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 Public Schools	School: Gregory Elementary School
Chief School Administrator: Dr. Michael Salvatore	Address: 201 Monmouth Ave., Long Branch, NJ 07740
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: 1-5
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Beth McCarthy
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: bbehnken@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-571-2868	Principal's Phone Number: 732-222-7048

Principal's Certification

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

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

_____ _____ _____

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____6_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ 5, 616,420 , which comprised 96.71 % of the school's budget in 2016-2017.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 5,627,089 , which will comprise 96.85 % 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
After School Tutors	Priority Problems 1, 2 & 3 for Supplemental Services	Extended Learning Time and Extended Day		$15,000
Parent Involvement	Priority Problem 3	Family and Community engagement		$375
NCLB Improvement Leaders	Priority Problems 1, 2 & 3	Everyday Math and Treasures		$6500
Professional Development	Priority Problems 1, 2	PD provided to		$0

	and 3	create best practices for all 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
Beth McCarthy	School Staff-Administrator	X	X	X	
Linda Alston-Morgan	School Staff-Administrator	X	X	X	
Nik Greenwood	Student Advisor	X	X	X	
Christina Marra	Teacher	X			
Erica Krumich	Teacher	X			
Michael Gatta	Teacher	X			
Stephanie Dispoto	Teacher	X	X	X	
Cari Rock	Teacher	X			
Mike McLaughlin	Teacher	X			
Laura Widdis	Teacher	X	X	X	
Elizabeth Muscillo	Teacher/Parent	X	X	X	

Holly Terracciano	Teacher	X			
Nicole Guerra	Teacher	X			
Heather Valdes	Parent	X			
Danah Jetter	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 26, 2016	Gregory School Main Office Conference Room	Review of schoolwide goals	X		X	
October 17, 2016	Gregory School Main Office Conference Room	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
November 21, 2016	Gregory School Main Office Conference Room	Review of Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data	X		X	
December 12, 2016	Gregory School Main Office Conference Room	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
January 30, 2017	Gregory School Main Office Conference Room	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
February 13, 2017	Gregory School Main Office Conference Room	Program Evaluation	X		X	

***Add rows as necessary**.

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?

   Yes, the program was implemented as planned. The 2016-2017 plan was used to drive all instructional decisions regarding Reading and Math this school year. In addition, parent involvement was a focus and specific days were included in the calendar for parents to visit their child's classroom outside of the activities that were planned by individual teachers.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The team met regularly and discussed specific benchmarks and goals set within the plan. Data was shared and strategies were implemented to assist our school in addressing our priority problems. Platooning in grades 3-5 allowed staff to be immersed in Professional Development and planning that was more content specific. The meetings of the Title I Stakeholder Committee and the sufficient amount of data sources presented and discussed helped guide the team in a successful implementation of the plan.

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

   The introduction of 7 new teachers presented a challenge, along with the continued implementation of platooning which designated teachers as either teachers of math or ELA. This was the fourth year the district has employed this practice. Teacher past performance was utilized in identifying if teachers would be best suited to teach math or ELA. In some cases teacher placement was not accurate.

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

   Strengths of the program stemmed from on-going contact between the Title I Stakeholder Committee and staff members. Data was continually analyzed and strategies were implemented to meet the deficiencies identified through review and discussion of the data.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

   Information was gathered during common planning periods, PLCs and monthly meetings held by the team. This was a district wide initiative that was supported by the Central Office Administration. In addition, there was constant collaboration between the administration and teachers in order to work together to determine what is and is not working and develop a unified vision and stakeholder buy in.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

   The New Jersey School Climate Survey was completed anonymously by all staff members. 70.6 % of the staff surveyed felt positively about the implementation of the school improvement plan.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

   In reviewing the New Jersey School Climate Survey , 77.3% of parents surveyed felt incorporated into both the social and academic fabrics of the school. This includes assessing the efficacy of the school-home communications and an assessment of the degree of home support for learning.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

   Delivery was established using multiple methods. One on one sessions were put in place to address specific concerns. Monthly meetings were scheduled to address general plan targets and discussions were held concerning goals and the collection of data to indicate the goal has been met.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

   Interventions were implemented using daily, weekly and unit data gathered from all educational disciplines. Educators met with administrators and peer teachers to set goals and implement interventions to meet student needs. Plans were developed and implemented that utilized best practices and strategies which would assist students performing below grade level in meeting targeted goals. Follow up meetings were held between the educators and administration to monitor if the strategies implemented were effective.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

    Instructional interventions were implemented daily. All teachers identified students performing below grade level through data analysis and created a targeted plan to address the areas of weakness for each students. During class time, teachers planned small group instruction and modified classroom instruction to target the specific needs of the class.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

    All students and staff in grades three through five used tablets to increase their access to online curriculum support. Students and staff were able to access Kidbiz 3000 and Link-it online resources. Everyday math online tools such as the Assessment Differentiation System and the ConnectED Treasures on-line tools were utilized for both reading and math. Staff was also supplied with the use of a smart slate to enhance and support instruction. All students were provided a Google account and many of their daily assignments and activities were completed using this platform. In addition, many teachers used either Class Dojo or Remind to keep parents informed in terms of student performance, behavior, and assignments due.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

    Technology offered students the opportunity to access tools which reinforced concepts and skills presented throughout the school day. The technology component needs to receive additional support and be monitored more closely for it to yield greater success.

