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: Long Branch High School
Chief School Administrator: Michael salvatore	Address: 404 Indiana Avenue Long Branch, NJ 07740
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: 9-12
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Vincent Muscillo
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: vmuscillo@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: (732) 571-2868 ext. 40030	Principal's Phone Number: (732) 229-7300 ext. 41004

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.

Vincent J. Muscillo

_____ _____ _____

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held __5____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ 15,804,585 , which comprised 97.64 **%** of the school's budget in 2016-2017.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 15,619,446 , which will comprise 97.71 % 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
Professional Development	1, 2 and 3	Professional development provided to create best practices for all intervention strategies.	200-300	$10,000
Parent Involvement	3	Parent and community workshops and events.	200-600	$2,500

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
Kimberly Jones	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Vincent Muscillo	Lead Principal	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Tara Okun	ELA Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Robin Reinhold-Canneto	Mathematics Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Frank Riley	Leadership Academy Administrator	Yes	Yes	Yes	

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

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

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

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

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
September 22, 2016	LBHS Main Office Conference Room	Establish Stakeholder/Schoolwide Title I Committee Coordinate Monthly Meeting Dates Identify Parent Advisory Council Members Review Schoolwide Goals with the Committee Prepare a list of data measures to be collected and analyzed this year to complete next year's plan	X		X	

October 20, 2016	LBHS Main Office Conference Room	Comprehensive Needs Assessment Discuss the school's plan and progress in implementing the programs and initiatives related to the schoolwide goals Are all stakeholders following through with the implementation of interventions, strategies, programs, and initiatives identified in the report with fidelity? Are there any revisions needed to the plan?	X		X	
November 17, 2016	LBHS Main Office Conference Room	Review all data measures Obtain student feedback to celebrate what is working and ways to improve what's not	X		X	
January 26 , 2017	LBHS Main Office Conference Room	Status Check Parent Involvement	X		X	

		2017 Plan Development				
April 27, 2016	LBHS Main Office Conference Room	Status Check Data Collection Questions to assist in writing the 2017-18 plan	X		X	

Add rows as necessary.

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

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Schoolwide Program *

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

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

   The 2016-2017 plan was implemented to address students struggling in both Language Arts and Mathematics. Discovering Mathematics was implemented in all Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II classes to improve students ability to think critically and apply this to solve higher level problems. Algebra I lab, Algebra II lab and Senior Math courses were offered during the school day and provided standards based data driven instruction. Read 180 and Newsela were interventions implemented to increase proficiency in all reading standards. In addition, the plan addressed increasing professional development opportunities such as PLCs and Data Chats, common planning time and opportunities for data discussion and remediation. The plan also increased parent involvement through school events and community outreach programs.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The strengths found from the implementation of the 2016-2017 plan was the use of student data collection and analysis to drive instruction. English Language Arts and Mathematics teachers used specific software to collect, analyze, and modify instructional practices to remediate standards identified as below proficiency through data. The implementation of the plan aided in assessing the various components that affected the educational viability of the school.

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

   The school continued to offer numerous family and community events which were communicated with parents and the community through multiple channels including but not limited to the LBHS webpage, social media, phone calls and fliers. However, parent and community involvement continues to be a major area in need of improvement for our school.

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

   English Language Arts and Mathematics teachers used the opportunities presented by the data collection software to collectively make pedagogical decisions for their respective subjects and grade levels. This enhancement and increase in communication

significantly benefited the school. Professional collaboration has been allocated on a weekly basis to ensure the diffusion of ideas with regard to educational practices. Parental communication, while becoming regular and consistent, still requires further attention as education reinforcement is required outside of school. Although there has been efforts made to increase parental attendance at school events, further intervention will be required to advance the school in meeting these specific goals.

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

   Professional development that focused on strategies aimed at meeting these goals were offered throughout the 2016-2017 school year. Teachers were provided common planning time and opportunities to discuss, analyze, and reflect on data results. Additionally, various family based activities were hosted throughout the year to encourage parents and the community to become involved in our school.

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 administered to all staff members this year in an effort to assist in reinforcing positive conditions and addressing vulnerabilities for learning at the high school. Based on a 100 point scale where 100 represents completely satisfied, the survey results are as follows:

Domain	**Score**
Physical Environment	59.9
Teaching & Learning	51.1
Morale in the School Community	60.4
Relationships	66.3
Parental Support & Engagement	52.9
Safety	77.4
Emotional Environment	56.2

Administrative Support	60.6

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

The New Jersey School Climate Survey was administered to students and parents this year in an effort to assist in reinforcing positive conditions and addressing vulnerabilities for learning at the high school. Based on a 100 point scale where 100 represents completely satisfied, the survey results are as follows:

Domain	**Parent/Community Results**	**Student Results**
Physical Environment	78.2	56.1
Teaching & Learning	64.1	59.3
Morale in the School Community	71.5	57.6
Relationships	64.3	50.2
Parental Support & Engagement	63.2	69.4
Safety	72.6	67.8
Emotional Environment	72.4	47.5

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

The school opted to use Google Forms to administer the surveys. The student survey was administered during physical education classes. Staff Members took the survey during a scheduled professional development session. The survey was placed online and offered to parents in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Parents were informed via email and the auto dialer.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Instructional interventions were offered to students who were performing below grade level as identified through multiple measures. Read 180, Algebra I Lab, and Algebra II Lab were offered as elective courses during the school day. Senior Math was offered to seniors that failed to meet the graduation requirements set forth by the State of New Jersey to prepare them for alternative assessments and the appeals process.

The Student Advocacy Program and Homework Club presented students with additional opportunities for one on one and small group instruction for tutoring purposes in all subject areas.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Students received instructional interventions on a regular basis. During class time, teachers examined daily lesson assessments to determine what immediate interventions were necessary. The use of formative and summative assessments aided teachers in modifying classroom instruction to target the needs of their students. In addition, standards-based benchmark assessments, administered three times throughout the year, provided essential data used for goal setting and remediation. Homework Club was offered daily both before and after school and the Student Advocacy Program (SAP) was offered daily after school.

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

The school actively strives to use cutting edge technological resources to improve student achievement. Over the course of the year the school utilized various programs such as LinkIt, Newsela, Edcite, OpenEd, Kahoot, Socrative, Quizlet, Google Docs, Google Classroom, Google Slides, Prezi, Nearpod, Remind, IXL, Desmos and SMART technologies. Each floor of the school was provided with approximately one hundred ChromeBooks to be shared amongst the teachers for instructional purposes in addition to the six fully equipped computer labs in the building. All mathematics teachers were provided with class sets of graphing calculators and all teachers were offered SMART slates and SMART responders to use in their classes. Khan Academy, Read 180, and Newsela were utilized to support, remediate and enrich instruction in both English Language Arts and Mathematics classes.

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

All utilized technology aided in increasing student engagement and provided real-life assessment experiences. Khan Academy, Newsela, and Read 180 aided in providing support, remediation and enrichment to students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics by providing targeted instruction based on the individual needs of each student.

