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.

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: LONG BRANCH	School: Joseph M. Ferraina Childhood Learning Center
Chief School Administrator: MICHAEL SALVATORE	Address: 80 Avenel Blvd. Long Branch, Nj 07740
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: K
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Mrs. Loretta Johnson
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: ljohnson@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-571-2868	Principal's Phone Number: 732-571-4150

Principal's Certification

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

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

_____   _____   _____

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____8_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.

- State/local funds to support the school were $ 586,518 , which comprised 94.92 % of the school's budget in 2016-2017.

- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 820,770, which will comprise 96.46 % 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
ELA Intervention Tutoring Program Tutors and Supplies	1, 2, 3	Extended learning time and extended day	100-100 100-600	$6,451.84
Professional Development	1, 2,	Content specific Staff Training	200-300	$5,000
Parent Involvement Activities	3	Intervention to increase parent involvement	200-800	$1,000

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan. Parents/Families and Community Members <u>cannot be affiliated with the school</u>.
Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.
Add lines as necessary.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Loretta Johnson	School Administrator	yes	yes	yes	
Kimberly Walker	PIRT Specialist/I & RS	yes	yes	yes	
Betsy Callaghan	Community Groups	yes	yes	yes	
Francine Van Brunt	Math/Reading K Teacher	yes	yes	yes	
Elizabeth Reid	Math/Reading K Teacher	yes	yes	yes	
Meghan Ronan	Preschool Teacher	yes	yes	yes	
MaryAnn Carr	Preschool Teacher	yes	yes	yes	
Bridgette Burtt	Coordinator of Grants and Innovative Programs	yes	yes	yes	
Tracey Widdis	Parent	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
October 26, 2016	JMFECLC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Collection and Analysis	yes		yes	
November 23, 2016	JMFECLC	Schoolwide Plan Development	yes		yes	
December 21, 2016	JMFECLC	Schoolwide Plan Development Data Collection and Analysis Schoolwide data review	yes		yes	
January 25, 2017	JMFECLC	Schoolwide Data Review Data Collection and Analysis Define Priority Problems Data Analysis	yes		yes	

				yes		yes	
February 22, 2017	JMFECLC	Schoolwide Data Review Define Priority Problems Data Collection and Analysis		yes		yes	
March 22, 2017	JMFECLC	Family and Community Engagement Priority Problems and Intervention to address Review Survey Data		yes		yes	
April 19, 2017	JMFECLC	Data Review Review Data for students enrolled in Tutoring Program Finalize Priority Problems		yes		yes	
May 24, 2017	JMFECLC	Finalization and review of Title 1 NCLB Plan		yes		yes	

Add rows as necessary.

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 plan was implemented as planned. All of the new programs were implemented with monitoring and accountability. The before school ELA Intervention tutoring program needed additional teachers. Transportation for theses students is needed.**

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process? **A before school ELA Intervention tutoring program was implemented in November 2016 and data collection indicates the program was a success for these at risk students. The strengths of the implementation process was the communication and collaboration among the leadership team in the building to ensure that the plans were carried out and there was accountability.**

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter? **The challenges we faced were the lack of additional computer stations in the Kindergarten classrooms that can be used for intervention and support programs. The other challenge was that only one teacher applied for the before school ELA Intervention tutoring program stipend and many students could not attend due to lack of transportation. Due to both of these challenges, fewer students were able to benefit.**

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation? **The Tools of the Mind Writing Program was implemented for the second year in the Kindergarten classes and teachers had a stronger understanding of the program. Educators and support staff had a better understanding of the evaluation process and had strategies in place to**

move the red flag students to the next step on the continuum. With the structure and support, we have seen an increase in scores from baseline to mid year data.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs? **The initiatives are district wide and being implemented throughout the school district. These initiatives are supported by Central Office Administration, therefore all stakeholders were on board and in complete agreement. Professional development was provided in all targeted areas to address priority problems.**

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions? **Staff perception surveys are sent out by administration and support staff throughout the year to determine needs and clarifications of all school programs. Overall the school climate survey produced positive results in regard to the social emotional component of the program.**

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions? **The Community Needs Assessment Survey was used to determine the perceptions of the families and community members. A Parent Perception Survey was distributed to all Kindergarten families. Overall the parents of the community were pleased with the family involvement activities such as the Tools and Treasures activities that took place monthly. This program educated families about the core components of the curriculum. These activities support ELA, writing and mathematics both in school and at home. Parents stressed the need for more translators for Back to School Night, Parent Teacher conferences, I&RS meetings, phone calls home, and other events throughout the year. Parents indicated that they would be interested in learning**

more about the Kindergarten Curriculum and requested workshops and trainings to assist them with their children in the area of Reading and Writing at home.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)? **The methods of delivery varied with each program. For example, the ELA Intervention tutoring program was led in a small groups by one ELA Intervention Program Title 1 tutor. From April until the commencement of the ELA Intervention Title 1 Tutoring program in early June, there were two teachers leading the program. PLC meetings were a combination of Administration, teacher, and Support Staff lead component meetings and trainings that addressed our priority problems and reviewed and analyzed data. The Student Advisor provided Interventions in small groups during ELA and writing to students identified by the I&RS team falling below grade level expectation.**

9. How did the school structure the interventions? **Interventions were structured by reviewing data cycles quarterly by the School Leadership Team. When reviewing the data, the team identified at risk students based on multiple indicators. Once students were identified, collaboration then took place with classroom teachers of the identified students. Specific areas were targeted that needed to be addressed and academic plans were put into place with either push in, pull out, or before school ELA interventions. This was completed following the proper I&RS process led by the student facilitator.**

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions? **Instructional Interventions took place on a daily basis during Writing and ELA Instruction. These programs are structured in such a way to provide interventions and differentiated instruction during small groups and centers with the classroom teacher and Instructional Assistant. Some students received**

push in support while others were pulled out by I&RS teachers as well as ESL staff. The students enrolled in the Title 1 ELA Intervention Tutoring program received 30 minutes of instruction 4 days per week.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program? **Both ELA and Math Core Programs are supported with teacher technology components as well as student components. Both ELA and Math student technology components which included Raz Kids(for ELL learners), Treasures, and Everyday Math Online were available for student use at home. The Tools of the Mind Writing Program provides various videos and power points that assist students in building their background knowledge. instruction background building videos and power points for the students. Families can access this at home as well.**

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?   **Student Technology use was minimal due to the fact we do not have classrooms equipped with student computer workstations. Therefore the programs Razz Kids, Everyday Math Online, and Treasures offered can only be viewed as a whole group or for use at home.   Each Kindergarten class is equipped with 6 I-Pads for use during center time. ELA , Math, and digital storytelling programs were available for students at this time. In the ELL Kindergarten classroom, laptops are provided to all 12 students during small groups during ELA and Math.**

