NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2017-2018 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: LONG BRANCH	School: Lenna W. Conrow
Chief School Administrator: DR. MICHAEL SALVATORE	Address: 335 Long Branch Avenue, Long Branch NJ 07740
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: Preschool through Kindergarten
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: BONITA POTTER-BROWN
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: bpotter-brown@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-571-2868 ext. 40311	Principal's Phone Number: 732-222-4539

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.

Bonita Potter-Brown	_____	April 24, 2017
Principal's Name (Print)	**Principal's Signature**	**Date**

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held 7 stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $798,315, which comprised 95.61% of the school's budget in 2016-2017.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $841,937, which will comprise 96.00% 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
Tutors	Priority Problems 1, 2 and 3 for Supplemental Services	Extended Learning Time and Extended Day	100-100 and 100-600	$9,900
Summer Camp	Priority Problems 1, 2 and 3	Extended Year		
Parent Assistance	Priority Problem 3	Family and Community Engagement	200-800	$1,890
NCLB Improvement Leaders	Priority 1 and 2	Everyday Math and Treasures	200-100	$1200
Curriculum Materials Across All	Priority Problems 1, 2	Everyday Math		

Content Areas	and 3	and Treasures		
Professional Development	Priority Problems 1, 2 and 3	Everyday Math and Treasures	200-300	$1,500
WIFI	Priority Problems 1, 2 and 3	Everyday Math and Treasures		
Computers	Priority Problems 1, 2 and 3	Everyday Math and Treasures		

ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): *"The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

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

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Bridgette Burtt	Coordinator of Grants and Innovative Programs	X	X	X	
Dr. Renee Whelan	Director of Early Childhood	X	X	X	
Bonita Potter Brown	LWC School Principal	X	X	X	
Jennifer Campbell	Student Advisor/CPIS	X	X	X	
Jennifer Long	Preschool 3 Teacher	X	X	X	
Michelle Fiore	Kindergarten Teacher	X	X	X	
Melissa Riggi	Preschool 4 Teacher	X	X	X	
Elaine Atkinson	Title One Tutor	X	X	X	
Jillian Zoppi	Preschool/Kindergarten Parent Representative	X	X	X	

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

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

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

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

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
September 27, 2016	LWC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
October 13, 2016	LWC	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
November 16, 2016	LWC	Program Evaluation	X		X	
December 14, 2016	LWC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment School Wide Plan Development	X		X	
February 15, 2017	LWC	Program Review Data Review	X		X	
March 15, 2017	LWC	Survey Results Review Kindergarten before school tutoring Analyzing strategies to support priority problems	X		X	

April 19, 2017	LWC	Final review of 2017-2018 Schoolwide Plan Priority Problems identified as: ELA, Writing across all curricular areas, ELL proficiency in ELA, Writing and cross curricular instruction.	X		X	

Add rows as necessary.

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

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Schoolwide Program *

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

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

   The plan was implemented as planned, however, tutoring start date was delayed. Tutoring, with the exception of timing was implemented with monitoring and accountability. Parent Involvement consisted of parental visitation days both in all areas of the curriculum, a 100th Day of School celebration, open house, parent teacher conferences. Teachers were provided with continued professional development in ELA and Writing.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The strength of the implementation process was the collaboration for most of the team and leadership team in the building.

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

   One challenge was starting tutoring in a timely manner.

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

   The staff continues to implement current academic programs and was provided with district and school level professional development and support.

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

   The buy-in was not very difficult because most of the initiatives were district wide and being implemented throughout the school district and supported by central office administration. The school also distributed information regarding the programs and aligned standards based report cards through the student handbook and school webpage.

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

   Programs used were aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards, to help in student mastery of the standards. Teachers were receptive being it was the second year of the tutoring program. The staff faced some challenges with the delay in the starting of the program. The staff also faced challenges with PLC's being more teacher-driven. They perceived PLCs as adding even more to their workload and dedicated little of their time to the planning of what needed to be addressed, discussed, and planned during this time.

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

The community perception survey showed that the community was overall pleased with the opportunities students would be receiving. The parents of the community were pleased with the parent involvement activities that were available.

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, tutoring was group sessions, professional development was separated by levels and the PLC were a combination of Administrative and Support Staff led PLC meetings as well as teacher led.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Interventions were structured by quarterly data reviews by the stakeholders. 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 students to help target even more specific areas that need to be addressed and academic plans were put in place with before school tutoring. This was completed following the I&RS process lead by the student facilitator.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

    Instructional interventions took place on a daily basis before school four days a week. This program is structured to provide small group instruction.

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

    We do not have school wide wifi available.

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

Student technology was not used due to lack of student computers and no available wifi.