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 9	201/369	TBD	All students in grade 9 were provided standards-based remediation during SAP periods. Tutoring and remediation was also provided during Homework Club. Student conferencing, peer editing and revising, portfolio reflections and goal setting allowed students to review writing product and discuss strengths and weaknesses. Benchmark and unit reflections provided students the opportunity to identify and remediate reading standards identified as below proficiency. Students were also provided meaningful feedback on all reading and writing product. Literacy center-based learning activities were also incorporated into instructional practices to address specific reading and writing tasks aligned to standards and congruous with the PARCC Assessment. There were teacher led centers that focused on standards-based remediation in	Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake in March.

			addition to an independent center such as Newsela that was product and data-driven.	
Grade 10	193/381	TBD	All students in grade 10 were provided standards-based remediation during SAP periods. Tutoring and remediation was also provided during Homework Club. Student conferencing, peer editing and revising, and portfolio reflections with goal setting allowed students to review writing product and discuss strengths and weaknesses. Benchmark and unit reflections provided students the opportunity to identify and remediate standards below proficiency. Students were also provided meaningful feedback on all reading and writing product. Literacy center-based learning activities were also incorporated into instructional practices to address specific reading and writing tasks aligned to standards and congruous with the PARCC Assessment. There were teacher led centers that focused on standards-based remediation in addition to an independent center such as Newsela that was product and data-driven.	Upon receiving PARCC data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions. However, students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake.
Grade 11	246/292	TBD	All students in grade 11 were provided standards-based remediation during SAP periods. Tutoring and remediation was also provided during Homework Club. Student conferencing, peer editing and revising, and portfolio reflections with goal setting allowed students to review writing product and discuss strengths and weaknesses. Benchmark and unit reflections provided students the opportunity to identify and remediate standards below proficiency.	Upon receiving PARCC data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions. Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

			Students were also provided meaningful feedback on all reading and writing product. Literacy center-based learning activities were also incorporated into instructional practices to address specific reading and writing tasks aligned to standards and congruous with the PARCC Assessment. There were teacher led centers that focused on standards-based remediation in addition to an independent center such as Newsela that was product and data-driven.	
Grade 12	222/325	TBD	All students in grade 12 were provided standards-based remediation during SAP periods. Student conferencing, peer editing and revising, and portfolio reflections with Goal Setting allowed students to review writing product and discuss strengths and weaknesses. Writing workshops were implemented in classrooms identified as requiring additional support. Tutoring and remediation was also provided during lunch periods and Homework Club. benchmark and unit reflections provided students the opportunity to identify and remediate standards below proficiency. Students were also provided meaningful feedback on all reading and writing product. Literacy center-based learning activities were also incorporated into instructional practices to address specific reading and writing tasks aligned to standards and congruous with the PARCC Assessment. There were teacher led centers that focused on standards-based remediation in	Upon receiving PARCC Appeals data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions.

			addition to an independent center such as Newsela that was product and data-driven.	

Mathematics	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** or ***did not*** result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 9	205/369	TBD	Within each math class, instruction was tiered to address each student's individual strengths and weaknesses. In addition, Algebra I Lab classes were offered to further address student weaknesses in mathematics. These classes provided students with data driven small group instruction and remediation lessons that addressed the prerequisite skills necessary for students to be successful in their core mathematics classes.	Upon receiving PARCC data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions.
Grade 10	205/381	TBD	Within each math class, instruction was tiered to address each student's individual strengths and weaknesses. In addition, Algebra I Lab classes were offered to further address student weaknesses in mathematics. These classes provided students with data driven small group instruction and remediation lessons that addressed the prerequisite skills necessary for students to be successful in their core mathematics classes.	Upon receiving PARCC data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions.
Grade 11	211/292	TBD	Within each math class, instruction was tiered to address each student's individual strengths and weaknesses. In addition, Algebra II Lab classes were offered to further address student weaknesses in mathematics. These classes provided students with data driven small group instruction and remediation lessons that addressed the prerequisite skills	Upon receiving PARCC data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions.

			necessary for students to be successful in their core mathematics classes.	
Grade 12	211/325	TBD	Within each math class, instruction was tiered to address each student's individual strengths and weaknesses. Algebra II Lab classes were offered to further address student weaknesses in mathematics. These classes provided students with data driven small group instruction and remediation lessons that addressed the prerequisite skills necessary for students to be successful in their core mathematics classes. In addition, Senior Math was offered to seniors that failed to meet the mathematics graduation requirement set forth by the State of New Jersey. This helped prepare students for alternative assessments as well as the appeals process. Students received feedback on all tasks. Student products were revised until a proficient score was earned as measured by a task specific rubric.	Upon receiving PARCC assessment and portfolio appeals data, scores will be analyzed to measure the effectiveness of all interventions.

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 9	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 10	NA	NA	NA	NA

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 9	NA	NA	NA	NA
Grade 10	NA	NA	NA	NA

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	Read 180 Intervention; Department goal setting and action plans for standards-based remediation; and instruction and Student Advisory Program (SAP).	Yes	Benchmark Results and SRI Scores.	Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year: <u>Grade 9:</u> From September to March, of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49

					points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> From September to March, of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the Read 180 Program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).
Math	Students with Disabilities	Department goal setting and action plans for standards-based remediation; and instruction and Student Advisory Program (SAP).	Yes	Benchmark Results	Students enrolled in Algebra I increased an average of 6% on the Linkit Algebra I CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra I CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Geometry increased an average of 12.9% on the Linkit Geometry CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Geometry CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Algebra II increased an average of 21% on the Linkit Algebra II CC

					Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra II CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.
ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs	Modifications to the ESL/ ELA classes for consistency in daily instruction. Small group instruction.	Yes	Benchmark Scores	Average of ELL student scores increased from Benchmark A assigned in September to Benchmark A Retake assigned in March with Grade 11 ELL students averaging the highest increase of 4.6%.
Math	ELLs	Senior Math Tutoring	Yes	Student product	Each student that attended the senior math tutoring program produced a minimum of one proficient work sample in each of the four areas required for a Portfolio Appeal.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read 180 Intervention; department goal setting and action plans for standards-based remediation; and instruction and Student Advisory Program (SAP).	Yes	Benchmark Results and SRI Scores.	Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March.

					Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year: <u>Grade 9:</u> From September to March, of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> From September to March, of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the Read 180 Program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).

Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Algebra I Lab Algebra II Lab	Yes	Benchmark Results	The students enrolled in Algebra I Lab classes increased an average of 14 percentage points from Benchmark A which was administered in September to Benchmark C administered in April. The students enrolled in Algebra II Lab classes increased an average of 16.7 percentage points from Benchmark A which was administered in September to Benchmark C administered in April.
ELA	Grade 12 students that failed to meet the graduation requirement for English.	Mandatory SAP attendance and/ or tutoring during lunch. Writer's Workshop in designated classes requiring additional support.	Yes	Student Product	Each student that attended the senior English tutoring program and/ or participated in the Writer's Workshop produced a portfolio of proficient work samples required for a Portfolio Appeal.
Math	Grade 12 students that failed to meet the graduation requirement for mathematics	Senior Math	Yes	Student Product	All students enrolled in Senior Math produced seven proficient work samples for the NJDOE Portfolio Appeal. 40% of the students enrolled in Senior Math demonstrated proficiency in mathematics by meeting the graduation assessment requirements set forth by the State of New Jersey.