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 ***did*** **or** ***did not*** **result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Grade 4	95 (PARCC)	TBD (Pending PARCC results)	● Platooning in grades 3-5. Teachers taught only reading and writing. This allowed for immersion into professional development and planning for these areas only. ● KidBiz3000 ● LinkIt! Online resources ● Common planning times for all grade level ELA teachers. ● In-Class support using support staff. ● Job embedded professional development through the use of PLC's, lesson studies, and demo lessons. ● Professional development in best practices related to ELA content area with a specific focus on guided reading planning/instruction. ● Incorporation of literacy centers which are designed to provide appropriate materials to help students work	● Professional development was provided, but needed to be more directly prescribed for the specific needs of each teacher in regards to classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Professional development should have also been more targeted to support staff in the areas of data analysis and using data to drive their instruction. ● Professional development in the area of differentiation needed to be more prescriptive and an effective follow up plan was not in place supporting the implementation of this practice. ● Instruction in writing and reading was also inconsistent from classroom to classroom. ● Link it online benchmarks and tools were introduced in January of 2014. After the initial implementation in 2014, the benchmarks and tools were updated to include technology enhanced items in 2015 so that they were in-line with the types of questions that students will encounter during PARCC. Though there were

			independently or collaboratively to meet targeted goals. ● Treasures online tools	trainings and support, this program is still new and teachers are still discovering its many resources and uses for intervention.
Grade 5	94 (PARCC)	TBD (Pending PARCC results)	● Platooning in grades 3-5. Teachers taught only reading and writing. This allowed for immersion into professional development and planning for these areas only. ● KidBiz3000 ● LinkIt! Online resources ● Common planning times for all grade level ELA teachers. ● In-Class support using support staff. ● Job embedded professional development through the use of PLC's, lesson studies, and demo lessons. ● Professional development in best practices related to ELA content area with a specific focus on guided reading planning/instruction. ● Incorporation of literacy centers which are designed to provide appropriate materials to help students work independently or collaboratively to meet targeted goals. ● Treasures online tools	● Professional development was provided, but needed to be more directly prescribed for the specific needs of each teacher in regards to classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Professional development should have also been more targeted to support staff in the areas of data analysis and using data to drive their instruction. ● Professional development in the area of differentiation needed to be more prescriptive and an effective follow up plan was not in place supporting the implementation of this practice. ● Instruction in writing and reading was also inconsistent from classroom to classroom. ● Link it online benchmarks and tools were introduced in January of 2014. After the initial implementation in 2014, the benchmarks and tools were updated to include technology enhanced items in 2015 so that they were in-line with the types of questions that students will encounter during PARCC. Though there were trainings and support, this program is still new and teachers are still discovering its many resources and uses for intervention.

Mathematics	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Grade 4	90 (PARCC)	TBD (Pending PARCC	● Platooning in grades 3-5. Teachers taught only math, science, and social studies. This allowed for	● Professional development was provided to the staff through data analysis, learning walks, PLC's and common planning time.

		results)	staff to be immersed in professional development and planning for these areas of study only. ● Common Planning period for all grade level mathematics teachers. ● Job embedded professional development in mathematics through the use of PLC's, lesson studies, and demo lessons. ● Everyday Math online tools such as the Assessment Differentiation System. ● LinkIt! Online resources	● Due to platooning, Math teachers' professional development was targeted. ● Individualized coaching was also offered. Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. Professional development should have also been more targeted in supporting staff to utilize the data to directly guide their instruction and support. ● In class support staff were not trained in mathematics best practices. They were placed as support, but perhaps should have been included in more PLC meetings with the grade level groups that they were working with.
Grade 5	87 (PARCC)	TBD (Pending PARCC results)	● Platooning in grades 3-5. Teachers taught only math, science, and social studies. This allowed for staff to be immersed in professional development and planning for these areas of study only. ● Common Planning period for all grade level mathematics teachers. ● Job embedded professional development in mathematics through the use of PLC's, lesson studies, and demo lessons. ● Everyday Math online tools such as the Assessment Differentiation System. ● LinkIt! Online resources	● Professional development was provided to the staff through data analysis, learning walks, PLC's and common planning time. ● Due to platooning, Math teachers' professional development was targeted. ● Individualized coaching was also offered. Professional development needed to be more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. Professional development should have also been more targeted in supporting staff to utilize the data to directly guide their instruction and support. ● In class support staff were not trained in mathematics best practices. They were placed as support, but perhaps should have been included in more PLC meetings with the grade level groups that they were working with.

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 ***did*** or ***did not*** result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 1	33 (Based on the Diagnostic Reading Assessment)	32 (Based on the Diagnostic Reading Assessment)	● After administering the Treasures Unit Assessments, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Treasures online and RTI resources to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create intervention groups 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 ● Job embedded professional development in reading and writing through PLC meetings ● Differentiated small group instruction	● Professional development was provided, but needed to be more directly prescribed for the specific needs of each teacher in regards to classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Teachers required additional professional development and support in effectively analyzing student data, and developing small group/differentiated lessons to support both student strengths and weaknesses.

			● Differentiated homework assignments ● Content area coaching	
Grade 2	38 (Based on the Diagnostic Reading Assessment)	39 (Based on the Diagnostic Reading Assessment)	● After administering the Treasures Unit Assessments, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Treasures online and RTI resources to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create intervention groups 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 ● Job embedded professional development in reading and writing through PLC meetings ● Differentiated small group instruction ● Differentiated homework assignments ● Content area coaching	● Professional development was provided, but needed to be more directly prescribed for the specific needs of each teacher in regards to classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Teachers required additional professional development and support in effectively analyzing student data, and developing small group/differentiated lessons to support both student strengths and weaknesses.