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	The following data reflects students that scored as developing and below in the following areas: 102 (Letter Recognition) 176 (Letter Sound Recognition) 179 (Student Writing Level) 228 (Verbal Planning) 199 (Language Acquisition) 176 (Vocabulary) 173 (Listening Comprehension) 210 (Phonological Awareness)	The following data reflects students that scored as developing and below in the following areas: 85 (Letter Recognition) 182 (Letter Sound Recognition) 145 (Student Writing Level) 162 (Verbal Planning) 151 (Language Acquisition) 210 (Vocabulary) 190 (Listening Comprehension) 182 (Phonological Awareness) On average 163 preschool	PLC, Parent meetings, parent workshops, one on one instruction, I&RS, ELL consultation	Wi-fi was not available throughout the building. There is a lack of computer stations, not enough time in the schedule, lack of parent follow through, and lack of teacher follow through with I&RS action plans and interventions. Additionally, monitoring and follow through by case manager is needed.

	On average 180 preschool students performed below grade level.	students performed below grade level.		
Kindergarten	As of May, 2016 35 out of 120 Kindergartners scored below proficient (below 72%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. As of May, 2016 30 out of 120 scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2016. On average 32 kindergarten students performed below grade level in ELA. Based on the Treasures and DRA2 Mid Year Assessments. As of May 2016, 29% of the Kindergarten students (35 out of 120) have been absent/ tardy for 15 or more days. Of these students, 23% (8 out of 35) are below proficient. As of May, 2016 87% of Kindergarten students (104 out of 120) scored below proficient (5 points or below) on the writing portion of the Treasures	- As of May, 2017 41 out of 119 Kindergarten students scored below proficient (below 72%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. - As of May, 2017 111 out of 119 Kindergarten students scored a 4 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 6 or higher by June, 2017. On average 76 kindergarten students performed below grade level in ELA. Based on the Treasures and DRA2 Mid Year Assessments. - As of May 2017, 25% of the Kindergarten students (30 out of 119) have been absent/ tardy for 15 or more days. Of these students, 77% (23 out of 30) are below proficient. - As of May, 2017 63% of	RTI, Homework Incentives, Reading Clubs, I&RS Action Plans	Lack of computer stations, WIFI is not available throughout the building, lack of parent follow through, not enough time in daily schedule, need to request additional Lexia accounts for Kindergarten students for the 2015-2016 school year, and lack of teacher follow through with PIRT and I&RS action plans and interventions. Additional monitoring and follow through by case manager is needed.

	mid-year assessment. Of those students, 24% (25 out of 104) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3) - As of May, 2016 34% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 120) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2) Of these students, 90% (37 out 41) are economically disadvantaged. Of these students, 46% (19 out 41) are English Language Learners. - 45% (13 out of 29) of the ELL population scored below proficient (70% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. - 41% (12 out of 29) of the ELL population scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. - 62% (18 out of 29) of ELL students will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA	Kindergarten students (75 out of 119) scored below proficient (75% or below) on the Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. Of those students, 52% (39 out of 75) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3) - As of May, 2017 54% of Kindergarten students (64 out of 119) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2) Of these students, 95% (61 out 64) are economically disadvantaged. Of these students, 53% (34 out 64) are English Language Learners. - 43% (26 out of 60) of the ELL population scored below proficient (72% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. - 98% (59 out of 60) of the ELL population scored a 4 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment.		

	Spring Assessment results. These students scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment.	Scores for ELL students that will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA Spring Assessment results will be provided by the state by June 2017. These are students that scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment.		
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2				
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. September 2016 DRA2 scores indicate that less that 1% of Kindergarten students with disabilities were on or above grade level. Of those students, 3 out of the 12 (25%) were above proficient on the DRA2 Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
Math	Students with	N/A	N/A	N/A	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of

	Disabilities				119) have an IEP for special education and related services. Of those students, 6 out of the 12 (50%) scored above proficient on the EveryDay Math Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. Of those students, 0 out of 12 (0%) scored above proficient on the Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Small group reading instruction.	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2016 DRA indicates 1% of Kindergarteners (5 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates 12 % of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
Math	ELLs	Small group math instruction	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores	September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates less

					than 1 % of Kindergarteners (1 out 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 Everyday Math assessment indicates 51 % of Kindergarteners (31 out of 60) were on or above grade level. This indicates a 50 % increase over the duration of the school year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Small group reading instruction.	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2015 DRA indicates 0% (1 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. May 2016 (Mid Year) DRA indicates less than 1% (6 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Small group math instruction	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores	September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates less than 1% (3 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. May 2017(Mid Year) Everyday Math assessment indicates 57 % (59 of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. This indicates a 57% increase over the duration of the school year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.

ELA		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

1 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Math		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. September 2016 DRA2 scores indicate that less that 1% of Kindergarten students with disabilities were on or above grade level. Of those students, 3 out of the 12 (25%) were above proficient on the DRA2 Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. Of those students, 6 out of the 12 (50%) scored above proficient on the EveryDay Math Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. Of those students, 0 out of 12 (0%) scored above proficient on the Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. A third

					assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Weekly Professional Learning Community based on student data	Yes	Student increase in DRA Levels and Developmental Writing Stages	September 2016 DRA indicates 1% of Kindergarteners (5 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates 12 % of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
Math	ELLs	Professional Learning Community	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates less than 1 % of Kindergarteners (1 out 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 Everyday Math assessment indicates 51 % of Kindergarteners (31 out of 60) were on or above grade level. This indicates a 50 % increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Weekly Professional Learning Community based on student data	No	Student increase in DRA Levels and Developmental Writing Stages	September 2017 DRA indicates less than 1% (1 of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. May 2017 (Mid year) DRA indicates less than 1% (6 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Community	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates less than less than 1% (3 out of 103) of

					Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. May 2017 (Mid Year) Everyday Math assessment indicates 57% (59 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. This indicates a 57% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Family and Community Engagement **Implemented in 2016-2017**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Family Literacy Night	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels. Possibly a series of parent reading events will be organized to show an improvement is student growth data.	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. September 2016 DRA2 scores indicate that less that 1% of Kindergarten students with disabilities were on or above grade level. Of those students, 3 out of the 12 (25%) were above proficient on the DRA2 Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.

ELA	Students with Disabilities	Treasures Time	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels.	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. September 2016 DRA2 scores indicate that less that 1% of Kindergarten students with disabilities were on or above grade level. Of those students, 3 out of the 12 (25%) were above proficient on the DRA2 Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Read Across America Parent Readers	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels.	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. September 2016 DRA2 scores indicate that less that 1% of Kindergarten students with disabilities were on or above grade level. Of those students, 3 out of the 12 (25%) were above proficient on the DRA2 Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
Math	Students with Disabilities	100th Day of School	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services.

					Of those students, 6 out of the 12 (50%) scored above proficient on the EveryDay Math Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Family Literacy Night	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels. Possibly a series of parent reading events will be organized to show an improvement is student growth data.	September 2016 DRA indicates 0% of Kindergarteners (0 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates 0% (1 out of 60) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
ELA	ELLs	Treasures Time	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2016 DRA indicates 0% of Kindergarteners (0 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates 0% (1 out of 60) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
ELA	ELLs	Read Across America parent readers	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2016 DRA indicates 0% of Kindergarteners (0 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates 0% (1 out of 60) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
Math	ELLs	100th Day Of School	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates less

					than 1 % of Kindergarteners (1 out 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 Everyday Math assessment indicates 51 % of Kindergarteners (31 out of 60) were on or above grade level. This indicates a 50 % increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Family Literacy Night	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels. Possibly a series of parent reading events will be organized to show an improvement is student growth data.	September 2017 DRA indicates less than 1% (1 of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. May 2017 (Mid year) DRA indicates less than 1% (6 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures Time	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2017 DRA indicates 0% of Kindergarteners (0 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates less than 1% (1 out of 60) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read Across America parent readers	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2017 DRA indicates 0% of Kindergarteners (0 out of 60) were on or above grade level. May (Mid Year) 2017 DRA indicates less than 1% (1 out of 60) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	100th Day Of School	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates less than less than 1% (3 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade level. May 2017 (Mid Year) Everyday Math assessment indicates 57% (59 out of 103) of Kindergarteners were on or above grade

					level. This indicates a 57% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Principal's Certification

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

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

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

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

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	● Link It Data: ● ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment. ● DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year and Final Assessment. ● Attendance Data	● As of September 2016 94% (112 out of 119) of Kindergarten students scored below proficient on the baseline ELA assessment. As of May, 2017 34% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 119) scored below proficient (below 72%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. This indicates a 60% increase from baseline to mid year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. ● As of September 2016 99% (118 out of 119) Kindergarten students scored below proficient on the baseline DRA 2 assessment. As of May, 2017 97% of Kindergarten students (115 out of 119) scored a 4 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 6 or higher by June, 2017. This indicates a 3% increase from baseline to mid year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. ● As of May 2017, 25% of the Kindergarten students (30 out of 119) have been absent/ tardy for 15 or more days. Of these students, 76% (23 out of 30) are below proficient.
Academic Achievement - Writing	● Link It Data: ● ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final	● As of September 2016 98% (117 out of 119) of Kindergarten students scored below proficient on the Tools Of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. As of May, 2017 63% of Kindergarten students (75 out of 119) scored below proficient (75% or below) on the Tools

	Assessment. ● DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year and Final Assessment. ● Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment	of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. This indicates a 35% increase from baseline to mid year. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. ● Of those students, 52% (39 out of 75) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3) ● As of May, 2017 54% of Kindergarten students (64 out of 119) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2) Of these students, 95% (61 out 64) are economically disadvantaged. Of these students, 53% (34 out 64) are English Language Learners.
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	● Link It Data: ● Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.	● As of May 2017, 65% of students (78 out of 119) scored proficient or above (72% or higher).
Family and Community Engagement	● Parent surveys ● Sign in Sheets ● Feedback forms	● According to the Community Needs Assessment (CNA) results from 2016 - 2017 percentages of families indicated their need for trainings as follows: Reading and Writing 32%, Social/Emotional Development 22%, Speech/Language 30%, Parenting Techniques 35%, Childhood Obesity/Nutrition 17%, Mathematics 23%, Self Help Skills 16%, ESL classes 22%, GED classes 10%, Parent Support Groups 20%. This indicates that wide variety of topics are of interest to the parents of LWC ECLC. Percentages of families interested in Community Resources and information is as follows: Church 13%, Food Banks 11%, Local Pediatricians 19%, Local Dentists 20%, Hospitals 65% Speech and Language 20%, Mental Health 2%, Play Therapy 14%, Banks 2%, Library 12%. ● Sign in sheets document the numbers of family/community members at each event held during the 2016-2017 school year. The following represents the number of families/community members who attend each event: Kindergarten Orientation: 93 out of 118 families (78%), Preschool 3yr Orientation: 143 out 168 families (85%), Back to School Night: Kindergarten 79 out of 118 families