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Student Performance *State Assessments-Partially Proficient*

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

English Language Arts	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mathematics	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Student Performance
Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

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

English Language Arts	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	38 students out of 112 (34%) scored below proficient on ELA Assessment 49 students out of 112 (44%) scored below a 3 on DRA2	29 out of 106 (27%) scored below proficient on ELA Assessment 46 students out of 106 (43%) scored below a 3 on DRA2	Small Group Reading Instruction Differentiated Centers during small groups One-on-one Instruction Intervention Lab ELL Small Group and Individual Instruction Tier Two Interventions (Treasures) Raz Kids Online Program Treasures Online Support	ELA Intervention Program increased student achievement from baseline to mid year based on ELA/DRA2/Writing Data Results. Baseline ELA data indicates that 17% scored proficient or above. Mid year ELA data indicates that 71% scored proficient or above. This is a 54% increase. Lack of additional computer stations and unreliable and inconsistent Wi-Fi in building results in the ineffectiveness of many online intervention programs. Success of interventions and goals set in I&RS action plans for at risk students depend upon follow through and accountability of the teachers, parents and case manager. The students' scores increased on DRA2 and ELA/TOM Writing Assessment when the plan was monitored and followed effectively.

				ELA/Small group and individual instruction increased student achievement but ELL learners are not on grade level. Over 50% of the ELL students are below proficient on DRA2 and ELA/Writing Assessments. Professional Development for Tools of the Mind Writing Program contributed to the increase in scores from baseline to mid year on TOM Continuum and Writing Rubric. Tools and Treasures Curriculum workshops for parents would be more effective if the parents of these at risk students attended more frequently.
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mathematics	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	23/110 (21%) students scored below proficient on the mid year Math assessment in January	38/106 (36%) students scored below proficient on the mid year Math assessment in January	The Everyday Math Program provides small group center activities that reinforce math skills and strategies as well as developing specific interventions that target specific needs of at-risk students.	73% of the students scored below proficient at baseline and 36% scored below at mid-year on the Link it Math Diagnostic Assessment, therefore, the interventions put in place have been effective resulting in increased student achievement. (64% on or above level) The trend shows there will continue to be an increase by the end of the year.

	2016	2017		
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2016-2017**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELL	Small Group Reading Instruction (push in/pull out)	Yes	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Increase in DRA-2 Data	● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. ● January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (9/20) of

| | | | | | the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Mid Year Assessment.

This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year.

- September 2016 DRA2 Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/20) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher).
- January 2017 DRA2 Assessment indicates 60% (12 out of 20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher).

This indicates a 60% increase over half of the school year. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELA | ELL | Intervention Lab/I&RS Action Plan Interventions | yes | Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data

Increase in DRA-2 Data | - September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment.
- January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Mid Year Assessment.

This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. |

					- September 2016 DRA2 Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/20) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). - January 2017 DRA2 Assessment indicates 60% (12 out of 20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). This indicates a 60% increase over half of the school year.
Writing	ELL	Small group instruction/red flag TOM benchmark Interventions	yes	Increase in Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	- September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that 0% (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarteners scored 70% or higher - January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year.
Writing	ELL	Intervention Lab /I&RS Action Plan Interventions	yes	Increase in Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	- September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that 0% (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarteners scored 70% or higher - January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 45% increase by mid-year.

Math	ELL	Differentiated Math Centers	Yes	Increase in Math Assessment Data	● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (1/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 54.5% increase over half of the school year.
Math	ELL	Intervention Lab/I&RS Action Plan Interventions	Yes	Increase in Math Assessment Data	● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (1/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 54.5% increase over half of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Small Group Reading Instruction (push in/pull out)	Yes	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Increase in DRA-2 Data	● September 2016 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that .6% (5/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) ● January 2017 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or

					above grade level (80% or higher) This indicates a 42.4% increase over half of the year. ● September 2016 DRA-2 data indicates that .4% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) ● January 2017 DRA-2 data indicates that 48% (39/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) This indicates a 47.6% increase over the half of the year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Intervention Lab/I&RS Action Plan Interventions	Yes	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Increase in DRA-2 Data	● September 2016 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that .6% (5/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) ● January 2017 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) This indicates a 42.4% increase over half of the year. ● September 2016 DRA-2 data indicates that .4% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade

					level (3 or higher) ● January 2017 DRA-2 data indicates that 48% (39/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) This indicates a 47.6% increase over the half of the year.
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Small group instruction/red flag TOM benchmark Interventions	pending EOY data	Increase in Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that .5% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarteners scored on or above grade level (70% or higher) ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 27% (22/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 26.5% increase over half of the school year.
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Intervention Lab /I&RS Action Plan Interventions	pending EOY data	Increase in Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that .5% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarteners scored on or above grade level (70% or higher) ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 27% (22/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 26.5% increase over half of

					the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Differentiated Math Centers	yes	Increase in Math Assessment Data	● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (4/77) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 41% (33/81) of the Economically disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 40.5% increase over half of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Intervention Lab /I&RS Action Plan Interventions	yes	Increase in Math Assessment Data	● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (4/77) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 41% (33/81) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 40.5% increase over half of the school year

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

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELL	ELA Intervention Program Raz Kids Program Scholastic Leveled Readers	YES	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Increase in DRA-2 Data Bi-weekly Assessment Data from ELA Intervention Tutors	● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. ● January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Mid Year Assessment. This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. ● September 2016 DRA2 Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/20) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level

					(score of 3 or higher). ● January 2017 DRA2 Assessment indicates 60% (12 out of 20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). This indicates a 60% increase over half of the school year.
Writing	ELL	ELA Intervention Program	YES	Bi-weekly Assessment Data from ELA Intervention Tutor Increase in TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that 0% (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarteners scored 70% or higher ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 45% increase by mid-year.
Math	ELL	No extended day/year interventions were in place for math during the 2016- 2017 school year.	N/A	No extended day/year interventions were in place for math during the 2016- 2017 school year.	No extended day/year interventions were in place for math during the 2016- 2017 school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	ELA Intervention Program	YES	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Increase in DRA-2 Data Bi-weekly Assessment Data from ELA Intervention Tutor	● September 2016 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that .6% (5/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) ● January 2017 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or

					above grade level (80% or higher) This indicates a 42.4% increase over half of the year. ● September 2016 DRA-2 data indicates that .4% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) ● January 2017 DRA-2 data indicates that 48% (39/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) This indicates a 47.6% increase over the half of the year.
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Title 1 ELA Extended Day Program	pending EOY data	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Bi-weekly Assessment Data from ELA Intervention Tutors Increase in TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that .5% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarteners scored on or above grade level (70% or higher) ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 27% (22/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 26.5% increase over half of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	No extended day/year interventions were in place for math during the 2016- 2017 school	N/A	No extended day/year interventions were in place for math during the 2016-2017 school year.	No extended day/year interventions were in place for math during the 2016- 2017 school year.

					year.