Grade 3	78 (Based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory)	56 (Based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory)	● After administering the Treasures Unit Assessments, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the Treasures online and RTI resources to develop activities and guide small group instruction. Teachers used the data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction and support whole group lessons. ● Common planning time for all 3rd grade teachers ● Weekly PLC meetings to analyze student products and student data and plan interventions for weak skills ● Quarterly goal setting/action planning ● Job embedded professional development in reading and writing through PLC meetings ● Differentiated small group instruction ● Differentiated homework assignments ● Content area coaching	● Professional development was provided, but needed to be more directly prescribed for the specific needs of each teacher in regards to classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Teachers required additional professional development and support in effectively analyzing student data, and developing small group/differentiated lessons to support both student strengths and weaknesses.

Mathematics	**2015-2016**	**2016-2017**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**

Grade 1	19 (Based on the LinkIt Benchmark Assessment)	29 (Based on the LinkIt Benchmark Assessment)	After administering the Link It Benchmark Assessment in September 2016, teachers were given opportunities during staff meetings and PLC meetings to analyze results and use the resources provided by Link It. Teachers used the data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction. They also used class wide results to guide differentiated teaching days once a week.	The students were administered the Link it benchmark in December each year. In December 2015, 19 students were not proficient. In December 2016, 29 students scored in the partially proficient range. Some possible causes why the interventions resulted in a decreased amount of proficiency may be: ● Professional development was provided to the staff through data analysis, learning walks, PLC meetings and common planning time. However, it was not individualized with each staff member. ● Professional development was more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. However, it was not focused on specific standards per grade level where needed. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
Grade 2	65 (Based on the LinkIt Benchmark Assessment)	67 (Based on the LinkIt Benchmark Assessment)	After administering the Link it benchmark assessment in September 2016, teachers were trained on how to analyze results and use the resources provided by Link it. Teachers used the data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction. They also used class wide results to guide differentiated teaching days once a week.	The students were administered the Link it benchmark in December each year. In December 2015, 19 students were not proficient. In December 2016, 29 students scored in the partially proficient range. Some possible causes why the interventions resulted in a decreased amount of proficiency may be: ● Professional development was provided to the staff through data analysis, learning walks, PLC meetings and common planning time. However, it was not individualized with each staff member. ● Professional development was more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards.

				However, it was not focused on specific standards per grade level where needed. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
Grade 3	99(Based on the LinkIt Benchmark Assessment)	87 (Based on the LinkIt Benchmark Assessment)	After administering the Link it benchmark assessment in September 2016, teachers were trained on how to analyze results and use the resources provided by Link it. Teachers used the data to create intervention groups for small group targeted instruction. They also used class wide results to guide differentiated teaching days once a week.	The students were administered the Link it benchmark in December each year. In December 2015, 99 students were not proficient. In December 2016, 87 students scored in the partially proficient range. Some possible causes why the interventions resulted in an increased amount of proficiency may be: ● Professional development was provided to the staff through data analysis, learning walks, PLC meetings and common planning time. ● Individualized coaching was also offered. ● Professional development was more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards. ● Professional development was more targeted in supporting staff to utilize the data to directly guide their instruction and support. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.

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	Treasures McGraw-Hill Core Reading Program Read 180 Systems 44	Yes	• Link It Baseline Assessment administered in September 2016 • Link It Mid-Year Assessment administered in January 2017	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 2: 61% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 8%. • Grade 3: 63% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 12%. • Grade 4: 55% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 11%. • Grade 5: 59% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 6%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Everyday Mathematics	Yes	• Link It Baseline Assessment administered in September 2016 • Link It Mid-Year Assessment	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 1: 81 % of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 22%.

				administered in January 2017	• Grade 2: 75% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 21%. • Grade 3: 90% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. • Grade 4: 91% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 19%. • Grade 5: 76% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 20% *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures McGraw-Hill Core Reading Program	Yes	• Link It Baseline Assessment administered in September 2016 • Link It Mid-Year Assessment	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 2: 54% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 6%

				administered in January 2017	● Grade 3: 65% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 8% ● Grade 4: 40% o of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 9% ● Grade 5: 52% o of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 6% *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Everyday Mathematics	Yes	● Link It Baseline Assessment administered in September 2016 ● Link It Mid-Year Assessment administered in January 2017	LinkIt Benchmark Data: ● Grade 1: 90% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 22%. ● Grade 2: 86% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 21%. ● Grade 3: 85% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. ● Grade 4: 94% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 19%.

					● Grade 5: 86% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 20%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
ELA	ELA	Treasures McGraw-Hill Core Reading Program	Yes	● Link It Baseline Assessment administered in September 2016 ● Link It Mid-Year Assessment administered in January 2017	● Grade 2: 58% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 400 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 2: 61% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 14% with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 3: 36% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 590 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 3: 63% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. ● Grade 4: 49% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 700 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given.

					● Grade 4: 40% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 10%. ● Grade 5: 44% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 810 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 5: 61% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 13%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
Math	MATH	Everyday Mathematics	Yes	● Link It Baseline Assessment administered in September 2016 ● Link It Mid-Year Assessment administered in January 2017	Mathematics LinkIt Benchmark Assessment Data: ● Grade 1: 89% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 22%. ● Grade 2: 87% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 21%. ● Grade 3: 85% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%.

					• Grade 4: 95% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 19%. • Grade 5: 89% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 20%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.

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	• Weekly After School Small Group Tutoring • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	• LinkIt Benchmark Data	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 2: 61% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 8%. • Grade 3: 63% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 12%. • Grade 4: 55% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 11%.