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	SAP	Yes	Benchmark Results	Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March. Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG assigned in September to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake assigned in March.
Math	Students with Disabilities	SAP	Yes	Benchmark Results	Students enrolled in Algebra I increased an average of 6% on the Linkit Algebra I CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra I CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Geometry increased an average of 12.9% on the Linkit Geometry CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Geometry CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Algebra II increased an average of 21% on the Linkit Algebra II CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra II CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.

ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs	Mandatory SAP attendance for senior appeals and writing workshop in identified classes requiring additional support.	Yes	Student Product	Each student that attended the senior English tutoring program and/ or participated in Writer's Workshop produced proficient work samples required for a Portfolio Appeal.
Math	ELLs	Senior Math Tutoring	Yes	Student product	Each student that attended the senior math tutoring program produced a minimum of one proficient work sample in each of the four areas required for a Portfolio Appeal.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Mandatory SAP attendance for senior appeals.	Yes	Student product	Each student that attended the senior English tutoring program produced a minimum of one proficient work sample in each of the four areas required for a Portfolio Appeal.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	SAP	Yes	Benchmark Results	Students enrolled in Algebra I increased an average of 6% on the Linkit Algebra I CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra I CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Geometry increased an average of 12.9% on the Linkit Geometry CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Geometry CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Algebra II increased an average of 21% on the Linkit Algebra II CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra II CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.

<table>
<tr>
<td>ELA and Math</td>
<td>Grades 9-12 Athletes</td>
<td>Student Advisory Period (SAP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SAP Genesis Sign in</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Athletic Season</th><th>Percent of Athletes on Academic Probation during the 2015-2016 school year</th><th>Percent of Athletes on Academic Probation during the 2016-2017 school year</th><th>Improvement</th></tr>
<tr><td>Fall</td><td>89%</td><td>56%</td><td>33%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Winter</td><td>68%</td><td>74%</td><td>-6%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Spring</td><td>67%</td><td>67%</td><td>0%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

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	Thrice weekly PLCs and Data Chat with Analysis. Bimonthly Department meetings.	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agendas. Read 180 and Benchmark Data.	The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year: <u>Grade 9:</u> From September to March, of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> From September to March, of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).

					From September to March, students enrolled in English 9 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake. From September to March, students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake. From September to March, students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Thrice weekly PLCs and Data Analysis and Chat Bimonthly Department meetings.	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agendas Benchmark Data and Analysis.	Students enrolled in Algebra I increased an average of 6% on the Linkit Algebra I CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra I CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Geometry increased an average of 12.9% on the Linkit Geometry CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Geometry CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Algebra II increased an average of 21% on the Linkit Algebra II CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG which was administered in September to the Linkit Algebra II CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.

ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs	Thrice weekly PLCs and Data Analysis and Chat. Bimonthly Department meetings.	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agendas. Read 180 and Benchmark Data.	The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year: <u>Grade 9:</u> Of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> Of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form

					A TEI AG to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake. Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake. Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake.
Math	ELLs	Thrice weekly PLCs and Data Analysis and Chat. Bimonthly Department meetings.	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agenda Benchmark Data and Analysis.	Students enrolled in Algebra I increased an average of 6% on the Linkit Algebra I CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG administered in September to the Linkit Algebra I CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Geometry increased an average of 12.9% on the Linkit Geometry CC Form A TEI AG administered in September to the Linkit Geometry CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Algebra II increased an average of 21% on the Linkit Algebra II CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG administered in September to the Linkit Algebra II CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read 180 Implementation and Analysis	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agenda Read 180 and Benchmark	The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year:

				Data.	<u>Grade 9:</u> From September to March, of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> From September to March, of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Thrice weekly PLCs and Data Analysis and Chat Bimonthly Department meetings.	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agendas Benchmark Data and Analysis.	Students enrolled in Algebra I increased an average of 6% on the Linkit Algebra I CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG administered in September to the Linkit Algebra I CC Form C TEI AG administered in April. Students enrolled in Geometry increased an average of 12.9% on the Linkit Geometry CC Form A TEI AG administered in September to the Linkit Geometry CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.

					Students enrolled in Algebra II increased an average of 21% on the Linkit Algebra II CC Form A CC Form A TEI AG administered in September to the Linkit Algebra II CC Form C TEI AG administered in April.
ELA	Students who score below proficiency in reading standards on SRI, Benchmark, and PARCC Assessments.	Read 180 Implementation and Analysis. Thrice weekly PLCs and Data Chat. Bimonthly Department meetings.	Yes	Meeting Minutes and Agendas Read 180 and Benchmark Data.	The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year: <u>Grade 9:</u> Of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> Of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). Students enrolled in English 09 increased an

					average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake. Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake. Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

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	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA and Math	ELLs	Family Programs - Different topics each month	Yes	Sign in sheets	The family literacy series held every Wednesday in March had ten moms who attended the sessions. The family programs held the second Wednesday of the month, the attendance varied by month. The lowest was 7 attendees and the highest was 18.
ELA and Math	ELLs	Adult ESL classes for parents of our students	Yes	Registration information	48 parents enrolled. 28 completed the program and attended the graduation ceremony.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA and Math	Grades 9-12	Back to School Night	Yes	Sign in sheets Parent feedback	Approximately 743 teacher meetings were held on Back to School Night.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Parent Conferences

Spring Parent Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 609 conferences were held during Winter Parent Teacher Conferences.

Approximately 446 conferences were held during Spring Parent Teacher Conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA and Math</td>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td>Genesis Parent Portal

District and High School Webpages

Teacher Pages</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Genesis enrollment statistics</td>
<td>1424 parents are signed up for access to the parent portal. This is an increase of approximately 9% from the 2015-16 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td>Family and Community Events</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sign in sheets</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><th>Title of Event</th><th>Number of Parents/Community in Attendance</th></tr>
<tr><td>Alternatives to College Fair</td><td>60</td></tr>
<tr><td>Junior Prom Parent Night</td><td>35</td></tr>
<tr><td>Financial Aid Night</td><td>90</td></tr>
<tr><td>Class of 2019 Parent Meeting</td><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Winter Chorus Concert</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>Winter Piano Recital</td><td>20</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Children’s Concert	150
Spring Chorus Concert	20
Cinderella’s Closet Boutique	30
Paint and Pasta Night	5
Parent Pre-Prom Assembly	150+
Breakfast of Champions	10
National Day of Prayer	5 + community

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.