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

Professional Development – **Implemented in 2016-2017**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELL	Weekly PLC's to discuss student data PD Sessions focusing	YES	Increase in ELA Treasures Assessment Data Increase in DRA-2 Data	• September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on

		on Guided Reading			the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. ● January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Mid Year Assessment. This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. ● September 2016 DRA2 Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/20) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● January 2017 DRA2 Assessment indicates 60% (12 out of 20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). This indicates a 60% increase over half of the school year.
Writing	ELL	Weekly PLC's to discuss student data ½ day PD sessions focused on Tools of the Mind Writing Program	YES	Increase in TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that 0% (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarteners scored 70% or higher. ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 45% increase by mid-year.

Math	ELL	Weekly PLC's to discuss student data	YES	Increase in Math Link It Assessment	- September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (1/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). - January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 54.5% increase over half of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Weekly PLC's to discuss student data	YES	Increase in Treasures ELA Assessment Data	- September 2016 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that .6% (5/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) - January 2017 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) This indicates a 42.4% increase over half of the year. - September 2016 DRA-2 data indicates that .4% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) - January 2017 DRA-2 data indicates that 48% (39/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the

					Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) This indicates a 47.6% increase over the half of the year.
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Weekly PLC'S to discuss student data	YES	Increase in TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment Data	• September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that .5% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarteners scored on or above grade level (70% or higher) • January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 27% (22/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 26.5% increase over half of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Weekly PLC's to discuss student data	Yes	Increase in Math Diagnostic Assessment	• September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (4/77) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). • January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 41% (33/81) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 40.5% increase over half of the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION -ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(III)
Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2016-2017

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Tools and Treasures ELA Family Events	YES	Parent Sign-in Sheets Parent Survey Data	On September 21, 2016 40% (8/20) of the ELL families attended a Treasures Family Literacy Event at JMFECLC. On February 14, 2017 45% (9/20) of the ELL families attended the Treasures Family Literacy Event at JMFECLC. ● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. ● January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on

					the Treasures Mid Year Assessment. This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. ● September 2016 DRA2 Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/20) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● January 2017 DRA2 Assessment indicates 60% (12 out of 20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). This indicates a 60% increase over half of the school year.
Writing	ELLs	Tools of the Mind Family Writing Events	YES	Parent Sign-in Sheets Parent Survey Data TOM Dynamic Writing Writing Assessment Data	On October 20, 2017 55% (11/20) of the ELL Families attended the Tools of the Mind Writing Event at JMFECLC. On January 19, 2017, 30% (6/20) of the ELL families attended the Tools of the Mind Writing Event at JMFECLC ● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that 0% (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarteners scored 70% or higher ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 45% increase by mid-year.

Math	ELLs	Everyday Math Family Events	Yes		On April 20, 2017 45% (9/20) of the ELL families attended the Everyday Math Family Event at JMFECLC. ● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (1/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 54.5% increase over half of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Tools and Treasures ELA Family Events	YES	Parent SIgn in sheets Parent Survey data	On October 20, 2017 27% (22/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged families attended the Tools and Treasures ELA event at JMFECLC. On February 14, 2017 37% (30/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged families attended the Treasures Family Literacy Event at JMFECLC. ● September 2016 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that .6% (5/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher) ● January 2017 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or

					above grade level (80% or higher)
					This indicates a 42.4% increase over half of the year.
					• September 2016 DRA-2 data indicates that .4% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher) • January 2017 DRA-2 data indicates that 48% (39/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher)
					This indicates a 47.6% increase over the half of the year.
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Tools of the Mind Family Writing Events	YES	Parent Sign-in sheets Parent Survey data TOM Writing Data	On October 20, 2017 34.5% (21/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged Families attended the Tools of the Mind Writing Event at JMFECLC.
					On January 19, 2017, 39% (29/81) of the ELL families attended the Tools of the Mind Writing Event at JMFECLC
					• September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that .5% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarteners scored on or above grade level (70% or higher) • January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 27% (22/81) of the Economically

					Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 26.5% increase over half of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Everyday Math Family Events	YES	Parent Sign in sheets Parent Survey Data Math Link it Assessment Data	On April 20, 2017 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged families attended the Everyday Math Family Event at JMFECLC. ● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (4/77) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 41% (33/81) of the Economically disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 40.5% increase over half of the school year.

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

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

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

_____   _____   _____

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

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	Treasures ELA Diagnostic Assessment DRA-2 Assessment Attendance Rates	• As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 50% (13/26) are below proficient according to the ELA Assessment mid-year data. • September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 16% (16/102) of Kindergartners scored proficient (70% or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. • January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 60% (64/106) of Kindergartners scored proficient (70% or higher) on the Treasures Mid- Year Assessment. • This indicates a 44% % increase over half of the school year. • September 2016 DRA-2 Assessment Data indicates 6% (7/102) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). • January 2017 DRA- 2 Assessment Data indicates 56.6% (60/106) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). • This indicates a 50.6 % increase over half of the school year.
Academic Achievement - Writing	TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment	• As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 46% (12/26) are below proficient according to the TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment mid-year data. • September 2016 Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that .6% (7/102) of the Kindergarten students were proficient in writing (70% or higher).

		• January 2017 Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 35% (37/106) of the Kindergarten students were proficient in writing (70% or higher).
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Everyday Math Diagnostic Assessment Data	• As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 34.6% (9/26) are below proficient according to the Math Diagnostic Assessment mid-year data. • September 2016 beginning of the year Math Assessment indicates 24% (24/102) of Kindergartners were on or above grade level proficiency (70% or higher). • January 2017 mid-year Math Assessment indicates 55 % (58/106) of Kindergartners were on or above grade level proficiency (70% or higher. • This indicates a 31% increase over half of the school year.
Family and Community Engagement	Parent Surveys SIgn in Sheets	According to the Community Needs Assessment (CNA) results from 2016-2017, Percentages of families indicated their need for trainings as follows:. Parent Support Groups 20.4%, GED Classes 5.4%, ESL Classes 18,3%, Childhood Nutrition 30.1%, Parenting Skills 43%, Speech Services 34.4%, Math 27%, Social and Emotional Skills 29%, Reading/Writing 33.3%, Percentages of families interested in Community Resources and Information are as follows: Library 20% , Family Therapy 15.1%, Speech/Language Services 19.4%, Local Pediatricians/Developmental Specialists 11.8% , Food Banks 14%, and Churches 10.8% This indicates that a wide variety of topics are of interest to the parents at JMFECLC. • The average attendance of Kindergarten parents for all school events was 29%. • 92% of Parents completed the Parent Survey.
Professional Development	Data Walks Professional Development Surveys	100% of staff were offered weekly Professional Learning Community Time during common planning periods. 100% of staff were offered Professional Development hours during all half