					• Grade 5: 59% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 6%.
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Weekly After School Small Group Tutoring • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	• LinkIt Benchmark Data	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 1: 81 % of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 22%. • Grade 2: 75% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 21%. • Grade 3: 90% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. • Grade 4: 91% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 19%. • Grade 5: 76% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 20%
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• Weekly After School Small Group Tutoring	Yes	• Data from Link It Benchmarks	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 2: 54% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt

		• Summer Enrichment Camp			Benchmark with average growth of 6% • Grade 3: 65% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 8% • Grade 4: 40% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 9% • Grade 5: 52% of students showed improvement on the LinkIt Benchmark with average growth of 6%
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• Weekly After School Small Group Tutoring • Summer Enrichment Camp	Yes	• Data from Link It Benchmarks	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 1: 90% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 22%. • Grade 2: 86% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 21%. • Grade 3: 85% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. • Grade 4: 94% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 19%. • Grade 5: 86% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 20%.

ELA	All ELA	KidBiz3000	Yes	• Kidbiz3000 report • Scholastic Reading Inventory Results (Grades 2-5) • DRA2 (Grade 1)	• 100% of students were able to access Kidbiz at home, after school throughout the year. The goal was achieved from the 2016-2017 plan. • In December 2016, 48% of 1st grade students were reading on grade level. This is a 4% decrease from the September 2016 baseline of 52%. An End of Year Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year. • In March 2017, 58% of 2nd grade students were reading on grade level. This is a 28 % increase from the September 2016 baseline of 25%. • In March 2017, 36% of 3rd grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 11% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 25%. • In March 2017, 49% of 4th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 17% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 32%. • In March 2017, 44% of 5th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is an 13% increase

					from the September 2016 baseline of 31%.
Math	Math	Everyday Mathematics Online- ConnectEd	Yes	● ConnectEd ● LinkIt!	● 100% of students were able to access ConnectEd after school and throughout the school year. The goal was achieved from the 2016-2017 plan. Mathematics Unit Assessment Data: ● Grade 1: 94% of students scored an average of 60% or better (increase of 1% from September 2016). ● Grade 2: 95% of students scored an average of 60% or better (no increase or decrease of % from September 2016) ● Grade 3: 80% of students scored an average of 60% or better (1% decrease from September 2016) ● Grade 4: 73% of students scored an average of 60% or better (18% increase from September 2016) ● Grade 5: 84% of students scored an average of 60% or better (21% increase from September 2016) Mathematics Benchmark Data: ● Grade 3: 5% proficient (September 2016) to 29% proficient (December 2016). This was an increase of 24%. ● Grade 4: 9% proficient (September 2016) to 33% proficient (December 2016). This was an increase of 24%.

					• Grade 5: 6% proficient (September 2016) to 39% proficient (December 2016). This was an increase of 33%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
ELA	ELA	Treasures Online	Yes	• ConnectED Online Access • Scholastic Reading Inventory Results (Grades 2-5) • DRA2 Results (Grade 1)	• Throughout the school year 100% of students were able to access Treasures on-line at home, during small group and after school. The goal was achieved from the 2016-2017 plan. • In March 2017, 46% of 1st grade students were reading on grade level. This is a 38% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 8%. • In March 2017, 58% of 2nd grade students were reading on grade level. This is a 33% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 25%. • In March 2017, 36% of 3rd grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is an 11% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 25%. • In March 2017, 49% of 4th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 17% increase

					from the September 2016 baseline of 32%. ● In March 2017, 44% of 5th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 13 % increase from the September 2016 baseline of 31%
Math	Math	LinkIt!	Yes	● Link it Benchmark Report	● 100% of teachers utilized the Link it intervention system and resources to target student mathematics weaknesses based on benchmark results.

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				
Math	Students with Disabilities				
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged				
Math	Economically Disadvantaged				
ELA	ELA	Program Specific Staff Training	Yes	• Sign-in Sheets • Scholastic Reading Inventory Results (SRI)	• 100% of staff attended specific PD trainings during the summer and the school year in order to increase student test scores. This goal was achieved from the 2016-2017 plan. • In March 2017, 36% of 3rd grade students were reading on grade level

					according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is an 11% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 25%. ● In March 2017, 49% of 4th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 17% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 32%. ● In March 2017, 44% of 5th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 13 % increase from the September 2016 baseline of 31%
Math	Math	Program Specific Staff Training	Yes	● Sign-in Sheets ● Surveys	● 100% of staff attended specific PD trainings during the summer and the school year in order to increase student test scores. This goal was achieved from the 2016-2017 plan. ● 100% of staff completed a survey, rating the trainings and offering suggestions.
All	All	Professional Technology Training	Yes	● Sign-in Sheets	● 100% of teachers participated in specific Professional Technology trainings. This goal was achieved from the 2016-2017 plan.

All	All	Professional Learning Communities	Yes	• Sign In sheets • Action Plans	• 100% of staff were members of a professional learning community.
ELA and Mathematics	ELA and Mathematics	Peer Coaching	Yes	• Sign in sheets • SRI Quarterly Assessments • LinkIt Benchmarks	LinkIt Benchmark Data: • Grade 1: 90% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 22%. • Grade 2: 86% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 21%. • Grade 3: 85% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. • Grade 4: 94% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 19%. • Grade 5: 86% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 20%.