Vincent Muscillo

_____	_____	_____
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	● Scholastic Reading Inventory ● Benchmark Test Scores ● 2016 PARCC Results	The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year: <u>Grade 9:</u> From September to March, of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI.) <u>Grades 10 - 11:</u> From september to March, of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). The following are the data for the students proficiency attainment levels for both reading and writing as tracked using LinkIt during the 2016-2017 school

year:

Grade 9

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	72%	54%	48%
40-60%	25%	34%	33%
60-80%	3%	11%	18%
Over 80%	0%	1%	1%

3% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 12%. The March administration of the Benchmark demonstrated a proficiency of 19%.

Grade 10

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	87%	69%	64%
40-60%	12%	24%	29%
60-80%	1%	7%	7%
Over 80%	0%	0%	0%

1% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 7%. The March administration of the Benchmark demonstrated a consistent proficiency of 7%.

Grade 11

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	83%	53%	39%
40-60%	15%	33%	39%
60-80%	2%	13%	20%
Over 80%	0%	1%	2%

2% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 14%. The March administration of the Benchmark demonstrated a proficiency of 22%.

Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 9 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 8 Assessment
Level 1	53
Level 2	76
Level 3	92
Level 4	98
Level 5	5

221 out of 324 students performed below level on the Grade 8 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 10 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 9 Assessment
Level 1	84 (20.8%)
Level 2	98 (24.3%)
Level 3	101 (25%)
Level 4	107 (26.5%)
Level 5	14 (3.5%)

283 out of 404 students performed below level on the Grade 9 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2015-16 Grade 11 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 10 Assessment
Level 1	32.8% (106)
Level 2	22.6% (73)
Level 3	21.1% (68)
Level 4	19.5% (63)
Level 5	4% (13)

247 out of 323 students performed below level on the Grade 10 PARCC Assessment.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 12 students.

<table>
<tr><td>Proficiency Level</td><td>PARCC ELA 11 Assessment</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 1</td><td>22.9% (77)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 2</td><td>20.2% (68)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>22.9% (77)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>29.8% (100)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>4.2% (14)</td></tr>
</table>
222 out of 336 students performed below level on the Grade 11 PARCC Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement - Writing</td>
<td>● Benchmark Test Scores
● 2016 PARCC Results</td>
<td>The following is the data for the students proficiency attainment levels for both reading and writing as tracked using LinkIt during the 2016-2017 school year:

Grade 9

<table>
<tr><td>Proficiency Level</td><td>September Benchmark A</td><td>December Benchmark B</td><td>March Benchmark A Retake</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Below 40%	72%	54%	48%
40-60%	25%	34%	33%
60-80%	3%	11%	18%
Over 80%	0%	1%	1%

3% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 12%. The March administration of the Benchmark demonstrated a proficiency of 19%.

Grade 10

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	87%	69%	64%
40-60%	12%	24%	29%
60-80%	1%	7%	7%
Over 80%	0%	0%	0%

1% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 7%.The March administration of the Benchmark demonstrated a consistent proficiency of 7%.

Grade 11

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	83%	53%	39%
40-60%	15%	33%	39%
60-80%	2%	13%	20%
Over 80%	0%	1%	2%

2% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 14%. The March administration of the Benchmark demonstrated a proficiency of 22%.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 Grade 9 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 8 Assessment
Level 1	53
Level 2	76
Level 3	92
Level 4	98

		<table><tr><td>Level 5</td><td>5</td></tr></table> 221 out of 324 students performed below level on the Grade 8 PARCC exam. The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 10 students. <table><tr><td>Proficiency Level</td><td>PARCC ELA 9 Assessment</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>84 (20.8%)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>98 (24.3%)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>101 (25%)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 4</td><td>107 (26.5%)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 5</td><td>14 (3.5%)</td></tr></table> 283 out of 404 students performed below level on the Grade 9 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2015-16 Grade 11 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 10 Assessment
Level 1	32.8% (106)
Level 2	22.6% (73)
Level 3	21.1% (68)
Level 4	19.5% (63)
Level 5	4% (13)

247 out of 323 students performed below level on the Grade 10 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 12 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 11 Assessment
Level 1	22.9% (77)
Level 2	20.2% (68)

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>22.9% (77)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>29.8% (100)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>4.2% (14)</td></tr>
</table>
222 out of 336 students performed below level on the Grade 11 PARCC Assessment.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement – Mathematics</td>
<td>2016 PARCC results
Benchmark assessment results</td>
<td>
The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 9 students.
<table>
<tr><td>Proficiency Level</td><td>PARCC Grade 8 Assessment</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 1</td><td>20.4% (59)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 2</td><td>31.5% (91)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 3</td><td>29.1% (84)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 4</td><td>19% (55)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 5</td><td>0% (0)</td></tr>
</table>
234 out of 289 students performed below level on the PARCC Grade 8 assessment.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	1.8% (1)
Level 2	9.3% (5)
Level 3	9.3% (5)
Level 4	79.6% (43)
Level 5	0% (0)

6 out of 54 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 10 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	18.5% (51)
Level 2	35.6% (98)
Level 3	28.4% (78)
Level 4	17.5% (48)
Level 5	0% (0)

227 out of 275 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Geometry Assessment
Level 1	5.3% (4)
Level 2	11.8% (9)
Level 3	50% (38)
Level 4	32.9% (25)
Level 5	0% (0)

51 out of 76 students scored below level on the Geometry PARCC exam

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 11 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	53% (10)
Level 2	42% (8)
Level 3	5% (1)
Level 4	0% (0)
Level 5	0% (0)

19 out of 19 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Geometry Assessment
Level 1	12% (23)
Level 2	58% (111)
Level 3	27% (52)
Level 4	3% (6)
Level 5	0% (0)

186 out of 192 students scored below level on the Geometry PARCC exam

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra II Assessment
Level 1	20% (12)
Level 2	31.7% (19)
Level 3	35% (21)
Level 4	13.3% (8)
Level 5	0% (0)

60 out of 60 students scored below level on the Algebra II PARCC exam

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 12 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	23% (3)
Level 2	54% (7)
Level 3	23% (3)
Level 4	0% (0)
Level 5	0% (0)

13 out of 13 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Geometry Assessment
Level 1	34.5% (10)
Level 2	51.7% (15)
Level 3	13.8% (4)
Level 4	0% (0)
Level 5	0% (0)

29 out of 29 students scored below level on the Geometry PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra II Assessment
Level 1	51% (100)
Level 2	31% (61)
Level 3	14% (28)
Level 4	4% (7)
Level 5	0% (0)

189 out of 196 students scored below expectations on the Algebra II PARCC exam.

The following are the data for the student's proficiency attainment levels as measured by mathematics benchmark assessments. Benchmark assessments were administered in each math class using Linkit during the 2016-2017 school year.

Algebra I

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark C
Below 40%	91% (310)	76% (257)	60% (216)
40-60%	9% (30)	22% (73)	35% (128)
60-80%	0% (0)	2% (7)	5% (18)
Over 80%	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

0% of students scored proficient during the Benchmark A administration. During the Benchmark C administration student proficiency increased to 5%.

Geometry

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark C
Below 40%	81% (265)	67% (221)	43% (144)
40-60%	19% (62)	32% (105)	34% (113)
60-80%	1% (2)	1% (4)	22% (74)
Over 80%	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (4)

1% of students scored proficient during the Benchmark A administration. During the Benchmark C administration student proficiency increased to 23%.