	Sign In Sheets PLC Meetings Faculty In-services PDP Trainings	day PD Trainings and at weekly faculty meetings.
Leadership	PLN Meetings Management Meetings	100% of Leadership and Administration team were given the opportunity to meet weekly to develop and monitor school wide data. They also attended specific trainings to target the needs of their building based upon aggregated data.
School Climate and Culture	Teacher Perception Survey School Climate Survey for staff, parents, and students	100% of staff, students, and parents were asked to participate in a School Climate/Perception Survey. 100% of staff and 97% of the students completed the survey. 92% of parents completed the Parent Perception Survey.
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	Genesis Database	Only 12 % of the Kindergarten students (13/106) have an IEP for Special Education and Related Services
Homeless Students	Genesis Database	N/A
Migrant Students	Genesis Database	N/A
English Language Learners	Treasures ELA Diagnostic Assessment DRA-2 Assessment Attendance Rates Math Diagnostic Assessment Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment	● As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 27% (7/26) are from our ELL population. ● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that 0% (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarteners scored 70% or higher ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 45% (9/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 45% increase by mid-year ● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. ● January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (9/20) of the

		ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Mid Year Assessment.
		This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year ● September 2016 DRA2 Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/20) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● January 2017 DRA2 Assessment indicates 60% (12 out of 20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). This indicates a 60% increase over half of the school year ● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (1/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). This represents a 54.5% increase over half of the school year.
Economically Disadvantaged	Lunch Status Application Treasures ELA Diagnostic Assessment DRA-2 Assessment Attendance Rates Math Diagnostic Assessment TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment	● As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 65% (17/26) are from our Economically Disadvantaged population. ● September 2016 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment indicated that .5% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarteners scored on or above grade level (70% or higher). ● January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 27% (22/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored 70% or higher. This indicates a 26.5% increase over half of the school year. ● September 2016 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that .6% (5/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher). ● January 2017 ELA Treasures Assessment data indicated that 43% (35/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of

		Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher).
		This indicates a 42.4% increase over half of the year.
		● September 2016 DRA-2 data indicates that .4% (4/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher).
		● January 2017 DRA-2 data indicates that 48% (39/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of the Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (3 or higher).
		This indicates a 47.6% increase over the half of the year.
		● September 2016 Math Assessment Data indicates that .5% (4/77) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher).
		● January 2017 Math Assessment Data indicates that 41% (33/81) of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergarten students scored on or above grade level (80% or higher).
		This represents a 40.5% increase over half of the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT -ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A)
2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment? **Our school conducted a Comprehensive Needs Assessment using the standardized assessments, local assessment data, and the teacher surveys which was then analyzed by the Title 1 Stakeholder Committee. Results from the surveys along with the standardized assessments and students' achievement on local assessments were analyzed and and discussed at faculty and PLC meetings. This report focuses on the goals in the areas of English Language Arts, Writing, and our English Language Learners. The report also addresses the needs of the specialized populations identified in the information gathered. The ELL students were identified as a large majority of the total number of students scoring below proficient in Reading and Writing.**

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups? **District Administrators, building administrators, student advisors, parents and teachers analyze results from state assessments, benchmark assessments, and curriculum based assessments. The data is analyzed and categorized by all subgroups. Once analyzed the data is used to create action plans with regards to professional development and curriculum revision in an effort to address areas of strengths and weaknesses.**

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)? **The Math Diagnostic Assessment, Treasures Diagnostic Assessment,Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment and DRA2 Assessments are valid and reliable, therefore reports generated from Link it are a result of a reliable collection method. JMFECLC uses the Link It Database system to document and monitor all assessments.**

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction? **In ELA, data was gathered from DRA2, Treasures Assessments, and Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessments showed a high percentage of students reading and writing below grade level and scoring below proficiency. Hispanic and Limited English Proficient Students subgroup are among the subgroups with the lowest**

numbers of students performing on grade level. Teachers may benefit from additional professional development assisting them with differentiating their instruction to reach needs of all students, with an increased focus on our Limited English Proficient and Hispanic Population.

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)? **The data shows there is evidence that implementation of learned strategies through PD opportunities is carried over into the classroom. Additional PD data training paired with self-reflection and inter-rater reliability is required as well as one-on-one feedback to help increase student proficiency. The use of a Professional Development survey would benefit all staff and allow them to attend specific trainings to target the needs of their students' learning styles.**

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner? **Student achievement data is reviewed quarterly by the school leadership team. At risk students are targeted and interventions are put into place by the I&RS Team. The team meets every 4-6 weeks to review, update, and modify individual action plans of the students and the goals in place. Interventions are modified as needed.**

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students? **Multiple opportunities are available for at risk students such as daily small group reading interventions, pull out and push in intervention services as well as the district academic half day summer camp program. All students are instructed using research based programs. Before school ELA Intervention tutoring was offered from November 2016 until May 2017. Parents are invited in monthly to view the programs and curriculum. This way they can better assist their children in the home. I & RS Action Plans are put in place for at-risk students.**

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

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

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program? **All classroom teachers are part of the professional learning communities that analyze data and**

make informed instructional decisions based on their analysis. Grade level representatives and elected members of the teaching staff as well as administrators serve on the Title 1 Stakeholder Committee as well as the professional development committee. At these monthly meetings, data is gathered, presented, and analyzed to determine school wide goals and implementation of new programs to reach these goals.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school? **This is the third year as an early childhood learning center which houses preschool and kindergarten. We have articulation meetings with the elementary schools upon students' exit at the end of the year. The school continues to evaluate standards based student growth along with the designed curricula in both ELA and Mathematics. Ongoing articulation between Kindergarten and First Grade teachers support seamless transitions between the two programs. Professional Learning Communities are in place for all preschool and Kindergarten teachers based on program components and how they are implemented. The Treasures Program seamlessly creates a bridge from the Kindergarten curriculum preparing students to transition to the upper grades with a consistent language, strategies and exposure to new literature in a new building. Preschool 4 classes buddy up with the Kindergarten classes in January and work in buddy activities bi-weekly to collaborate and form special relationships to help transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten. Kindergarten classes travel at the end of the school year to their sister school where they tour the building, meet the staff and students alike. This activity is put into place to ensure a seamless move for them. These Prekindergarten/Kindergarten students and staff that collaborate in these buddy/transitional activities throughout the year help to ensure a smooth transition between grade levels.**