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)
All	All	Back to School Night	Yes	● Parent Sign-In Sheets	● In September 2016, 90% of parents/guardians attended Back to School Night. The 2016-2017 goal of 90% was met. ● 77.3% of parents surveyed felt incorporated into both the social and academic fabrics of the school. This includes assessing the efficacy of the school-home communications and an assessment of the degree of home support for learning.
All	All	Fall Parent/Teacher Conferences	Yes	· Parent Sign In Sheets	● 93% of parents attended both the Fall and Spring Parent-Teacher Conferences or participated in a phone conference. The 2016-2017 goal of 90% was met.
All	All	Spring/Parent/Teacher Conferences	Yes	· Parent Sign In Sheets · Perception Survey	● 90% of families either attended the Spring Parent-Teacher Conferences or participated in a phone conference. The 2016-2017 goal of 90% was met. ● 76.3% of parents surveyed felt that they were informed regarding their child's progress.

All	All	Math Family Night	Yes	· Parent Sign In Sheets · Perception Survey	● 200 guests attended the school wide math parent visitation 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	● Quarterly Reading Assessments - Scholastic Reading Inventory ● Link It Benchmark Assessments	● Grade 3: 36% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 590 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 3: 63% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. ● Grade 4: 49% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 700 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 4: 40% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 10%. ● Grade 5: 44% of students met their end of year grade level lexile goal of 810 points as measured by the SRI with one administration still to be given. ● Grade 5: 61% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 13%.
Academic Achievement - Writing	· PARCC Assessment	● In 2016, 19% of 3rd grade students met or exceeded expectations on the writing portion of the PARCC assessment.

		● Grade 3: 63% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 15%. ● In 2016, 24% of 4th grade students met or exceeded expectations on the writing portion of the PARCC assessment. ● Grade 4: 40% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 10%. ● In 2016, 25% of 5th grade students met or exceeded the expectations on the writing portion of the PARCC assessment. ● Grade 5: 61% of students showed growth on the LinkIt benchmark averaging an improvement of 13%.
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	● PARCC Assessment ● Mathematics Unit Assessment Data	PARCC Data: ● In 2016, 21% of 3rd grade students met or exceeded expectations on the mathematics portion of the PARCC assessment. ● In 2016, 26% of 4th grade students met or exceeded expectations on the mathematics portion of the PARCC assessment. ● In 2016, 29% of 5th grade students met or exceeded expectations on the mathematics portion of the PARCC assessment. Mathematics Unit Assessment Data: ● Grade 3: 80% of students scored an average of 60% or better (1% decrease from September 2016) ● Grade 4: 73% of students scored an average of 60% or better (18% increase from September 2016)

		• Grade 5: 84% of students scored an average of 60% or better (21% increase from September 2016)
Family and Community Engagement	• Sign in sheets • Teacher contact Logs	• 100% of families had been contacted at least twice during the 2016-2017 school year as indicated through sign in sheets and parent contact logs. • 90% of families attended the Back to School night. 90% of families attended in 2015-2016. No increase or decrease. • 100% of 5th grade students had a family member attend the 5th grade Moving Up Ceremony. • 28% of all parents attended a math family night.
Professional Development	• PLC Meetings • Learning Walks • Lesson Study • Sign-in sheets from • Professional Development Surveys	Sign in sheets: • 100% of staff was offered weekly Professional Learning Community time during common planning periods. • 100% of staff have participated in learning walks. • 100% of staff was offered content area specific PD trainings for lesson study. • 100% of teachers were offered specific PD trainings in order to increase student test scores in both LAL and Math.
Leadership	• Survey Results	• 100% of teachers were asked to participate in a leadership survey.
School Climate and Culture	• Survey results	• 100% of teachers were asked to participate in a school and climate survey.
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	n/a	
Homeless Students	N/A	N/A

Migrant Students	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	not included in last years	

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?

Gregory School conducted a needs assessment using data, teacher surveys, and focus groups during PLC meetings. The Title I Stakeholder Committee analyzed data gathered throughout the 2016-2017 school year. All results were then analyzed and discussed at faculty and PLC meetings.

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

When students are enrolled, subgroup information is collected as part of the registration process. This information is input into Genesis, which is our data management system. From there, the information is uploaded into Link-it which allows us to analyze standardized and district assessments by subgroup.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

The quantitative data from the collection methods is valid and reliable because the assessment tools measure what they intend to measure and the assessments will yield same results on repeated occasions as proven through research. The surveys used to collect qualitative data are both established and reliable (NJ School Climate Surveys). For example, the Scholastic Reading inventory (SRI) has been the subject of many scientific validation studies. The SRI research ranges from a norming study with a sample of 512,224 students to an analysis of gender, race, and ethnic differences among 19,000 fourth through ninth grade students.

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

In LAL, data gathered from weekly assessments, the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), as well as benchmark assessments showed a high percentage of students reading below grade level and scoring below proficiency. Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, Special Education and African American 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 the needs of all students, with an increased focus on our Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, African American and Special Ed. populations.

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

There has been an increased focus on job-embedded professional development opportunities. There is evidence of data analysis, lesson study, and demo lessons however unit and weekly assessments along with benchmark data show that implementation of learned strategies and conveyance of data analysis to the classroom is weak. Additional training paired with one on one feedback sessions is required to increase student proficiency. Platooning and targeted professional learning in the area of mathematics in grades 3-5 revealed an increase in students scoring an average of 80% or better on the mathematics unit assessments in 2016-2017.

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

Educationally at-risk students are identified using Standardized assessment data, fall and winter benchmark assessments, weekly and unit ELA assessments, math unit assessments, facts mastery data, marking period grades, observations by teachers, weekly attendance data, and discipline referrals. These data help 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?

