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: Morris Avenue
Chief School Administrator: Dr. Michael Salvatore	Address: 318 Morris Ave
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: PreK 3- K
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Matthew E. Johnson
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: mjohnson@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-571-2868	Principal's Phone Number: (732) 571-3139

Principal's Certification

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

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

_____   _____   _____

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION-ESEA §1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____7_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.

- State/local funds to support the school were $ 1,360,700, which comprised 97.48 % of the school's budget in 2016-2017.

- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 986,374, which will comprise 96.70 % 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
3 Extended Day Tutors	#1, #2	Before School Tutorial Program		
Supplies for Parent Involvement	#3	Family & Community Involvement		
18 Student computer workstations to access Treasures online activities	#1, #2	Small group reading & writing instruction		
In Demand Translator	#1, #2, #3	Parent Participation in curricular activities		2 x $2,500 for InDemand Essential Touchscreens = $5,000
In Demand Translator minutes	#1, #2, #3	Parent Participation in curricular		$1.50 per minute for 3,000 minutes = $4,500

		activities		
Rigby Flying Colors Complete Package (Magenta, Red, Yellow, & Blue)	#1, #2	Intervention Lab, Before School Tutoring, & Small Group Reading & Writing Instruction		$905 per set x 4 levels = $3,620
Fine Motor Interventions	#2	Intervention Lab, Before School Tutoring, & Small Group Reading & Writing Instruction		
Professional Development	#1, #2	PD provided to create best practices for all intervention strategies		

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

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

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Matthew Johnson	School Staff- Administrator	YES	YES	YES	
Michael Gatta	Special Education Teacher	YES	YES	YES	
Nicole Trainor	Guidance	YES	YES	YES	
Gail Becker	Guidance	YES	YES	YES	
Tessy Simoes	Tutor	YES	YES	YES	
Cecilia Tamayo	Parent Representative	YES	YES	YES	
Michelle Gonzalez	Parent Representative	YES	YES	YES	

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

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

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

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

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
10/24/16	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Establish Stakeholder/Schoolwide Title 1 Committee. Review goals and data assessment measures.	X		X	
11/28/16	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Review Schoolwide goals. Review all data measures. Discuss Parent Perception Survey Professional Development and Teacher Surveys. Review Comprehensive Needs Assessment. Review Program Evaluations.	X		X	

12/19/16	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Review and analyze data assessment results. Brainstorm how to review schoolwide goals and findings from data analysis with staff.	X		X	
1/23/17	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Review dissemination process and responses to parent, student and teacher surveys. Review Program Evaluations and data for this year and next year.	X		X	
2/27/17	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Analyze survey results, review and discuss mid-year data.Set date to share results with staff. Review effective strategies and interventions. Review Comprehensive Needs Assessment.	X		X	
4/03/17	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Discuss programs and initiatives for remainder of year. Review attendance data and parent involvement data. Review Program Evaluations and data.	X		X	
4/24/17	Morris Avenue Conference Room	Data collection and identification of 2017 priority problems. Review	X		X	

		mission & vision statements. Identify resources necessary to implement the 2017-2018 plan				

Add rows as necessary.

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Schoolwide Program *
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2016-2017, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

   The program was implemented as planned with the exception of the student workstations. Those materials were not ordered in time to successfully implement the interventions with fidelity.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The strengths of the implementation process were the communication and collaboration of the committee stakeholders in the building to ensure that the plans were carried out and that there was accountability.

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

   The barriers/challenges encountered during the implementation process were refining the implementation of the New Jersey Student Learning Standards to their full potential. Due to the wealth of material offered in all of our programs, teachers expressed that they were struggling to decide how to best select specific items from ELA/Math materials which would offer differentiated instruction, but still meet the New Jersey Student Learning Standards. Also, additional support staff would be beneficial to assist in the school's day to day functions (ie translating ESL support, and tutoring).

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

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

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

Information was gathered during common planning periods, PLCs and monthly meetings held by the team.