Algebra II

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark C
Below 40%	97% (285)	71% (200)	41% (115)
40-60%	3% (8)	27% (76)	47% (132)
60-80%	0% (0)	1% (4)	11% (31)
Over 80%	0% (0)	0% (1)	1% (2)

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>0% of students scored proficient during the Benchmark A administration. During the Benchmark C administration student proficiency increased to 12%.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Family and Community Engagement</td><td>School and Community Events

Course Activities</td><td>Participation of activities are used to measure success and growth in this category. The following list represents the activities held throughout the year to aid in generating family and community engagement:

<table>
<tr><th>Title of Event</th><th>Number of Parents/Community in Attendance</th></tr>
<tr><td>Alternatives to College Fair</td><td>60</td></tr>
<tr><td>Junior Prom Parent Night</td><td>35</td></tr>
<tr><td>Financial Aid Night</td><td>90</td></tr>
<tr><td>Class of 2019 Parent Meeting</td><td>6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Winter Chorus Concert</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>Winter Piano Recital</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>Children’s Concert</td><td>150</td></tr>
<tr><td>Spring Chorus Concert</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cinderella’s Closet Boutique</td><td>30</td></tr>
<tr><td>Paint and Pasta Night</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Parent Pre-Prom Assembly</td><td>TBD 100+</td></tr>
<tr><td>Breakfast of Champions</td><td>10</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

		<table><tr><td>National Day of Prayer</td><td>5 + community</td></tr></table> While participation has increased, parental and community involvement still requires improvement.
Professional Development	● District Run Professional Development ● Turn Key Professional Development ● Tuition Reimbursement	During the 2016-2017 school year professional development opportunities were offered to each department. The professional development was offered by both administrators and staff and was aimed at creating more rigorous instruction and enhancing educational effectiveness in the classroom, and the inclusion of new pedagogical practices. Examples of the professional development offered are: ● Professional learning community meetings ● Professional development half days ● Paid PD during the school year and over summer recess ● Teacher lead professional development ● Data chats and analysis The average teacher had available exposure to numerous professional development throughout the school year. The ability for the district to allot so much time and variety to professional development opportunities allowed teachers to further tailor their instruction to meet the diverse needs of their students.
Leadership	PLN Meetings	100% percent of the high school administration attended the semi monthly workshops.
School Climate and Culture	● Physical environment ● Teaching and learning ● Morale in the school community ● Relationships ● Parental support and	The New Jersey School Climate Survey was administered to students, parents, and staff members this year in an effort to assist in reinforcing positive conditions and addressing vulnerabilities for learning at the high school. The school used Google Forms to administer the survey. 100% of staff and students were asked to participate. The student survey was administered through our physical education classes over the course of a

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engagement
● Safety
● Emotional environment
● Administrative support</td>
<td>two week period. Staff Members took the survey during a scheduled professional development session. The survey was placed online and offered to parents in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Parents were informed via email and the auto dialer.

Based on a 100 point scale where 100 represents completely satisfied, the community survey results are as follows:

<table>
<tr><th>Domain</th><th>Staff Results</th></tr>
<tr><td>Physical environment</td><td>59.9%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Teaching and learning</td><td>51.1%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Morale in the school community</td><td>60.4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Relationships</td><td>66.3%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Parental support and engagement</td><td>52.9%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Safety</td><td>77.4%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Administrative support</td><td>60.6%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Emotional environment</td><td>56.2%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Domain</th><th>Student Results</th><th>Parent/Community Results</th></tr>
<tr><td>Physical environment</td><td>56.1%</td><td>78.2%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Teaching and learning</td><td>59.3%</td><td>64.1%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Morale in the school community</td><td>57.6%</td><td>71.5%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Relationships</td><td>50.2%</td><td>64.3%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Parental support and engagement</td><td>69.4%</td><td>63.2%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Safety</td><td>67.8%</td><td>72.6%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Emotional environment</td><td>47.59%</td><td>72.4%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>School-Based Youth Services</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>Homeless Students</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
</table>

Migrant Students	NA	NA
English Language Learners	NA	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA

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?

Throughout the 2016-2017 school year, the Title I Stakeholder Committee met regularly to discuss progress toward the 2017 goals outlined in the school's Title I School Wide Plan. During meetings data were analyzed and discussed in an effort to assess areas that required continued focus. Benchmark, chapter, and standardized assessment data in Mathematics and English Language Arts were reviewed to determine specific areas of academic strengths and weaknesses.

In addition, the school conducted a research based assessment, known as the Climate Survey, for data collection. The high school conducted an extensive needs assessment using teacher surveys, student surveys and parent surveys. Data gathered from these surveys were analyzed by the Title I Stakeholder Committee.

Attendance sheets were analyzed from various activities that were held throughout the 2016-17 school year. These consistently showed low parental attendance/involvement.

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

The high school compiles data in a variety of ways. Results from state assessments and benchmark assessments are analyzed by district administrators, building administrators, and teachers. Data are disaggregated by school, academy, teacher, and student. Data is then further broken down by subgroup. Data is analyzed by administrators and teachers in order to create action plans with regard to professional development, instructional remediation, and curriculum revisions in an effort to address marked areas of strength and

weakness.

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)?

Data from standardized assessments administered by the State of New Jersey are valid and reliable. Standard protocol for reviewing data are established and utilized when analyzing school data. Additionally, Long Branch High School used the New Jersey School Climate Survey. The survey was administered to students, parents, and staff members this year in an effort to assist in reinforcing positive conditions and addressing vulnerabilities for learning at the high school. Linkit benchmark assessment data corroborates the validity of the needs assessment process.

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

The data analysis revealed that with increased rigor comes increased student achievement. Long Branch utilizes state standards as a means to drive instruction and accurately assess student skill levels. This year, the school has continued to implement the use of student data collection software to tailor instruction time so that it aligns with the standards and the needs of the students.

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

Student achievement along with consistent attendance at professional development opportunities suggests that the on-going professional development offered to the English and Mathematics Departments were successful. As in previous years, the school held professional learning community meetings on a regular basis. The goals of these meeting were to collaborate and drive instructional initiatives.

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

Through historical data, previous grades, and initial benchmark data in September, at risk students are identified. From there, student progress is tracked on a regular basis using LinkIt. Pedagogical decisions are then made based on the needs of each student. Administrators, supervisors, and teachers monitor student progress on unit assessments as well as benchmark assessments and administrators met with teachers regularly to create plans for at risk students.

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

The Student Advisory Period (SAP) program runs after school daily and provides students with an opportunity to receive instructional support. Additionally, teachers are available daily for extra help both before and after school. Homework Club is available daily for before and after school for students to receive extra help. Highly qualified teachers from every discipline are available during Homework Club to provide targeted assistance. The high school employs an athletic facilitator to monitor and assist athletes with their academic performance. Athletes were mandated to attend SAP daily. Students identified as reading below grade level based on historical data are enrolled in a Read 180 course that provides interventional and instructional support for reading. Students identified as being at-risk in mathematics, are enrolled in math lab classes.