A myriad of opportunities are available for academically at risk students such as daily push in classroom support in both reading and math, extended day/year programs such as after school tutoring. Weekly and quarterly data is reviewed to provide specific support. Students with attendance concerns are identified with on-going family contact and support given to assist these students in improving their attendance. All students are instructed using research based programs. Parents are invited to various workshops which offer information so that they can assist their children at home. The School I&RS team addresses all at risk students referred to the team for either academic, attendance or behavior concerns.

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

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

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

To assist in improving the instructional program elected members of the teaching staff serve on the Title I Stakeholder 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?

On-going articulation between the kindergarten and first grade teachers supports seamless transition between the two programs. Professional Development for teachers in these grade levels provides insight of program components and how they are implemented. The Treasures program seamlessly creates a bridge from the kindergarten curriculum preparing students to transition to the upper grades with consistent language, strategies and exposure to literature. Students transitioning from elementary to middle school attend assemblies and visit the middle school to better understand what to expect in the upcoming year. A summer reading assignment is also presented to students to complete which may assist in preparing them in completing a typical middle school assignment. These strategies may make the transition to the middle school less stressful.

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

Data, from a variety of sources such as the surveys, benchmark assessments, Scholastic Reading Inventory, and PARCC data, was gathered and carefully analyzed by the school wide Title I Stakeholder Committee. Once the team met, we selected the priority

problems and discussed possible root causes. All stakeholders were in agreement of the priority problems progress is monitored throughout the school year during committee meetings.

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	English Language Arts	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Scholastic Reading Inventory: ● In March 2017, 36% of 3rd grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is an 11% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 25%. ● In March 2017, 49% of 4th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 17% increase from the September 2016 baseline of 32%. ● In March 2017, 44% of 5th grade students were reading on grade level according to the Scholastic Reading Inventory. This is a 13 % increase from the September 2016 baseline of 31% Reading Benchmarks: All grade levels had less than 80% of the students score in the proficient range. There was stronger growth in G5 (36%), but grade 4 is an area of	Mathematics Unit Assessment Data: ● Grade 1: 94% of students scored an average of 60% or better (increase of 1% from September 2016). ● Grade 2: 95% of students scored an average of 60% or better (no increase or decrease of % from September 2016) ● Grade 3: 80% of students scored an average of 60% or better (1% decrease from September 2016) ● Grade 4: 73% of students scored an average of 60% or better (18% increase from September 2016) ● Grade 5: 84% of students scored an average of 60% or better (21% increase from September 2016) Mathematics Benchmarks: All grade levels had less than 80% of the students score in the proficient range. There was stronger growth in G5 (33%).

	concern with only 15% of students scoring in the proficient range. ● Grade 3: 15% proficient (September 2016) to 27% proficient December 2016). This was an increase of 12%. ● Grade 4: 37% proficient (September 2016) to 37% proficient (December) 2016). This was an increase of 0%. ● Grade 5: 42% proficient (September 2016) to 48% proficient (December 2016). This was an increase of 6%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.	● Grade 3: 5% proficient (September 2016) to 29% proficient (December 2016). This was an increase of 24%. ● Grade 4: 9% proficient (September 2016) to 27% proficient (December 2015). This was an increase of 18%. ● Grade 5: 6% proficient (September 2016) to 39% proficient (December 2016). This was an increase of 33%. *A 3rd Benchmark Assessment will be administered later in the school year, which would show growth reflective of whole school year.
Describe the root causes of the problem	● No consistent method in place for students to achieve assistance in completing missed homework. ● Teachers were not exposed to a large amount of professional development focused on addressing Special Education, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students. ● Based on teacher observations there was an inconsistency with the implementation of the Core Reading strategies. Strategies were not fully incorporated across curriculum and supported across disciplines. ● No consistent method for implementing RTI services or tracking these services.	Teachers received ongoing professional development from outside providers as well as job embedded trainings. However, teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how to effectively use assessments to guide instruction. Teachers are continuing to work towards refining the implementation of the program may have been needed. Though teachers received professional development and support to incorporate weak curriculum areas, such as geometry and measurement and patterns and algebra into their instruction, it was inconsistent from classroom to classroom.
Subgroups or populations addressed	ALL	ALL

Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English Language Arts	Mathematics
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	● Treasures Reading/Writing Program incorporating Writer's Workshop (Lucy Calkins) ● Kid Biz ● Link It	● Everyday Math ● Link It
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Treasures Reading and Writer's Workshop are aligned with the New Jersey Student Learning Standards: Reading Standards for Literature K–5 Reading Standards for Informational Text K–5 Reading Standards: Foundational Skills K–5 College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing Writing Standards K–5 Speaking and Listening Standards K–5 Language Standards K–5 Standard 10: Range, Quality, and Complexity of Student Reading K–5 Staying on Topic Within a Grade and Across Grades	In the past, Everyday Mathematics has fully incorporated the skills and processes described in the Standards for Mathematical Practice. As a school using Everyday Mathematics, the transition from the NJCCCS to the CCSS, and therefore the New Jersey Student Learning Standards has been easy since the practices required by the CCSS are fundamental features woven throughout the entire program. Everyday Mathematics and the New Jersey Student Learning Standards have a shared origin in decades of research and authoritative opinion. Everyday Mathematics was built and is constantly revised using an ever-growing body of research in the learning sciences, authoritative recommendations such as those from the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and the National Mathematics Advisory Panel, and the professional judgment of the authors. The New Jersey Student Learning Standards are built on the same foundation. So, as a result, good alignment between New Jersey Student Learning Standards and Everyday Mathematics is evident. Everyday Mathematics has produced new programs to connect grade level content to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards.