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2017-2018 school wide plan? **Data from the variety of measures throughout the year was gathered, shared, and carefully analyzed by the school wide Title 1 Stakeholder Committee. From this process we identified the top three priority problems and explored possible root causes.**

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

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

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

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	English Language Arts	Writing (Across All Curricular Areas)
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	As of January 2017, 40 % (42/106) of Kindergarten students scored below proficient on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. As of January 2017 43% (46/106) of Kindergarten students scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June 2017. As of January 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored below proficient (70% or lower) on the Treasures Mid Year Assessment. As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 50% (13/26) are below proficient according to the ELA Assessment mid-year data. The data represents a need for improvement school	As of January 2017, 65 % (69/106) of the Kindergarten students scored below proficient(70% or lower) on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment. January 2017 TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment data indicates that 55% (11/20) of the ELL population of Kindergarten students scored below 70% . As of May 2017 24% of the Kindergarten students (26/106) have been absent for 15 days or more. Of those students, 46% (12/26) are below proficient according to the TOM Dynamic Writing Assessment mid-year data. The data represents a need for improvement school wide in writing.

	wide in English and Language Arts.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Teachers received ongoing professional development ,however, teachers are continuing to learn and refine components of the program and how to effectively use assessments and data to guide and drive instruction. Though teachers received professional development and support to incorporate weak curriculum areas, there is still lack of consistency from classroom to classroom. Differentiation is not evident and consistent in all classrooms. Targeted PD is needed to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic reading knowledge; stronger ability to differentiate instruction to students' needs.	Teachers are in the second year of implementation of the Tools of the Mind Writing Program. Teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how to effectively use assessments and TOM benchmark data to guide instruction. Teachers are continuing to work towards refining the implementation of the program. Teachers received professional development and are using PLC's for inter-rater reliability exposure using the TOM Assessment. There is more consistency and collaboration among the Kindergarten classes. They are using Jack and Annie Magic Treehouse Series as a writing prompt in all Kindergarten classes and as part of the program. Due to the fact it is the 2nd year of implementation and although it is much stronger than last year, we are still working towards refinement. All mid year data revealed a large majority of the students still fell below grade level.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	All
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English Language Arts	Writing
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Treasures Reading/Writing Program Tier 2 Interventions Raz Kids Online Intervention Program DRA-2 Supplemental Materials Scholastic Leveled Readers Small group guided reading	Treasures Tier 2 Support and Interventions Tools of The Mind Benchmark Data to identify Red Flags and Interventions ELA Intervention Program

	Intervention Lab Support ELA Intervention Program	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards? NJ Student Learning Standards	Treasures Reading/ Tools of the Mind Writing Program, Raz Kids Online are aligned with the Nj Student Learning Standards Reading Standards for Literature-K Reading Standards for Informational Text-K Reading Standards Foundational SKills-K Language Standards-K	Treasures Writing Program, and Tools of Mind Scaffold Writing Curriculum align with the NJ Student Learning Standards RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3,K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2

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

	#3	**#4**
Name of priority problem	Parent and Community Involvement	N/A
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	There is a low percentage of parental involvement for during and after school programs, including programs that pertain to parents supporting their child in the areas of ELA, Writing and Math. Events with student performances are highly attended venues. Events such as curriculum visitation days are moderately attended by parents. Events which include light refreshments with a school event may increase parental involvement and encourage family time. Offering transportation during inclement weather could increase attendance for families that oftentimes walk or have to pay a fee for a taxi. The use of the district's auto-dialer for reminders of events in three languages may yield a higher turnout rate for events. • 28% (30/106) of families attended Kindergarten Tools and Treasures Reading and Writing Events. • 11% (12/106) families attended the Community and Parent Involvement Resource Night. • 7% (8/106) families attended the Books and Blankets Summer Reading and Literacy	N/A

	Event.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Lack of transportation, language barrier, weather, working hours, times events are held	N/A
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	N/A
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English Language Arts, Writing and Math	N/A
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	What Works Clearinghouse- Shared Book Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=458 (April 2015) **"Parental engagement makes a difference"** *Educational Leadership, Volume 55*	N/A
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Through the New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders, staff will build relationships with parents, guardians, families and agencies to support student learning (standard 9).	N/A

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

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)
		ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;			
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELL	I & RS Action Plan Interventions (Tier 2) Small Group Intervention Lab Small Group Instruction with ESL Support Staff	Teacher, in-class support teacher, ELL teacher, Student Advisor, parents	65% of the ELL population will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA-2 Assessment data by January 2018 This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017 50% of the ELL population will be on or above grade level (81% or higher) according to	EVIDENCE REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INTERVENTIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, VERSION 2.2 (January, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_ell_protocol_v2.2pdf What Works Clearinghouse:

| | | | | | the Treasures Diagnostic Assessment by January, 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January, 2017. | "**Reciprocal Teaching**" *Intervention Report, November 2013*

 "Shared Book Reading" (Early Childhood Education) *Intervention Report, April 2015* http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Stud Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural_Schools.pdf

 Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School. (April, 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: **http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19**

 Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, July 2016, What Works Clearinghouse https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/21 |

Writing	ELLs	I & RS Action Plan Interventions (Tier 2) Small Group Intervention Lab Small Group Instruction with ESL Support Staff	Teacher, student advisor, in-class support teacher, ELL teacher, parents	50% of the ELL population will be on or above grade level on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment by January 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017.	What Works Clearinghouse: "**Reciprocal Teaching**" *Intervention Report, November 2013* **"Teaching Elementary School Students to be Effective Writers"** *Practice Guide, June 2012* EVIDENCE REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INTERVENTIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, VERSION 2.2 (January, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_ell_protocol_v2.2.pdf **Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School. (April, 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from:** **http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19**
Math	ELLs	I & RS Action Plan Interventions (Tier 2)	Teacher, student advisor, in-class	60% of the ELL population will be above grade level (higher than 80%) on the Math Diagnostic Assessment in	Teaching Math to Young Children (November, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGu

		Small Group Intervention Lab Small Group Instruction with ESL Support Staff	support teacher, ELL teacher, parents	January 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017.	ide.aspx?sid=18 Aguirre, J. M., & Zavala, M. del R. (2013). Making culturally responsive mathematics teaching explicit: A lesson analysis tool. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *8*(2), 163–190. **Kersaint, G., Thompson, D. R., Petkova, M. (2013).** ***Teaching mathematics to English language learners (2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.***
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	I & RS Action Plan Interventions (Tier 2) Small Group Intervention Lab Differentiated Instruction Intervention Lab Small group guided reading instruction	Teachers, Instructional Assistant, In-class support teacher, student advisor, parents	53% of the economically disadvantaged student population will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA-2 Assessment Data by January 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017. 48% of the economically disadvantaged student population will be on or above grade level (% or higher)	**"Shared Book Reading"** (Early Childhood Education) *Intervention Report, April 2015* What Works Clearinghouse: **"Reciprocal Teaching"** *Intervention Report, November 2013* http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Stud Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural _Schools.pdf **Addressing Summer Reading**

				according to the Treasures Diagnostic Assessment by January 2017 This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017	**Setback Among Economically Disadvantaged Elementary Students** Allington, Richard, L; Mc-Gill-Franzen, Anne; Camilli, Gregory,; Williams, Lunetta; Graff, Jennifer; Zeig, Jaqueline; Zmach, Coutney,;Nowak, Rhonda Reading Psychology, v31, n5 p411-427 (2010) http://eric.ed.gov/?id+EJ900788 **Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade**, July 2016, What Works Clearinghouse https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/21
Small group writing instruction					
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	I & RS Action Plan Interventions (Tier 2) Small group Intervention Lab scaffolded writing instruction	Classroom Teacher, Instructional Assistant, Student Advisor	32% of the Economically Disadvantaged population will be on or above grade level on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment by January of 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017	**"Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers"** *Practice Guide, June 2012* What Works Clearinghouse: **"Reciprocal Teaching"** *Intervention Report, November 2013* http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Stud Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural_Schools.pdf **Addressing Summer Reading**

					Setback Among Economically Disadvantaged Elementary Students Allington, Richard, L; Mc-Gill-Franzen, Anne; Camilli, Gregory,; Williams, Lunetta; Graff, Jennifer; Zeig, Jaqueline; Zmach, Coutney,;Nowak, Rhonda Reading Psychology, v31, n5 p411-427 (2010) http://eric.ed.gov/?id+EJ900788 **Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade**, July 2016, What Works Clearinghouse https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/21
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	I & RS Action Plan Interventions (Tier 2) Small group Intervention Lab differentiated math centers	Classroom Teacher, Instructional Assistant, Student Advisor	45% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will be performing above grade level (higher than 80%) on the Math Diagnostic Assessment in January, 2017. This will indicate a 4% increase from January, 2016.	Teaching Math to Young Children (November, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=18 Aguirre, J. M., & Zavala, M. del R. (2013). Making culturally responsive mathematics teaching explicit: A lesson analysis tool. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *8*(2), 163–190. **Kersaint, G., Thompson, D. R.,**

					Petkova, M. (2013). *Teaching mathematics to English language learners* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.

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 <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELL	Summer Enrichment Camp	Title 1ELA	65% of the ELL population	EVIDENCE REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INTERVENTIONS FOR ENGLISH

| | | Title 1 ELA Extended Day Program | Extended Day Tutor Enrichment Camp Staff | will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA-2 Assessment data by January 2018
This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017

50% of the ELL population will be on or above grade level (81% or higher) according to the Treasures Diagnostic Assessment by January, 2018.

This will represent a 5% increase from January, 2017 | LANGUAGE LEARNERS, VERSION 2.2 (January, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from:
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_ell_protocol_v2.2pdf

What Works Clearinghouse:
"**Reciprocal Teaching**"
Intervention Report, November 2013

"Shared Book Reading"
(Early Childhood Education)
Intervention Report, April 2015
http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Stud Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural_Schools.pdf

Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School. (April, 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from:
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19

Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade, July 2016,
What Works Clearinghouse |

					https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/21
Writing	ELL	Summer Enrichment Camp Title 1 ELA Extended Day Program	ELA Intervention Tutor Summer Enrichment Camp Staff	50% of the ELL population will be on or above grade level on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment by January 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017.	**"Teaching Elementary School Students to be Effective Writers"** *Practice Guide, June 2012*
Math	ELL	Summer Enrichment Camp	Summer Enrichment Camp Staff	58% of the ELL population will be above grade level (higher than 80%) on the Math Diagnostic Assessment in January 2018. This will represent a 3% increase from January 2017.	Teaching Math to Young Children (November, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=18 Aguirre, J. M., & Zavala, M. del R. (2013). Making culturally responsive mathematics teaching explicit: A lesson analysis tool. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *8*(2), 163–190. **Kersaint, G., Thompson, D. R., Petkova, M. (2013). *Teaching mathematics to English language learners* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.**
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Summer Enrichment Camp Title 1 ELA Extended Day Program	ELA Intervention Tutor Summer	53% of the economically disadvantaged student population will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA-2	**Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade**, July 2016, What Works Clearinghouse

| | | | Enrichment Camp Staff | Assessment Data by January 2018.

This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017.

48% of the economically disadvantaged student population will be on or above grade level (% or higher) according to the Treasures Diagnostic Assessment by January 2017

This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017 | https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/21

Addressing Summer Reading Setback Among Economically Disadvantaged Elementary Students
Allington, Richard, L; Mc-Gill-Franzen, Anne; Camilli, Gregory,; Williams, Lunetta; Graff, Jennifer; Zeig, Jaqueline; Zmach, Coutney,;Nowak, Rhonda
Reading Psychology, v31, n5 p411-427
(2010)
http://eric.ed.gov/?id+EJ900788

What Works Clearinghouse:
"Reciprocal Teaching" *Intervention Report, November 2013* |
| Writing | Economically Disadvantaged | Summer Enrichment Camp

Title 1 ELA Extended Day Program | Title 1 ELA Extended Day Tutor

Summer Enrichment Camp Staff | 32% of the Economically Disadvantaged population will be on or above grade level on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment by January of 2018.

This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017 | **Addressing Summer Reading Setback Among Economically Disadvantaged Elementary Students**
Allington, Richard, L; Mc-Gill-Franzen, Anne; Camilli, Gregory,; Williams, Lunetta; Graff, Jennifer; Zeig, Jaqueline; Zmach, Coutney,;Nowak, Rhonda
Reading Psychology, v31, n5 p411-427
(2010)
http://eric.ed.gov/?id+EJ900788 |

					What Works Clearinghouse: **"Reciprocal Teaching"** *Intervention Report, November 2013* **"Teaching Elementary School Students to be Effective Writers"** *Practice Guide, June 2012*
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Summer Enrichment Camp	Summer Enrichment Camp Staff	45% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will be performing above grade level (higher than 80%) on the Math Diagnostic Assessment in January, 2017. This will indicate a 4% increase from January, 2016.	Teaching Math to Young Children (November, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=18 Aguirre, J. M., & Zavala, M. del R. (2013). Making culturally responsive mathematics teaching explicit: A lesson analysis tool. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 8*(2), 163–190.

