetings, as well as online newsletters, parent conferences and board meetings. Results will also be made available on the district's website.

****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.

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

| Content Area Focus | Target Population(s) | Name of Strategy | Person Responsible | Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes) | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| ELA | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Students with Disabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | Homeless | Encouraging Positive Parenting | Principal Teacher Parent Supervisors Student Facilitators | There will be two parenting workshops offered for parents during the 2017-2018 school year. | Henderson, Anne T. and Mapp, Karen L. (2002). A New Wave of Evidence. National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools |
| Math | Homeless | Encouraging Positive Parenting | Principal Teacher Parent Supervisors Student Facilitators | There will be two parenting workshops offered for parents during the 2017-2018 school year. | Henderson, Anne T. and Mapp, Karen L. (2002). A New Wave of Evidence. National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools |
| ELA | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | Migrant | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| ELA | ELLs | Curriculum Parent | Curriculum | There will be a 50% increase | Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Visitations (classroom and whole school) | Supervisors | in the number of attendees at an ELA curriculum visitation event from the 2016-2017 school year to the 2017-2018 school year. | relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7. |
| Math | ELLs | Curriculum Parent Visitations (classroom and whole school) | Curriculum Supervisors | There will be a 50% increase in the number of attendees at a math curriculum visitation event from the 2016-2017 school year to the 2017-2018 school year. | Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7. |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Attendance Awareness Notifications Create incentive/rewards programs for homerooms that have a large percentage of parents that attend functions LAL, Mathematics, and Science Curriculum Nights | Student Facilitator PTO/A, Student Advisory Committee Curriculum Supervisors | 100% of parents will be given informational attendance handouts at arrival and dismissal in the Fall and Spring. Students who ride the bus will be given notices to take home to their parents. 100% of parents with students identified with attendance concerns will be notified and addressed, as frequently as needed, documenting interventions. There will be a 10% increase in attendance of all curriculum nights from the 2016-2017 school years to | Coleman, B, and McNeese, M. (2009). From home to school: the relationship among parental involvement, student motivation, and academic achievement. International Journal of Learning, 2009, Vol. 16, Issue 7. |

| | | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | the 2017-2018 school years. Workshops will be offered in Spanish and Portuguese | |
| Math | Economically Disadvantaged | Attendance Awareness Notifications | Student Facilitator | 50% of parents will be given informational attendance handouts at arrival and dismissal in the Fall and Spring. Students who ride the bus will be given notices to take home to their parents. 100% of parents with students identified with attendance concerns will be notified and addressed, as frequently as needed, documenting interventions. | Jeynes, W., (2005). Parental Involvement and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. Harvard Family Research Project, Family Involvement Research Digests. |
| ELA | Schoolwide | Inviting families to parent events such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter/Spring Concert • Open House • Math Night • Columbus Day • Dance (K-5) • Family Visitation Days • Harvest Festival • Art Show • Open House • Back to School Night • ELA Night | Principal, Supervisor, Head Teacher, Homeroom Teachers | 95% of parents will attend at least 2 school offered functions during the 2017-2018 school year, as measured by Back to School Night sign-in sheets, parent-teacher conference sign in sheets, and parent workshop sign-in sheets. During the 2017-2018 school year 100% of parents will attend Parent Teacher | IES Practice Guide: "Structuring Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement" http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf |

| | | | | | |
|------|------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | Parent-Teacher conferences | Principal and teachers | Conferences either in person or via conference call. | |
| Math | Schoolwide | <p>Improve the flexibility of scheduled events to range throughout the day and school year to increase attendance, such as Math In-Services</p> <p>Curriculum day visits followed up by a question and answer session</p> <p>Continue to have parents sign and return the school's Parent-School Compact</p> | <p>Student Advisory Committee Math Supervisor</p> <p>Principal, classroom teacher</p> <p>Principals and Supervisors</p> | <p>During the 2017-2018 school year 30% of parents will attend a math-in service which will be determine by the use of sign in sheets. 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact.</p> | <p>http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families</p> <p>Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/ (2011)</p> |

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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? Parental involvement requires that parents be informed so that programs may be developed to build ties between parents and the school in order to improve children's achievement in LAL and mathematics. The school's family and community engagement program will strengthen the school-home connection, which will result in greater test scores, grades, attendance, positive behaviors, and student motivation. Through various academic and social activities, the school will provide vehicles of communication with parents that will help build stronger school-home alliances. This communication will help build awareness of academic issues in both ELA and math. The school will offer parent workshops and activities that promote student academic achievement and also provide resources to parents to increase student achievement.
2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy? The schools will engage parents in parent involvement procedures by inviting parents to take part on the Title I committee. The school will engage parents in parent involvement through meetings and surveys. Input gathered from these meetings and surveys will help create plans for future family and community engagement activities.
3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? The written parent involvement policy will be distributed by classroom teachers to students, via the Parent Portal, and will be available on the district website.

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact? Through previous year's surveys and parent meetings, the school parent compact will be revised to reflect parental input. Once developed, the school-parent compact will be sent home with the students and parents will be asked to read and sign the document and return it to school. The homeroom teachers and student advisors will place follow-up phone calls home to ensure that a compact is returned for each student.
5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact? In order to ensure that parents receive and review school-parent compacts, the process is as follows: the school-parent compact is sent home with the students, parents are asked to read and sign the document and return it to school, and homeroom teachers and the student advisor follow-up with phone calls home to ensure that a compact is returned for each student.
6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community? The school will report its student achievement data to families and the community through district/school letter, parent/teacher conferences, report cards, phone calls, emails, 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 will be notified by letter.
8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results? They are informed via the School Report Card and Central Office presents a public agenda meeting to address results.
9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan? The school will involve families and the community in the development of the Title I School wide 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? The school will inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children through marking period standardized report cards, scheduled conferences, timely notes and emails and online access to students' grades through the Genesis parent portal.
- 11.** On what specific strategies will the school use its 2017-2018 parent involvement funds? The schools will use its 2017-2018 parental involvement funds in multitude of ways. First, the funds will be allocated to hold several events that are intended to promote a positive school culture and climate that includes the learning of social skills and study habits that promote student achievement. One example of this is the Back-to-School Night in which the building principal will introduce and inform the parents of school-wide initiatives. Second, school funds will be allocated to promote the awareness of curriculum and New Jersey Student Learning Standards along with social activities to help garnish parental support and build parent-school communication. Third, allocations will be set aside for the recognition of student achievement. This will include awards ceremonies and the distribution of certificates for excellent student achievement.

****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, consistent with Title II-A | 67 | Teachers will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and management, family involvement and discipline. |
| | 100% | |
| Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A | | |
| | | |
| Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test) | 5 | Instructional Assistants will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and management, family involvement and supporting teachers within the classroom. |
| | 100% | |
| Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)* | | |
| | | |

* 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 |
|---|--|
| <p>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.</p> <p>Every Instructional Assistant in the district has met the Title I requirement. With the onset of the new legislation, Long Branch entered into an agreement with Brookdale Community College to offer courses to all of the paraprofessionals in the district. This was done at the expense of the district and enabled many paraprofessionals to receive their Associate of Arts Degree and become highly qualified. Those who did not attend Brookdale courses attended prep sessions so that they were able to take the Para-Pro test. Portfolio assessment was not an option in Long Branch. Retention rate of paraprofessionals is high in the Long Branch School District.</p> | <p>Primarily the Personnel Manager in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff and Principals.</p> |