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

NA

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

NA

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?

Periodically throughout the school year, teachers met with their administrator to discuss and set instructional goals. These goals were monitored throughout the year. Teachers participated in the decision making process regarding academic assessments utilizing classroom data and perception surveys. Furthermore, professional learning communities fostered educational growth in pedagogical practices for teachers.

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

Long Branch High School offers programs to help students transition from middle school to high school. The Peer Group Connection (PGC), is a program which consists of a carefully selected group of high school students that visit the middle school monthly and work with grade eight students. This outreach program is designed to aid in the transition from middle to high school through mentoring. At the end of the year, eighth grade students have the opportunity to visit ninth grade classes to prepare them for the expectations of high school. In addition, a ninth grade orientation event is held over the summer to welcome new students and their families.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2016-2017 school wide plan?

Priority problems and root causes for this plan were determined by reviewing data collected through state and classroom assessments, student and teacher surveys and attendance records. Representatives from each department were included in data analysis and the identification of priority problems. Once all data was collected, the Title I Stakeholder Committee analyzed the results and discussed the varying factors that impacted each of the items from the needs assessment. As a next step, we determined which of the items discussed from the needs assessment impacted the school and the students the most in regard to student achievement.

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.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>#1</th><th>#2</th></tr>
<tr><td>Name of priority problem</td><td>English Language Arts</td><td>Mathematics</td></tr>
<tr><td>Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources</td><td>The following are the data for the students that were enrolled in the Read 180 program during the 2016-2017 school year:

<u>Grade 9:</u>
From September to March, of the 39 grade nine students enrolled in the program, 10% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 26% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew over 100 points or over as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI.)

<u>Grades 10 - 11:</u>
From September to March, of the 16 grade ten and eleven students enrolled in the program, 12% of the students grew between 0 and 49 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 19% of the students grew between 50 and 99 points as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). 38% of the students grew 100 points or over as measured by the</td><td>The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 9 students.

<table><tr><td>Proficiency Level</td><td>PARCC Grade 8 Assessment</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>20.4% (59)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>31.5% (91)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>29.1% (84)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 4</td><td>19% (55)</td></tr><tr><td>Level 5</td><td>0% (0)</td></tr></table>234 out of 289 students performed below level on the PARCC Grade 8 assessment.</td></tr>
</table>

Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).

The following are the data for the students proficiency attainment levels for both reading and writing as tracked using LinkIt during the 2015-2016 school year:

Grade 9

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	72%	54%	48%
40-60%	25%	34%	33%
60-80%	3%	11%	18%
Over 80%	0%	1%	1%

3% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 12%. March administration demonstrated a proficiency increase to 19%.

Grade 10

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	87%	69%	64%

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	1.8% (1)
Level 2	9.3% (5)
Level 3	9.3% (5)
Level 4	79.6% (43)
Level 5	0% (0)

6 out of 54 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 10 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	18.5% (51)
Level 2	35.6% (98)
Level 3	28.4% (78)
Level 4	17.5% (48)
Level 5	0% (0)

227 out of 275 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC exam.

40-60%	12%	24%	29%
60-80%	1%	7%	7%
Over 80%	0%	0%	0%

1% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 7%. The March administration demonstrated a consistent proficiency of 7%.

Grade 11

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	March Benchmark A Retake
Below 40%	83%	53%	39%
40-60%	15%	33%	39%
60-80%	2%	13%	20%
Over 80%	0%	1%	2%

2% of students scored proficient during the September Benchmark administration. During the January Benchmark administration student proficiency increased to 14%. The March administration demonstrated an increase of proficiency to 22%.

Students enrolled in English 09 increased an average of 7% on the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English I CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Geometry Assessment
Level 1	5.3% (4)
Level 2	11.8% (9)
Level 3	50% (38)
Level 4	32.9% (25)
Level 5	0% (0)

51 out of 76 students scored below level on the Geometry PARCC exam

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 11 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	53% (10)
Level 2	42% (8)
Level 3	5% (1)
Level 4	0% (0)

Students enrolled in English 10 increased an average of 3.8% on the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English II CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

Students enrolled in English 11 increased an average of 8.9% on the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG to the Linkit English III CC Form A TEI AG Retake.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 9 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 8 Assessment
Level 1	53
Level 2	76
Level 3	92
Level 4	98
Level 5	5

221 out of 324 students performed below level on the Grade 8 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2016-17 Grade 10 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 9 Assessment
Level 5	0% (0)

19 out of 19 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Geometry Assessment
Level 1	12% (23)
Level 2	58% (111)
Level 3	27% (52)
Level 4	3% (6)
Level 5	0% (0)

186 out of 192 students scored below level on the Geometry PARCC exam

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra II Assessment
Level 1	20% (12)
Level 2	31.7% (19)
Level 3	35% (21)
Level 4	13.3% (8)
Level 5	0% (0)

Level 1	84 (20.8%)
Level 2	98 (24.3%)
Level 3	101 (25%)
Level 4	107 (26.5%)
Level 5	14 (3.5%)

283 out of 404 students performed below level on the Grade 9 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment results for the 2015-16 Grade 11 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 10 Assessment
Level 1	32.8% (106)
Level 2	22.6% (73)
Level 3	21.1% (68)
Level 4	19.5% (63)
Level 5	4% (13)

247 out of 323 students performed below level on the Grade 10 PARCC Assessment.

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment

60 out of 60 students scored below level on the Algebra II PARCC exam

The following are the 2015-2016 PARCC exam results for the 2016-17 grade 12 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra I Assessment
Level 1	23% (3)
Level 2	54% (7)
Level 3	23% (3)
Level 4	0% (0)
Level 5	0% (0)

13 out of 13 students scored below level on the Algebra I PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Geometry Assessment
Level 1	34.5% (10)
Level 2	51.7% (15)
Level 3	13.8% (4)
Level 4	0% (0)

results for the 2016-17 Grade 12 students.

Proficiency Level	PARCC ELA 11 Assessment
Level 1	22.9% (77)
Level 2	20.2% (68)
Level 3	22.9% (77)
Level 4	29.8% (100)
Level 5	4.2% (14)

222 out of 336 students performed below level on the Grade 11 PARCC Assessment.

Level 5	0% (0)

29 out of 29 students scored below level on the Geometry PARCC exam.

Proficiency Level	PARCC Algebra II Assessment
Level 1	51% (100)
Level 2	31% (61)
Level 3	14% (28)
Level 4	4% (7)
Level 5	0% (0)

189 out of 196 students scored below expectations on the Algebra II PARCC exam.

The following are the data for the student's proficiency attainment levels as measured by mathematics benchmark assessments. Benchmark assessments were administered in each math class using Linkit during the 2016-2017 school year.

Algebra I

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	April Benchmark C
Below 40%	91% (310)	76% (257)	60% (216)
40-60%	9% (30)	22% (73)	35% (128)
60-80%	0% (0)	2% (7)	5% (18)
Over 80%	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

0% of students scored proficient during the Benchmark A administration. During the Benchmark C administration student proficiency increased to 5%.