		(67%), Back to School Night Preschool: 183 out of 306 families (60%), Kindergarten Treasures Time: 52 out of 118 families (44%), Preschool Tools Time: 162 out of 306 families (53%), November Parent Teacher conferences Kindergarten: 73 out of 118 families (62%), November Parent Teacher Conferences Preschool: 187 out of 306 families (61%), Kindergarten Parent Teacher Conferences March: 64 out of 118 families (54%), Preschool Parent teacher Conferences March: 174 out of 306 families (57%).
Professional Development	● PLC meetings ● Data walks ● Professional Development Surveys ● Sign In Sheets ● Professional Development/In Service Trainings	● 100% of staff was offered weekly Professional Learning Community Time during common planning periods.
Leadership	● PLN meetings ● Management meetings	● 100% of Leadership and Administration team was offered weekly meetings 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	● 100% of teaching and instructional staff was asked to participate in a school climate/perception survey. ● 100% of teachers were offered specific PD trainings in order to increase student test scores in ELA and Math. ● 100% of staff were asked to complete a Professional Development Survey.
School-Based Youth Services	● Not applicable at this level	● Not applicable at this level
Students with Disabilities	● Link It Data: ● ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.	● 10% of the Kindergarten students (12 out of 119) have an IEP for special education and related services. ● Of those students, (5 out of the 12) scored below proficient (42%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be

	● DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year and Final Assessment. ● Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment. ● Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment Beginning, Mid Year and Final Assessment.	administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. ● Of those students, 9 out of the 12 (75%) scored below proficient on the DRA2 Mid-Year Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. ● Of those students, 6 out of the 12 (50%) scored below proficient on the EveryDay Math Mid-Year Assessment.A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year. ● Of those students, 12 out of 12 (100%) scored below proficient on the Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. A third assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth for the whole school year.
Homeless Students	● Genesis Database	● Not applicable at this time.
Migrant Students	● Not applicable at this time	● Not applicable at this time.
English Language Learners	● Link It Data: ● ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment. ● DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year and Final Assessment. ● Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment. ● WIDA Model Grade K Assessment	● 43% (26 out of 60) of the ELL population scored below proficient (72% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. ● 90% (54 out of 60) of the ELL population scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. ● Scores for ELL students that will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA Spring Assessment results will be provided by the state by June 2017. These are students that scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment.
Economically Disadvantaged	● Lunch Status Application ● Genesis Database	● 80% (94 out of 119) of students in Kindergarten receive free lunch. ● Less than 1% (8 out of 119) of students in Kindergarten receive

		reduced lunch. ● 38% (39 out of 103) of students in Kindergarten that receive free/reduced lunch scored below proficient on the ELA Treasures Mid-Year Assessment.

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

2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*

Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment? **The Lenna W. Conrow School conducted a comprehensive needs assessment using teacher surveys, standardized assessment data, and local assessment data. The data was gathered and results from the data were analyzed and discussed at monthly PLC and faculty meetings. This report focuses on goals in the areas of English Language Arts and in Writing. The report also addresses the needs of specialized populations as 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, master teachers, student advisors, 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 marked areas of strengths and weaknesses.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)? **The Everyday Math Assessment, Treasures Reading Assessment, WIDA Model for ELL Assessment, and DRA2 Assessment are valid and reliable centered on research based programs; therefore, reports generated from Link It are a result of a reliable collection method. The Lenna W. Conrow School uses the Link It Database system to document and monitor all assessments.**

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction? **As of May, 2017 34% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 119) scored below proficient (below 72%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. Pending end of year data. As of May, 2017 79% of Kindergarten students (94 out of 119) scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2015. As of May 2017, 25% of the Kindergarten students (30 out of 119) have been absent/ tardy for 15 or more days. Of these students, 77% (23 out of 30) are below proficient. As of May, 2017 55% of Kindergarten students (66 out of 119) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2) Of these students, 92% (61 out 66) are economically disadvantaged. Of these students, 56% (34 out 66) are English Language Learners. As of May 2017, 39% of students (47 out of 119) scored proficient or above (70% or higher). As of May, 2017 63% of Kindergarten students (75 out of 119) scored below proficient (5 points or below) on the Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. Of those students, 52% (39 out of 75) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3) As a result, teachers may benefit from additional professional development assisting them with differentiating their instruction to reach the needs of all students, with an increased focus on our Hispanic (ELL) population. Additionally, a comprehensive writing curriculum would be beneficial to increase scores in the area of writing as it applies across all curriculum areas.**