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	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	The Gregory School had a high percentage of parents attending Back to School Night, 93% of parents were involved in Parent Teacher conferences, and 100% attended the 5th grade Moving up ceremony. However, curriculum events such as Curriculum Math and ELA Homework Nights and exploration visits for both ELA and Math are anticipated to maintain between 30 % attendance. This needs to increase.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Events with student performances are highly attended venues. Events such as curriculum visitation days are moderately attended by parents. Events which combine a breakfast/lunch/dinner with a school event may increase parental involvement and provide a meal while encouraging family time. Offering transportation during inclement weather could increase family attendance for families who walk. In addition, planning a rain date for events which occur during inclement weather. Lack of	

	routine for teachers to make phone calls home for Back to School Night and Conferences inviting parents. Perhaps, more direct contact with the homes through calls, emails, or a parent classroom web page would yield higher results. With the increased use and contact with families through classroom web pages parents may feel more comfortable attending school functions.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	All	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	● Parent Newsletters, outreach and communication programs ● Curriculum Nights ● Reliable and valid parent surveys. ● Ramapo for Children	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Through the New Jersey Standards for Teachers and School Leaders, staff will build relationships with parents, guardians, families, and agencies to support students' learning and well-being (standard 9). Teachers engage in activities to: 9.7 Identify and utilize family and community resources to foster student learning and provide opportunities for parents to share skills and talents that enrich learning experiences; 9.8 Establish respectful and productive relationships and to develop cooperative partnerships with	

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

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

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

Plan Components for 2013

2017-2018 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
All	Teachers and Administrators	Program Specific Staff Training	• staff • Building Administrator	By June 2018, 100% of teachers will participate in specific PD trainings in order to increase student test scores in both ELA and Math. Trainings will be offered throughout the school year and during the summer.	*The effects of teachers' professional development on student achievement:* *Findings from a systematic review of evidence* Kwang Suk Yoon (American Institutes for Research) Teresa Duncan (American Institutes for Research) Sylvia Lee (Taiwan National University) Kathy Shapley (Edvance Research) Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 24-28, 2008, New York
ALL	ALL	Quarterly Feedback meeting		Quarterly feedback sessions will be held between the teacher teams and/or individual teachers and administrators addressing	Patel, P., & Laud, L. E. (2009). Using goal-setting in "P(paw)LANS" to improve writing. *Teaching Exceptional Children PLUS*, *5*(4).

				student achievement with goal setting sessions as a focus.	Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1): 81–112.
ALL	ALL	Professional Development to support proficient use of the new Standards based report card		By June 2018 teachers will participate in on-going specific Professional Development Sessions targeting how to identify student proficiency using the Common Core Standards.	October 2008 | Volume **66** | Number **2** **Expecting Excellence** Pages 70-74 **Seven Reasons for Standards-Based Grading** Patricia L. Scriffiny

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)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
ELA	All	Kidbiz3000	Teachers	ELA Scholastic Reading Inventory	Achieve3000: National Elementary School, Lexile Study http://www.achieve3000.com/research/gated/2 Achieve3000: State of New Jersey, Lexile Study

					http://www.achieve3000.com/research/gated/30
Math & ELA	At-Risk students sent to I&RS Team	School Based Youth Services- RTI	RTI Tutors I&RS Team	To decrease the amount of students being recommended for Special Education Services, 10% more students will be brought to the I&RS team for request for assistance (Interventions).	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 Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School (IES Practice Guide, April 2009) http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=2
ELA and Mathematics	Total Population	Summer Enrichment Camp	Camp Facilitator	Based on daily attendance records 50% of all students from the Gregory School will attend Summer Enrichment Camp during the summer of 2017 in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement: A Practice*

					Guide (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides
ELA	Total Population	Treasures Online	Staff	All students will be given a log-in which will allow them to access online language arts practice from any computer with internet capabilities. 100% of all students will log onto Treasures online weekly for additional support in reading	All students will be given a log-in which will allow them to access online language arts practice from any computer with internet capabilities. 100% of all students will log onto Treasures online weekly for additional support in reading

***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 & Mathematics	All Teachers	Professional Learning Communities Meetings	Teachers	As measures by daily sign in sheets and Agendas, 100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings.	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R. (2011). Promoting professional learning from within. *International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2.*
ELA & Math	All Math & ELA teachers	Customized Professional Development Sessions	Staff Administrators	As measures by daily sign in sheets and Agendas, by June 2018, 100% of teachers will be exposed to a minimum of 2 Customized Professional Development Sessions assigned by their principal following walk-through or observations.	Easton, L.B. (Ed.), 2008. Powerful designs for professional learning (2nd edition). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council. *The effects of teachers' professional development on student achievement:* *Findings from a systematic review of evidence.* Kwang Suk Yoon (American Institutes for Research) Teresa Duncan (American Institutes for Research) Sylvia Lee (Taiwan National University) Kathy Shapley (Edvance Research) Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 24-28, 2008, New York
ELA & Math	All teachers	Learning Walks	Staff Administrators	By June 2018, 100% of teachers will be involved in a minimum of one math and one ELA learning walk. Teachers will use data and self-reflection to determine their areas of weakness. Based on their analysis and reflection, they will	Educational Leadership December 2007/January 2008/ Volume 65/ Number 4 Informative Assessment pages 81-82 Classroom Walk-Throughs

				go on a learning walk in a colleague's room during their targeted area of instruction.	
ELA & Math	All staff	Quarterly Data Chats with goal setting	Administrators	During the 2017-2018 school year, 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals. At the end of each 8 week cycle of instruction, teachers will meet in their PLC's to share data, identify weak students, determine root causes, and develop next steps and SMART goals.	US Department of Education, 2010, Use of Education Data at the Local Level : From Accountability to Instructional Improvement http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/use-of-education-data/use-of-education-data.pdf