Geometry

Proficiency Level	September Benchmark A	December Benchmark B	April Benchmark C
Below 40%	81% (265)	67% (221)	43% (144)
40-60%	19% (62)	32% (105)	34% (113)
60-80%	1% (2)	1% (4)	22% (74)
Over 80%	0% (1)	0% (0)	1% (4)

1% of students scored proficient during the Benchmark A administration. During the Benchmark C administration student proficiency increased to 23%.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Algebra II<table><tr><td>Proficiency Level</td><td>September Benchmark A</td><td>December Benchmark B</td><td>April Benchmark C</td></tr><tr><td>Below 40%</td><td>97% (285)</td><td>71% (200)</td><td>41% (115)</td></tr><tr><td>40-60%</td><td>3% (8)</td><td>27% (76)</td><td>47% (132)</td></tr><tr><td>60-80%</td><td>0% (0)</td><td>1% (4)</td><td>11% (31)</td></tr><tr><td>Over 80%</td><td>0% (0)</td><td>0% (1)</td><td>1% (2)</td></tr></table>0% of students scored proficient during the Benchmark A administration. During the Benchmark C administration student proficiency increased to 12%.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Describe the root causes of the problem</td><td>Students enter high school reading more than two years below grade level. This results in an increasing academic gap as the students continue through high school. This negatively impacts the students not only in ELA, but in all academic content areas.</td><td>Students enter high school without command of foundational mathematical skills. These prerequisite skills are necessary to be successful in high school level mathematics courses.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Subgroups or populations addressed</td><td>Students reading below grade level
Special Education
English Language Learners</td><td>Students scoring below expectations on 2016 PARCC exams.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)</td><td>ELA</td><td>Mathematics</td></tr>
<tr><td>Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems</td><td>Read 180 Next Generation and Newsela</td><td>NA</td></tr>
</table>

How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The Scholastic Read 180 program is aligned to the state mandated standards.	NA

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/Community Involvement	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Parent and community involvement has increased but still does not meet expectations. Efforts to encourage attendance at school events will remain a focus. 743 attendees for Back to School Night. 609 conferences were held during Winter Parent Teacher Conferences. 446 conferences were held during Spring Parent Teacher Conferences.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Maintaining consistent parental contact proves difficult due to failed communication initiatives and language barriers.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	Total Population	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	NA	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address	NJ School Climate Survey District-based Auto-Dialer	

priority problems	http://www.sedl.org/connections/resources/evidence.pdf Genesis: Parent Portal and Family Connection	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	N.J.A.C. 6A:9-3.4 1.14- Vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members.	

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

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Read 180	ELA Supervisor and Teachers	SRI Scores	In an October 2015 report commissioned by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), *READ 180* was the only reading intervention program out of 10 investigated to demonstrate evidence of positive effects on reading achievement.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Homework Club and SAP	Teachers Students	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs, personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA

ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read 180	Meghan Cook	SRI Scores	In an October 2015 report commissioned by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), *READ 180* was the only reading intervention program out of 10 investigated to demonstrate evidence of positive effects on reading achievement.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Homework Club and SAP	Teachers Students	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs, personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Math	Senior Math	All students grades 9-12	Teachers Students	Benchmark results	The Education Alliance. (2006). Closing the Achievement Gap: Best Practices in Teaching Mathematics. Charleston, WV: The Education Alliance.

Math	Algebra I Lab Algebra II Lab	All students grades 9-12	Teachers Students	Benchmark results	The Education Alliance. (2006). Closing the Achievement Gap: Best Practices in Teaching Mathematics. Charleston, WV: The Education Alliance.

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	Students with Disabilities	Student Advisory Period (SAP)	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs, personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Student Advisory Period (SAP)	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs, personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in

					Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs	Student Advisory Period (SAP)	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs, personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Math	ELLs	Student Advisory Period (SAP)	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs,

				period grades.	personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Student Advisory Period (SAP)	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs, personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Student Advisory Period (SAP)	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking	McClure, L., Yonezawa, S., & Jones, M. (2010). Can school structures improve teacher student relationships? The relationship between advisory programs,

				period grades.	personalization and students' academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 18(17), 1–21. Drake, J.K. (2008). Recognition and Reward for Academic Advising in Theory and in Practice V. N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, and T.J. Grites (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Handbook (2nd ed.), pp. 396-412. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
ELA and Math	All students grades 9-12	Homework Club	Students Teachers	Marking period failures. The number of failures reported on interim reports will decrease by 20% as reported by marking period grades.	McLoughlin, Laura. "A Study of the Effects of Participation in an After-school Homework Club." DBS School of Arts, Dublin, 01 Mar. 2012. Harper, Sara N., and Maureen Anglin. "Narrowing the Gap in Academic Achievement Homework Clubs for Students in Low Income Neighbourhoods." Canadian Teacher Magazine, Jan. 2010.

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	Common Planning Time (PLCs) and Data Chats. Standards-based Remediation and Action Plans.	Special Education and English Teachers	Benchmark Data	Christopher M. Cook Ph.D. & Shawn A. Faulkner Ph.D. (2010) The Use of Common Planning Time: A Case Study of Two Kentucky Schools to Watch, RMLE Online, 34:2, 1-12. National High School Center , National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on Instruction. (2010). Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using Preliminary "Lessons Learned" to Guide Ongoing Discussion. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Common Planning Time (PLCs) and Data Chats. Standards-based Remediation and Action Plans.	Special Education and Math Teachers	Benchmark Data	Christopher M. Cook Ph.D. & Shawn A. Faulkner Ph.D. (2010) The Use of Common Planning Time: A Case Study of Two Kentucky Schools to Watch, RMLE Online, 34:2, 1-12. National High School Center , National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on Instruction. (2010). Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using

					Preliminary “Lessons Learned” to Guide Ongoing Discussion. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs	Common Planning Time (PLCs) and Data Chats. Standards-based Remediation and Action Plans.	English and ELL Teachers	Benchmark Data	Christopher M. Cook Ph.D. & Shawn A. Faulkner Ph.D. (2010) The Use of Common Planning Time: A Case Study of Two Kentucky Schools to Watch, RMLE Online, 34:2, 1-12. National High School Center , National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on Instruction. (2010). Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using Preliminary “Lessons Learned” to Guide Ongoing Discussion. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
Math	ELLs	Common Planning Time (PLCs) and Data Chats. Standards-based	Math and ELL Teachers	Benchmark Data	Christopher M. Cook Ph.D. & Shawn A. Faulkner Ph.D. (2010) The Use of Common Planning Time: A Case Study of Two Kentucky Schools to

		Remediation and Action Plans.			Watch, RMLE Online, 34:2, 1-12. National High School Center , National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on Instruction. (2010). Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using Preliminary "Lessons Learned" to Guide Ongoing Discussion. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Common Planning Time (PLCs) and Data Chats. Standards-based Remediation and Action Plans.	English, Special Education and ELL Teachers	Benchmark Data	Christopher M. Cook Ph.D. & Shawn A. Faulkner Ph.D. (2010) The Use of Common Planning Time: A Case Study of Two Kentucky Schools to Watch, RMLE Online, 34:2, 1-12. National High School Center , National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on Instruction. (2010). Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using Preliminary "Lessons Learned" to Guide Ongoing Discussion. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Common Planning Time (PLCs) and Data Chats. Standards-based Remediation and Action Plans.	Math, Special Education and ELL Teachers	Benchmark Data	Christopher M. Cook Ph.D. & Shawn A. Faulkner Ph.D. (2010) The Use of Common Planning Time: A Case Study of Two Kentucky Schools to Watch, RMLE Online, 34:2, 1-12. National High School Center , National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on

					Instruction. (2010). Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using Preliminary "Lessons Learned" to Guide Ongoing Discussion. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

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 Stakeholder Committee members will be responsible for evaluating the program. The committee is comprised of administrators, staff, parents, and community members. The review will be conducted internally on a monthly basis.