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)? **The data shows that there is some evidence that implementation of learned strategies through professional development opportunities is carried over into the classroom. Additional PD training paired with one-on-one feedback sessions and self-reflections is required to help increase student proficiency. The use of the professional development survey results would benefit all staff and allow them to attend specific training to target the needs of their students learning styles.**
6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner? **Students are identified through standardized assessment data, curriculum assessments, progress reports, teacher recommendation, observation conducted by master teachers/student advisors/ELL support staff, and weekly attendance data. The data helps master teachers and teachers identify and place students in proper intervention programs and helps to monitor their progress and revise interventions as needed.**
7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students? **Educationally at risk students are provided the online program Lexia which focuses on areas in need of academic assistance for ELA. Data is reviewed consistently in order to provide specific support and revise interventions as needed. In addition the ELA and Math programs have built in differentiation activities, which in ELA include Tier 2 Interventions. Students with attendance concerns are identified with on-going family contact and support given to assist these students in improving their attendance. All students are instructed using research based programs. Parents are invited throughout the year to various workshops which offer information so they can assist their children at home. The school and I &RS team meets weekly to address all at risk students referred to the team for academic, behavior, or attendance concerns.**
8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students? **The Lenna W. Conrow School currently has 0 students targeted as migrant.**
9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students? **The Lenna W. Conrow School currently has 0 students targeted as**

homeless.

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? **Elected members of the teaching and support staff serve on the Title I Committee as well as the Professional Development Committee. At these committee meetings, data is gathered, presented and utilized to determine school wide goals and implementation of new programs to reach these goals. All instructional staff is given data results to analyze and make informed instructional decisions based on their analysis. This data analysis helps instructional staff to modify lesson plans, differentiate instruction and also helps with student grouping.**

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school? **We recently became an early childhood learning center which houses preschool and kindergarten. We have articulation meetings with the elementary schools during exit of students through the Lenna W. Conrow School. The school continues to evaluate student growth of the NJ Student Learning Standards along with the designed curricula in both ELA and mathematics. Ongoing articulation between Kindergarten and First grade teachers support seamless transition between the two programs. Professional development for teachers in these grade levels provides insight of program components and how they are implemented. The Treasures Program seamlessly creates a bridge from the kindergarten curriculum preparing students to transition to the upper grades with a consistent language, strategies and exposure to literature in a new building. Pre-Kindergarten/Kindergarten students and staff collaborate and participate in buddy/transitional activities throughout the year to ensure a smooth transition between grade levels.**

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2017-2018 schoolwide plan? **All available data was collected, shared, and analyzed by the Title One Committee. From this process we identified the top three priority problems and explored their possible root causes.**

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

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

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

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	ELA	Writing (Across All Curriculum Areas)
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	• As of May, 2017 29% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 119) scored below proficient (below 72%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. *Pending end of year data.* • As of May 2017, 25% of the Kindergarten students (30 out of 119) have been absent/ tardy for 15 or more days. Of these students, 77% (23 out of 30) are below proficient. • As of May, 2017 79% of Kindergarten students (94 out of 119) scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2017.	• As of May, 2017 63% of Kindergarten students (75 out of 119) scored below proficient (75% or below) on the Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Assessment. Of those students, 52% (39 out of 75) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3) • As of May, 2017 54% of Kindergarten students (64 out of 119) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2)
Describe the root causes of the problem	Teachers received ongoing professional development from outside providers as well as job embedded trainings. However, teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how to effectively use assessments to guide instruction. Teachers are continuing to work towards refining the implementation of the program. Though teachers received professional development and support to incorporate weak curriculum areas, there was a lack of	Teachers received ongoing professional development from outside providers as well as job embedded trainings. However, teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how to effectively use assessments to guide instruction. Teachers are continuing to work towards refining the implementation of the program. Though teachers received professional development and support to incorporate weak curriculum areas, there was a lack of

	consistency from classroom to classroom. Targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic reading knowledge; stronger ability to differentiate instruction to students need.	consistency from classroom to classroom. Targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic writing across all curriculum areas; stronger ability to differentiate instruction to student's individual needs.
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 Lexia On-line Intervention Program	Writer's Workshop, Treasures Writing Program, Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Curriculum
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Treasures Reading/Writing Program, Lexia are aligned with the Common Core State Standards Reading Standards for Literature K Reading Standards for Informational Text K Reading Standards Foundational skills Writing Standards K Speaking and Listening Standards K Language Standards K	Writer's Workshop, Treasures Writing Program, Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Curriculum RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3; Standards K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2

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

2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process

Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	English Language Learner proficiency for ELA, Writing, and Cross Curricular instruction.	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	• 63% (26 out of 41) of the ELL population scored below proficient (70% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored below proficient, 63% (26 out of 41) are English Language Learners. • 100% (60 out of 60) of the ELL population scored a 4 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. Therefore, out of the total number of students who scored 4 or lower, 100% (60 out of 60) are English Language Learners. • Scores for ELL students that will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA Spring Assessment results will be provided by the state by June 2017. These are students that scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment. • As of May, 2017 54% of Kindergarten students (64 out of 119) scored below proficient on the	

	writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2) Of these students, 95% (61 out 64) are economically disadvantaged. Of these students, 56% (34 out 61) are English Language Learners.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Teachers were not exposed to a large amount of Professional Development focused on addressing the ELL population.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA, and Writing	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	WIDA Treasures Reading/Writing Program Lexia	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Reading Standards for Literature K Reading Standards for Informational Text K Reading Standards Foundational skills Writing Standards K Speaking and Listening Standards K Language Standards K	