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

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

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2017-2018 school year)

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

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2016-2017? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

The Title I School wide committee will be responsible for evaluating the school wide program and it will be conducted internally. This will be reviewed monthly throughout the school year.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

   A lack of up to date technology for students in all grade levels; along with the alignment of instruction with New Jersey Student Learning Standards might pose a challenge to the school.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

   To gain stakeholder support, the school will hold monthly meetings and provide professional development and/or informational sessions. In addition, continued support through data walks, PLC meetings, and professional development will be provided.

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

   The Victoria Bernhardt's School Portfolio 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 community.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

   The school will structure interventions both during school hours by providing RTI and tier 2 interventions, push in tutors, Lexia. Outside of school hours, the school will provide tutoring services and academic based summer enrichment camps.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

   Students will receive instruction interventions on a daily basis. Weekly assessments will be reviewed by the teacher and then shared at PLC meetings and common planning times to identify both class and grade level weaknesses and strengths.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

Online tools supporting both ELA and math along with targeted RTI instruction will be implemented daily. In addition on line 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?

    Student achievement data is reported to the public via the school report card, public board agenda meetings, and notifications sent home.

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)
All content areas	All families	Parent Teacher Conferences	Classroom teachers and student facilitator	100% of all families will either attend fall and spring Parent Teacher Conferences or be given a home visit or phone conference regarding their child's progress.	"Parental Involvement in Schools." *Indicators of Child and Youth Well-Being* (2013): 1-14. *Child Trends Data Bank*. Web.

LAL and Mathematics	All families	Parent-School Compact	Student Facilitator	100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact.	"Parental Involvement in Schools." *Indicators of Child and Youth Well-Being* (2013): 1-14. *Child Trends Data Bank*. Web.
LAL and Mathematics	All families	LAL, Mathematics, and Science Curriculum Nights	Curriculum Supervisors	There will be a 10% increase in attendance of all curriculum nights from the 2016-2017 school year to the 2017-2018 school year.	Dervarics , Chuck, and Eileen O'Brien. "Back to school: How parent involvement affects student achievement." (2011): n. pag. Center for Public Education . Web.
School wide goals and Unified Plan	All parents	NCLB Committee	Principal	There will be a minimum of once parent added to the Title 1 Schoolwide Plan Stakeholder Committee.	Dervarics , Chuck, and Eileen O'Brien. "Back to school: How parent involvement affects student achievement." (2011): n. pag. Center for Public Education . Web.
All	All Students	Back to School Night	Administrator, Supervisors and Staff	During the 2017-2018 school year 90% of the parents will attend Back to School Night as measured by sign-in sheets. The importance of attendance can be discussed during Back to School Night.	"Parental Involvement in Schools." *Indicators of Child and Youth Well-Being* (2013): 1-14. *Child Trends Data Bank*. Web.
All	All Students and Families	Inviting families to parent events	Administrator, Supervisors and Staff	During the 2017-2018 school year 100% of the parents will be invited by a phone call	Dervarics , Chuck, and Eileen O'Brien. "Back to school: How parent involvement affects student

				made by the classroom teacher or paraprofessional to attend scheduled family events.	achievement." (2011): n. pag. Center for Public Education . Web.

***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?

To increase parental involvement in the school and to strengthen the home-school connection, parental involvement activities in Math and English Language Arts will be implemented. To seek and encourage parental involvement further, teachers will continue to create and maintain web pages to remain in daily contact with all families to encourage positive participation in their child's education. In addition, Home Links and Home Connection newsletters provided by the ELA and Mathematics programs to inform parents of the content being learned during that time period in school will be sent home.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

Parents will serve on the School wide committee. In addition, the school will prepare surveys and questionnaires to be shared with parents and will invite parents to participate in the development of the school plan. Then, the results from those surveys and questionnaires will be reviewed with the committee to revise and implement the parent involvement policy.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

The parent involvement policy will be sent home with students and posted on the school's website.

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

This would be the result of having parents listed as stakeholders with the committee.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

Parents are asked to sign the document and return it to school. Teachers and Student Advisors follow up, by way of phone calls, and if necessary, home visits, to ensure a compact is returned by every student.

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

Student achievement data is reported to the public via the school report card, board meetings, and notifications sent home.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives

(AMAO) for Title III?

If the district has not met their annual measurable objectives for Title III, parents are notified by letter.

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

Assessment results will be shared via the school report card and the public board agenda meeting.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?

Parents will be encouraged to be involved in the school community through development of the schoolwide plan, having parent representatives attend Title 1 Stakeholder Committee meetings, and 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, and online access to students' grades through the Genesis Parent Portal. Parents of students at risk or failing are contacted through phone calls and permission letters home to invite students to attend extended day tutorial services.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2017-2018 parent involvement funds?

The Gregory School 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 Open House/Back to School Night in which the building principal will introduce and inform the parents of school wide initiatives. Second, the school funds will be allocated to promote the awareness of curriculum and New Jersey Student Learning Standards. Third, allocations will be set aside for the recognition of 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	53	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	0	
	0%	

Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	11 100%	Instructional Assistants will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, technology, classroom guidance and management, family involvement and supporting teachers within the classroom.
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0 0%	

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

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

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

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