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

Timely data reporting from state mandated test are essential for accurate assessment. As most state tests are new, data reporting takes extended amounts of time and thus cannot be completed during the school year.

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

Mandated and optional professional development for staff ensures participation in school directives. In addition, allowing all stakeholders to have an active say in the creation of goals and assessing the needs of the school contributes to buy-in with regard to program implementation. It will also be posted on the district website.

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

A School Climate Survey will be administered to staff members in an effort to assist in reinforcing positive conditions and addressing vulnerabilities for learning at the high school. The school will use Google Forms to administer the survey. Staff members will complete the survey during a scheduled professional development session. The survey will be placed online and offered to parents in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Parents will be informed via email and the auto dialer system.

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

A School Climate Survey will be administered to all students and parents in an effort to assist in reinforcing positive conditions and addressing vulnerabilities for learning at the high school. The school will use Google Forms to administer the survey. The student survey will be administered during physical education classes. The survey will be placed online and offered to parents in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. Parents will be informed via email and the auto dialer system.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

Students that meet district criteria will be scheduled for Read 180, Algebra I Lab, Algebra II Lab and Senior Math classes which will be held during the school day. Additional support will be made available to students during the Student Advocacy Period (S.A.P) which will be held after school daily and Homework Club which will be held before and after school on a daily basis.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

Students will receive instructional interventions on a daily basis as outlined by school directives and professional development. Read 180, Algebra I Lab, Algebra II Lab and Senior Math classes will be full year classes that will meet during the school day. The Student Advocacy Period (S.A.P) will be held after school daily and Homework Club will be held before and after school on a daily basis.

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

The school will actively strive to use cutting edge technological resources to improve student achievement. Over the course of the year, the school utilize various software such as Linkit, Kahoot, Socrative, Nearpod, Google Docs, Google Classroom, Prezi, and SMART technologies. Each pair of teachers will be provided with a class set of Chromebooks to be shared amongst them for instructional purposes. In addition, all teachers will have SMART slates and SMART Responders made available to them. In addition, Khan Academy, Read 180, and Newsela will be utilized to support underperforming students in both English Language Arts and Mathematics.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

The school will utilize the data reporting software to collect and analyze the results of student product collected at key points during the year. Furthermore, these results will be discussed during Title I meetings and assessed accordingly.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

The Title I Stakeholder Committee will evaluate all applicable data and disseminate the findings through presentations that will be scheduled throughout the 2017-18 school year. In addition, data will be analyzed and discussed by teachers regularly at PLC and Data Chat meetings.

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	Full Implementation of communication in native language	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	The number of parent conferences held during the 2017-18 school year will reflect an increase of 5% when compared to the number of conferences held during the 2016-17 school year.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Full Implementation of communication in native language	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	The number of parent conferences held during the 2017-18 school year will reflect an increase of 5% when compared to the number of conferences held during the 2016-17	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., &

				school year.	Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
ELA	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Homeless	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
Math	Migrant	NA	NA	NA	NA
ELA	ELLs	Full Implementation of communication in native language	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	The number of parent conferences held during the 2017-18 school year will reflect an increase of 5% when compared to the number of conferences held during the 2016-17 school year.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
Math	ELLs	Full Implementation of communication in native language	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	The number of parent conferences held during the 2017-18 school year will reflect an increase of 5% when compared to the number of conferences held during the 2016-17 school year.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Full Implementation of communication in native language	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	The number of parent conferences held during the 2017-18 school year will reflect an increase of 5% when compared to the number of conferences held during the 2016-17 school year.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Full Implementation of communication in native language	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	The number of parent conferences held during the 2017-18 school year will reflect an increase of 5% when compared to the number of conferences held during the 2016-17 school year.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
All students	Grades 9-12	Implementation of Parent Survey	Administrators Data Manager Guidance Teachers	10% increase in parent participation of the parent perception survey.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural*

					Partnerships: Involve All Families. New York: Taylor and Francis.
All students	Grades 9-12	Guidance Parent Workshops	Guidance	Attendance sign-in sheets at parent events and conferences will increase by 2% from previous school records.	Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools* (Second Edition). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Hutchins, D. J., Greenfeld, M. G., & Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., & Galindo, C. (2012). *Multicultural Partnerships: Involve All Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

***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?

The priority problem is the lack of parent and community involvement. Administrators, guidance counselors, and teachers will continue to work to increase parental involvement, in an effort to increase overall student achievement. The school will continue to inform parents, students and the community of upcoming events through multiple channels in various languages.

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

   Parent representatives are members of the school Title I Stakeholder committee and parent input is solicited through perception surveys, focus groups, and evaluation forms.

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

   The school will send its written parent involvement policy home with the students. This will also be available on the Parent Portal and posted on the district website.

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

   Parent representatives are members of the school Title I Stakeholder committee and parent input is solicited through perception surveys, focus groups, and evaluation forms. Also, the Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) was created in which parents will meet throughout the year to discuss ways to improve parent involvement within the school.

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

The school-parent compact is sent home with students. The parents are requested to sign the document and return it to the school. Homeroom teachers and guidance counselors follow up to ensure that a compact is returned for every student.

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

School achievement is reported to the public via the school report card and presented at a public board agenda meeting.

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?

Assessment results are shared via the school report card and presented at a public board agenda meeting.

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

Assessment results are shared via the school report card and presented at a public board agenda meeting.

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

Parent representatives are members of the school Title I Stakeholder committee and parent input is solicited through perception surveys, focus groups, and evaluation forms.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

Individual student score reports are discussed through parent conferences. Also, individual scores are mailed home.

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

The school will use its 2017-2018 parent involvement funds for various parental involvement activities including meetings, workshops, conferences, celebrations and adult literacy programs. These programs will be implemented throughout the year and light refreshments will be provided.

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	108 99%	See below
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	1 Less than 1%	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	11 100%	See below
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 Administrator attend college and university fairs to recruit highly qualified teachers. Job openings are also posted in 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 teachers 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 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 of the 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.	Assistant Superintendent for Pupil and Personnel in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff, and Principals.