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

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

2017-2018 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
ELA	Students with Disabilities	In Class Support Services	Teacher, Administrator In-class Support Teacher, OT/PT specialist Speech and Language specialist	By June 2017, 100% of teachers who were offered and attended specific PD training in order to increase student's proficiency in ELA. This will be reflected in the Link It data.	Macaruso, P., Hook, P.E., & McCabe, R. (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 29,162-172.
Math	Students with Disabilities	In Class Support Services	Teacher, Administrator In-class Support Teacher, OT/PT specialist Speech and Language	By June 2017, 100% of teachers who were offered and attended specific PD training in order to increase student's proficiency in Math. This will be reflected in the Link It data.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

			specialist		
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	Professional Development to staff of ELL students ESL support	Administrator, Teacher, Bilingual Supervisor	By June 2017, 100% of teachers of ELL students who were offered and attended specific PD training in order to increase student achievement on the WIDA, scoring a 4.5 or higher.	What Works Clearinghouse: Teaching Academics Content and Literacy to English Learning in Elementary and Middle School, Practice Guide, April 2014
Math	ELLs	Professional Development to staff of ELL students ESL support	Administrator, Teacher, Bilingual Supervisor	By June 2017, 100% of teachers of ELL students who were offered and attended specific PD training in order to increase student achievement on the Everyday Math Assessment.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Free and Reduced Before and After School Care-Champions	Administrative Assistant, Student Advisor Administrator	By June 2017, 100% of the students that attend the Champions program receive an engaging out of school time program that enriches their school based program. Champions program has five mind-expanding educational learning centers that allow	Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of

				exploration and discovery at the child's pace and enables teachers to individualize attention and encourage children to make appropriate choices to meet their needs. By June 2017, 100% of the students are given additional opportunities to grow through enrichments such as Do Right Kids, Fitness, and Read*Write*Now! programs.	Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Free and Reduced Before and After School Care-Champions	Administrative Assistant, Student Advisor Administrator	By June 2017, 100% of the students that attend the Champions program receive an engaging out of school time program that enriches their school based program. Champions program has five mind-expanding educational learning centers that allow exploration and discovery at the child's pace and enables teachers to individualize attention and encourage children to make appropriate choices to meet their needs. By June 2017, 100% of the students are given additional opportunities to grow through enrichments such as Do Right Kids, and Fitness.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

ELA	ALL	LinkIt Lexia PLC Before and After School Tutoring Learning Walks	Administrators and Teacher	By June 2017 100% of teachers who are offered and attend professional development on the Link It Dashboard program will increase their understanding of the student achievement data. Which will in turn help drive their instruction, therefore will improve student achievement. During the 2016-2017 school year 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and establish goals with specific target dates. By June 2017 100% of all teachers will be involved in a minimum of one ELA and one Writing learning walk.	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making. What Works Clearinghouse, September 2009 Practice Guide Educational Leadership Dec 2007/Jan 2008 l Volume 65 l Number **4** **Informative Assessment** pages 81-82 **Classroom Walk-Throughs** Jane L. David
Math	ALL	LinkI PLC Before and After School Tutoring Learning Walks	Administrators and Teacher	By June 2017 100% of teachers who are offered and attend professional development on the Link It Dashboard program will increase their understanding of the student achievement data. Which will in turn help drive their instruction, therefore will improve student achievement. During the 2016-2017 school year 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

				and establish goals with specific target dates. By June 2017 100% of all teachers will be involved in a minimum of one Math learning walk.	

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

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

2017-2018 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Summer Enrichment Camp	Camp Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Summer Enrichment Camp starting July 2017, in a n effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009 *Child Development, 69 (2),* 495-517. Macaruso, P., Hook, P E, & McCade, R (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in*

					Reading, 29, 162-172.
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Before and After School Tutoring	Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Before School Tutoring, in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009. *Child Development, 69 (2),* 495-517. Macaruso, P., Hook, P E, & McCade, R (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonic programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 29*, 162-172.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Summer Enrichment Camp	Camp Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Summer Enrichment Camp starting July 2017, in a n effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
Math	Students with Disabilities	Before and After School Tutoring	Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Before School Tutoring, in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