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

2017-2018 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and _ongoing professional development_ for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Strategy**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Strategy** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELL	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) PD In-Services	Master Teachers, Principals, Supervisors, Teachers, Support Staff	65% of the ELL population will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA-2 Assessment data by January 2018 This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017 50% of the ELL population will be on or above grade level (81% or higher) according to the Treasures Diagnostic Assessment by January, 2018.	Magnuson, P.; Mota, R. (2011). "**Promoting professional learning from within**" _International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2_ _Miguel Angel Serrano, "Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling"_ (January 1, 2012). _ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso._ Paper AA13525792. http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AA13525792

				This will represent a 5% increase from January, 2017 Teacher McRel Evaluations SGO Results	What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects students achievement (*Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No.033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
Writing	ELL	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) PD In-services	Master Teachers, Principals, Teachers, Support Staff, Supervisors	50% of the ELL population will be on or above grade level on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment by January 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017. Teacher McRel Evaluations SGO Results	Magnuson, P.; Mota, R. (2011). "**Promoting professional learning from within**" *International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2* *Miguel Angel Serrano, "*Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling" (January 1, 2012). *ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso.* Paper AA13525792. http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AA13525792 What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, SWY., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects students achievement (*Issues & Answers Report, REL

					2007-No.033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
Math	ELLs	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) PD In-services	Master Teachers, Principals, Teachers, Support Staff, Supervisors	58% of the ELL population will be above grade level (higher than 80%) on the Math Diagnostic Assessment in January 2018. This will represent a 3% increase from January 2017. McRel Teacher Evaluations Sign in Sheets Feedback Forms SGO Results	Teaching Math to Young Children (November, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=18 Aguirre, J. M., & Zavala, M. del R. (2013). Making culturally responsive mathematics teaching explicit: A lesson analysis tool. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *8*(2), 163–190. **Kersaint, G., Thompson, D. R., Petkova, M. (2013). *Teaching mathematics to English language learners* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.**
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) PD In-services	Master Teachers, Principals, Supervisors, Teachers, Support Staff, Instructional assistants	53% of the economically disadvantaged student population will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA-2 Assessment Data by January 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017.	Magnuson, P.; Mota, R. (2011). "**Promoting professional learning from within**" *International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2* *Miguel Angel Serrano, "*Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling" (January 1, 2012). *ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso.* Paper

					AA13525792.
				48% of the economically disadvantaged student population will be on or above grade level (% or higher) according to the Treasures Diagnostic Assessment by January 2017 This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017 Teacher McRel Evaluations SGO Results	http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AA13525792 What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects students achievement (*Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No.033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) PD In-Services	Master Teachers, Principals, Supervisors Support staff, Instructional Assistants, teachers	32% of the Economically Disadvantaged population will be on or above grade level on the Tools of the Mind Dynamic Writing Assessment by January of 2018. This will represent a 5% increase from January 2017 Teacher McRel Evaluations SGO Results	Magnuson, P.; Mota, R. (2011). "**Promoting professional learning from within**" *International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2* *Miguel Angel Serrano, "*Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling" (January 1, 2012). *ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso.* Paper AA13525792. http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AA13525792 What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007).

					*Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects students achievement (*Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No.033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.*
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) PD In-Services	Master Teachers, Principals, Supervisors Support staff, Instructional Assistants, teachers	45% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will be performing above grade level (higher than 80%) on the Math Diagnostic Assessment in January, 2017. This will indicate a 4% increase from January, 2016.	Magnuson, P.; Mota, R. (2011). "**Promoting professional learning from within**" *International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2* What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects students achievement (*Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No.033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.*

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 1 Committee will meet with all stakeholders on a monthly basis to review and evaluate the schoolwide program. Administrators, teachers, and support staff will be responsible for conducting both an internal and external schoolwide program evaluation for 2017-2018.**

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process? **Challenges the school anticipates will be getting the students to participate in the before school ELA Intervention tutoring program because there is no transportation provided as well as being able to use student based technology effectively during instruction. Lack of interventions and strategies put in place for specific content areas that are below proficient could pose a challenge in implementing this process.**

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)? **The school will obtain necessary buy in from all stakeholders by keeping all lines of communication open between the school Title 1 Committee team members and the staff during the monthly meetings. The school will communicate with the families about all available resources for students and families through flyers, school web site, and the auto dialer being translated in all 3 languages.**

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff? **A school climate/perception survey will be distributed to all of the staff. Data will be reviewed and analyzed by all stakeholders on a monthly basis.**

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community? **The Community Needs Assessment Survey will be distributed to all families and data will be used to develop family and community engagement activities throughout the year. A Parent Perception Survey will be distributed as well.**

6. How will the school structure interventions? **Administrators and support staff will develop timelines and schedules in order to**

effectively implement, model, and monitor strategies and interventions put in place. **All files and documentation will be kept electronically in Google Documents.**

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions? **Students will receive instructional interventions on a daily basis and many interventions will be embedded in the daily components such as small group reading instruction. The before school ELA Intervention tutoring program will document the effectiveness of these interventions every two weeks.**

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program? **Reliable wi-fi throughout the building and additional computer stations will be needed to support the schoolwide program and implement technology based interventions. RTI and I&RS plans will be used consistently in order to increase student achievement. Leveled readers and additional curriculum materials will be distributed.**

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided? **Data will be available through the district's Linkit database. The ELA Treasures Diagnostic Assessment, DRA2, TOM Dynamic Writing Program, and the Math Diagnostic Assessment as well as benchmark data will be analyzed quarterly.   Report card data will be used to determine if students are meeting NJ Student Learning Standards. Support staff will monitor effectiveness of RTI/I&RS action plans.**