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	Camp Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Summer Enrichment Camp starting July 2017, in a n effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009. *Child Development, 69 (2),* 495-517. Macaruso, P., Hook, P E, & McCade, R (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonic programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 29*, 162-172.
ELA	ELL	Before and After School Tutoring	Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Before School Tutoring, in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009. *Child Development, 69 (2),* 495-517. Macaruso, P., Hook, P E, & McCade, R (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary

					phonic programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 29*, 162-172.
Math	ELL	Summer Enrichment Camp	Camp Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Summer Enrichment Camp starting July 2017, in a n effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
Math	ELL	Before and After School Tutoring	Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Before School Tutoring, in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Summer Enrichment Camp	Camp Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Summer Enrichment Camp starting July 2017, in a n effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009. *Child Development, 69 (2),* 495-517. Macaruso, P., Hook, P E, & McCade, R (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonic programs for advancing

					reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 29*, 162-172.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Before and After School Tutoring	Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Before School Tutoring, in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades, IES PRACTICE GUIDE, NCEE 2009-4045,U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE, February 2009. *Child Development, 69 (2),* 495-517. Macaruso, P., Hook, P E, & McCade, R (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonic programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 29*, 162-172.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Summer Enrichment Camp	Camp Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Summer Enrichment Camp starting July 2017, in a n effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Before and After School Tutoring	Facilitator Administrators and Teachers	100% of targeted students will be offered Before School Tutoring, in an effort to bridge the achievement gap.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from:

					https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

***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	PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers in school on the day of the meeting will take part in the weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R (2011). Promoting professional learning from within. *International School Journal, Vol 30*, Issue 2. Rose, S., 2009. Personal professional development through coaching. *CEDER Yearbook*, p199-214.
Math	Students with Disabilities	PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers in school on the day of the meeting will take part in the weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved

				of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
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	PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers in school on the day of the meeting, will take part in weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R (2011). Promoting professional learning from within. *International School Journal, Vol 30*, Issue 2. Rose, S., 2009. Personal professional development through coaching. *CEDER Yearbook*, p199-214.
Math	ELLs	PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will be offered weekly PLC meetings. Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness.	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research

				100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R (2011). Promoting professional learning from within. *International School Journal, Vol 30*, Issue 2. Rose, S., 2009. Personal professional development through coaching. *CEDER Yearbook*, p199-214.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers in school on the day of the meeting, will take part in weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

ELA		PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R (2011). Promoting professional learning from within. *International School Journal, Vol 30*, Issue 2. Rose, S., 2009. Personal professional development through coaching. *CEDER Yearbook*, p199-214.
Math		PLC Data Walks Article Study Peer Coaching	Administrators, Teachers, Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers in school on the day of the meeting, will take part in weekly PLC meetings, Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness. 100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations	Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2008). Experimental evaluation of the effects of a research-based preschool mathematics curriculum. American Educational Research Journal, 45(2), 443–494. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795943

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? **All stakeholders, administrators, teachers and support staff will be responsible for conducting both an internal and external evaluation of the Schoolwide program for 2016-2017. This will take place quarterly through data checks and monthly Title One meetings.**
2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process? **The potential for weak interventions and strategies put in place for specific content areas, which are below proficient, could potentially impact the implementation process, such as the lack of wifi throughout the building and transportation for Before School Tutoring.**
3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)? **It is vital that all stakeholders evaluate data consistently to determine needed interventions and support through parent involvement workshops and interventions in class.**
4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff? **A research based school climate/perception survey will be distributed to all staff at the beginning and end of the year.**
5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community? **Parents and community members will receive a research based survey in the beginning and end of the year.**
6. How will the school structure interventions? **We will gauge data of involvement and perception through the use of surveys. Administration and staff are working together to monitor interventions through I&RS meetings, monthly PLC meetings, data walks, and self-reflection.**
7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions? **Students will receive instructional interventions on a daily**

basis. Effectiveness of instructional interventions will be monitored weekly.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program? **Wi-Fi throughout the building and computer stations/ labs will be needed to support the Schoolwide program.**
9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided? D**ata will be available through our district wide LinkIt program including DRA2, Every Day Math and Treasures. Genesis database system will assess attendance and parent contact information. We will also use I&RS action plans and report cards to monitor effectiveness.**
10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? **The information will be disseminated through the LinkIt and Genesis data based systems as well as monthly Title 1 meetings, weekly PLC meetings, and faculty meetings on a regular basis.**

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	Parent Teacher Conferences Parent –School Compact Title One Committee Back To School Night Inviting Families to Parent Events	Classroom teachers and student facilitator. Administrator and Staff Principal Student Advisors Administrator, Facilitator and Staff	100% of all families will be invited to attend fall and spring Parent Teacher Conferences or be given a home visit or phone conference regarding their child's progress. 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact There will be an additional parent and an additional Title One Tutor added to the Title One Plan Committee. 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact During the 2017-2018 school year 100% of the parents will be invited to attend scheduled family events.	Parental Involvement Strongly Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. IMPROVING PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOLS: A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE Theresa Keane * Teacher, New Searles Elementary School, Nashua, NH RIVIER ACADEMIC JOURNAL, VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2, FALL 2007
Math	Students with	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	Disabilities				
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Parent Teacher Conferences Parent –School Compact NCLB Committee Back To School Night Inviting Families to Parent Events	Classroom teachers and student facilitator. Administrator and Staff Principal Student Advisors Administrator, Facilitator and Staff	100% of all families will either attend fall and spring Parent Teacher Conferences or be given a home visit or phone conference regarding their child's progress. 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact There will be an additional parent added to the NCLB Plan Committee 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact During the 2017-2018 school year 100% of the parents will be invited to attend	Parental Involvement Strongly Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. IMPROVING PARENT INVOLVEMENT

				scheduled family events.	IN SCHOOLS: A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE Theresa Keane * Teacher, New Searles Elementary School, Nashua, NH RIVIER ACADEMIC JOURNAL, VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2, FALL 2007
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent Teacher Conferences Parent –School Compact Title One Committee Back To School Night Inviting Families to Parent Events	Classroom teachers and student facilitator. Administrator and Staff Principal Student Advisors Administrator, Facilitator and Staff	100% of all families will either attend fall and spring Parent Teacher Conferences or be given a home visit or phone conference regarding their child's progress. 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact There will be an additional parent added to the Title One Plan Committee 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact During the 2017-2018 school year 100% of the parents will be invited to attend	Parental Involvement Strongly Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. . Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. IMPROVING PARENT INVOLVEMENT

				scheduled family events.	IN SCHOOLS: A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE Theresa Keane * Teacher, New Searles Elementary School, Nashua, NH RIVIER ACADEMIC JOURNAL, VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2, FALL 2007
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA		Parent Teacher Conferences Parent –School Compact Title One Committee Back To School Night Inviting Families to Parent	Classroom teachers and student facilitator. Administrator and Staff Principal Student Advisors Administrator, Facilitator and	100% of all families will either attend fall and spring Parent Teacher Conferences or be given a home visit or phone conference regarding their child's progress. 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact There will be an additional parent added to the Title One Plan Committee 100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact During the 2015-2016 school year 100% of the parents	Parental Involvement Strongly Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Impacts Student Achievement *Science Daily (May, 2008)* New research from the University of New Hampshire Epstein, Joyce L. (2001). School, Family and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

		Events	Staff	will be invited to attend scheduled family events.	IMPROVING PARENT INVLOVEMENT IN SCHOOLS: A CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE Theresa Keane * Teacher, New Searles Elementary School, Nashua, NH RIVIER ACADEMIC JOURNAL, VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2, FALL 2007
Math		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

2017-2018 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment? **The school's family and community engagement program will help to strengthen the home-school connection, parent involvement activities in English Language Arts, Writing and English Language Learners will be implemented. The program will seek and encourage parental involvement through workshops, Back to School Night, targeted parent dinners, School Climate Survey, CNA, Book Club and Parent-Teacher Conferences. Teachers will continue to create and maintain web pages to remain in daily contact with all families to encourage parental participation in their student's education.**
2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy? **We engage parents by having them serve on our Schoolwide committee. Parents will be given research based surveys, and may attend meetings to discuss**

procedures to implement the policy.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? **The school will distribute its written parent involvement policy through the school-parent compact being sent home with students and posted on the school's website.**
4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact? **Parents will be involved in the development of the school/parent compact through involvement as stakeholders on the Advisory Committee and parent representatives on the Title One Committee. These parent groups will have input as to any changes to be made on the school/parent compact.**
5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact? **The school will ensure that the parents receive and review the school-parent compact by asking them to sign the document and return it to school. Teachers and Counselors follow up with phone calls and if needed, home visits, to ensure a compact is returned from each student.**
6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community? **Student achievement data is reported to the public via the school report card, board meetings, parent/teacher conferences, teacher web site pages and notifications sent home.**
7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III? **If the district has not met their annual measurable objectives for Title III, parents are notified by letter.**
8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results? **Lenna W. Conrow School**

will inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results via the school report card. Furthermore, central office presents a public meeting to address these results.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan? **The school involves families and community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide plan by having parent representatives attend Title One monthly meetings and through research based parent surveys.**
10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children? **The school informs families about academic achievement of their students via conferences biyearly, reports card quarterly, through phone calls, surveys, parent involvement activities, and I & RS team meetings.**
11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2017-2018 parent involvement funds? **Lenna W. Conrow 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 culture and climate that includes the learning of social skills and extended learning activities that promote student achievement. One example of this is the Open House/Back to School Night in which the building principal will introduce and inform the parents of school wide initiatives. Second the school funds will be allocated to promote the awareness of curriculum and common core state standards. Third allocations will be set aside for the recognition of student achievement. And finally, the district parent involvement committee with representatives from each school, who discuss community and school wide needs will promote activities to increase student achievement**.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	34 100%	Credentials are in the main office.
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)	33 100%	60 credits or the Para Pro Test
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 offers a high-quality mentoring program for new teachers, as well as an extensive new teacher induction program. This program is conducted throughout the school year and attendance is mandatory for all new teachers. Highly qualified specialists and district personnel are used to help new teachers achieve success in their classroom. Every new teacher is assigned a veteran teacher to help them with the routine problems and concerns that face new teachers. This program coupled with an extensive interview process has helped the district to retain highly qualified teachers. Teachers are afforded the opportunity to advance their studies by attending in-services, workshops, and conferences in and out of the district.	Primarily the District Manager of Personnel and Special Projects in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff, and Principals.