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? **The information will be disseminated through the Link It and Genesis Database Systems. The Title 1 Committee will analyze the data at the monthly Title 1 Committee meetings with all the stakeholders in attendance and at Faculty meetings. Data will be analyzed by teachers, administrators, and support staff at weekly PLC 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA Writing	ELLs	Tools and Treasures Family visitation days Book Club, Read Aloud or Program component Demonstrations with take home activities Adult ESL classes for bilingual families Literacy Incentive Series with collaboration with the LB Library and Long Branch Concordance	ELL Supervisors, Teachers, Student Advisor, Building Administrator, Parents	Based on data from 2016-2017 there will be at least a 10% increase in parental attendance in ESL classes and the monthly Tools and Treasures visitation days during the 2017-2018 school year Attendance and effectiveness will be measured by sign in sheets, surveys, and feedback forms. Parents	**"English Language LEarners Evidence, Review, Protocol"** *Reference Resource, January 2013* **"Teaching Academic Content to ELL in Elementary and Middle School"** *IES Practice Guide, APril 2014* **"Parental engagement makes a difference"** *Educational Leadership, Volume 55*

				of ELL learners and at-risk students will be targeted.	
		Curriculum Nights I & RS Action Planning			
Math	ELL	Tools and Treasures/ Everyday Math Family visitation days Program component activity demonstrations with take home activities Math and Makerspace Night I & RS Action Planning	ELL Supervisors, Teachers, Student Advisor, Building Administrator, Parents	Based on data from 2016-2017 there will be at least a 10% increase in parental attendance at the monthly Tools and Treasures /Everyday Math Family visitation days during the 2017-2018 school year Attendance and effectiveness will be measured by sign in sheets, surveys, and feedback forms. Parents of ELL learners and at-risk students will be targeted.	"**English Language Learners Evidence, Review, Protocol**" *Reference Resource, January 2013* **"Teaching Academic Content to ELL in Elementary and Middle School"** *IES Practice Guide, April 2014* **"Parental engagement makes a difference"** *Educational Leadership, Volume 55* http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/ new-jersey/families Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.e du/parents/understanding-em/a ssisting/
ELA writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Tools and Treasures Monthly Family Visitation Days Book Club, Read Aloud or Program component Demonstrations with take home activities Literacy Incentive Series with collaboration with the	Teachers, Student Advisor, Building Administrator, Parents, Supervisors, Community Members	Based on data from 2016-2017 there will be at least a 10% increase in attendance at family involvement activities during the 2017-2018 school year Attendance and	IES Practice Guide: **"Structuring Out-of-School Time To Improve Academic Achievement"** http://ies.edgov/ncee/wwc/pdf/pra ctic **"Parental engagement makes a difference"** *Educational Leadership, Volume 55*

		LB Library and Long Branch Concordance		effectiveness will be measured by sign in sheets, surveys, and feedback forms.	
		Family Literacy Night			
		Community Resource Night			
		I & RS Action Planning			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Tools and Treasures/ Every Day Math Family visitation days Program component activity demonstrations with take home activities Math and Makerspace Night I & RS Action Planning	Teachers, Student Advisor, Building Administrator, Parents, Supervisors	Based on data from 2016-2017 there will be at least a 10% increase in attendance at family involvement activities during the 2017-2018 school year Attendance and effectiveness will be measured by sign in sheets, surveys, and feedback forms.	**"Parental engagement makes a difference"** *Educational Leadership, Volume 55* http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/ new-jersey/families Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.e du/parents/understanding-em/a ssisting/

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

2017-2018 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the

   comprehensive needs assessment?**To increase parental involvement in the school and to strengthen the home-school connection,**

   parent involvement activities in ELA and writing will be implemented. To see and encourage parental involvement further, we

will continue to maintain web pages, Class DOJO, Twitter, The Long Branch District Facebook page, and by sending invitations via the Parent Portal to advertise Parental Involvement events. We shall continue to be vigilant and remain in daily contact with all families to encourage positive participation in their child's education. Incentives and rewards will be provided to families in attendance, and classrooms with the highest percentage of attendees will be recognized by monthly pizza or ice cream parties.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy? **Parents will serve on the School wide Title One Committee. In addition, parents will be given surveys or questionnaires that will provide valuable input in regards to the district parent involvement policy.**

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? **The school will distribute its written parental involvement policy through the school-parent compact that is sent home with students. It will be posted on the school district's website so that it is accessible to all families and community stakeholders. We will also send home paper copies of the Parent Involvement Policy (translated into student's native language).**

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact? **The school will engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact using input from school-climate surveys and Title 1 Committee Meetings.   The school will advertise events on social media and send invitations to events via the Genesis Parent Portal.**

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

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community? **Student achievement data is presented at a public board agenda meeting and through notifications sent home. Teachers will discuss individual data with families at parent teacher conferences, I&RS Meetings, and at home visits throughout the school year. Parents have access to the Parent Portal on the Genesis database.**

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

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

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan? **The school involves families and community members in the development of the Title 1 Schoolwide Plan by having parent representatives attend Title 1 Committee monthly meetings and through yearly parent surveys. Increased family involvement and community engagement at Early Childhood Advisory Council Meetings will assist the school and all stakeholders in the development of the Title 1 Schoolwide Plan.**

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children? **Parent/Teacher conferences are held two times a year. Report cards will be sent home at the end of each marking period. Parents of at-risk students will be contacted through phone calls and letters home to invite them to attend intervention and referral team meetings, as needed. Parents will**

be active members of the I&RS Team and will help create goals for Action Plans to increase their child's achievement. Letters will be sent home inviting students to attend before school ELA Intervention tutoring sessions focusing on specific and measurable goals and that data will be analyzed every two weeks.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2017-2018 parent involvement funds? **The JMFECLC School will use its 2017-2018 parental involvement funds in a multitude of ways. FIrst the funds will be allocated to hold several events that are intended to promote a positive school climate and culture that includes the learning of social skills and study habits that promote student achievement. One example of this is Open House/Back to School Night in which the building principal will introduce and inform the parents of schoolwide initiatives. Second, the school funds will be allocated to promote the awareness of curriculum and NJ Student Learning Standards. Third, allocations will be set aside for the recognition of student achievement and parental involvement events and presentations.**

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	24	Credentials located in the main office
	100%	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	N/A	
	0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	19	60 credits or Pro Para Test
	100%	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	N/A	
	0	

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

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

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

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
The Personnel Director and District Administrators attend college and university fairs to recruit highly-qualified teachers. Job openings are also posted in the local newspapers and on the district's website. The district offered a highly-qualified mentoring program for all new teachers as well as an extensive new teacher induction program. This program is conducted throughout the school year and attendance is mandatory for all new teachers. Highly qualified specialists and district personnel are used to help new teachers achieve success in their classroom. Every new teacher is assigned a veteran teacher to serve as a mentor and to help the, with the routine problems and concerns they face throughout the year. This program coupled with an extensive interview process has helped the district to retain highly qualified teachers. Teachers are afforded the opportunity to advance their studies by attending in-services, workshops, and conferences in and out of the district. Every instructional assistant in the district has met the NCLB requirement. WIth the onset of it's new legislation, Long Branch entered into an agreement with the Brookdale Community College to offer courses to all of the instructional assistants in the district. This was done at the expertise of the district and enabled many instructional assistants to received 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 Parapro Test. Retention rate of instructional assistants is high in the Long Branch School District.	Primarily the Assistant Superintendent for Pupil and Personnel Services in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff, and Principals