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

   Programs aligned to the New Jersey Student Learning Standards, were implemented to help in student mastery of the standards. Teachers were receptive being it was the fifth year of the Treasures reading program. With this program came a large amount of planning time needed with a wide variety of materials. This was a challenge for staff members. The staff also faced challenges with PLC's that were 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. In its seventh year of implementation the Everyday Math program has had a positive perception from majority of the staff. Although there continues to be challenges with the amount of time needed for planning, familiarity with the standards and mathematics goals and objectives increased.

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

   Overall, the Community Perception Survey showed that the community was overall pleased with the opportunities students would be receiving with a core reading programs. The parents were pleased with the community involvement activities to support both ELA and Mathematics as well as Community resource nights implemented by the student facilitator and were pleased to have translation available.

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

   The methods of delivery for Language Arts included teachers following whole group, small group and independent centers incorporated in Treasures. Treasures groupings are based in the Gradual Release of Responsibility model. Teachers used multiple methods including small group instruction, one-on-one instruction and additional resources to address the individual needs of struggling student populations. In mathematics, Everyday mathematics identified specific areas of needs for students so the teachers could provide individualized small group instruction and whole group differentiated activities to help reinforce weak concepts and skills in mathematics. Teachers were also encouraged to use the differentiated/readiness activities to address the individual needs of struggling student populations.

9. How did the school structure the interventions? before school and during school?

   Interventions were implemented using daily, weekly and unit data gathered from all educational disciplines. When reviewing

the data the team identified at risk students based on multiple indicators. Educators met with administrators and peer teachers to set goals and implement interventions to meet student needs. Specific plans were implemented that utilized best practices and strategies which would assist students in meeting targeted goals. Follow up meetings were held between the educators and administration to monitor if the strategies implemented were effective.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Instructional interventions were implemented daily. Intervention lab was implemented 2 times a week for 20 minutes at a time, and the Title I before school tutoring program was implemented 4 days a week for 30 minutes a day.

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

Both ELA and Math core programs are supported with teacher technology components as well as student components. Both ELA and Math student technology components were available for student use from home. Teachers were able to instruct using SMARTBOARD airliners.

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

Student technology use was minimal due to the fact that classrooms are not equipped with student computers.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

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

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in

English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

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

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

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

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally

appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions _did_ or _did not_ result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	9/106 DRA2 Assessment; (May, 2016)	47/114 DRA2 Assessment; (February, 2017)	The Treasures Literacy Program provides small group guided instruction which allows for more focus and interventions targeting the specific needs of at-risk students.	This program is in the fifth year of its implementation. Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to begin to master all elements of the program. While improvement was made, lack of professional development focusing on Literacy best practices and differentiated of instruction could improve.
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Mathematics	2015-2016	2016-2017	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided _did_ or _did not_ result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	8/106 Math Link It Benchmark Form C (May, 2016)	33/114 Math Link It Benchmark Form B (February, 2017)	The Everyday Math Program provides small group center activities that reinforce math skills and strategies as well as developing specific interventions that target specific needs of at-risk students.	This program is in the seventh year of its implementation. Throughout the year, teachers received professional development and support in order to increase mastery of all elements of the program. While improvement was made, professional development needs to more directly prescribed for specific classroom instruction and more closely connected to the standards.

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

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

Evaluation of 2016-2017 Interventions and Strategies

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Small group reading instruction.	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (24/53) of

					the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures End of the Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/53) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● February 2017 DRA indicates 49% (26 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● This indicates a 49% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment. ● February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 3%

					(2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment. ● This indicates a 3% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months
ELA	ELLs	Intervention Lab	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (24/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures End of the Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth

					reflective of the whole school year.
					- September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/53) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). - February 2017 DRA indicates 49% (26 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). - This indicates a 49% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or better on the assessment. - February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 3% (2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment. - This indicates a 3% increase over half of the school year.

					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
ELA	ELLs	Triumphs Tier 3 Reading Intervention	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. ● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (24/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures End of the Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/53) of Kindergartners were

					reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher).
					● February 2017 DRA indicates 49% (26 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher).
					● This indicates a 49% increase over half of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					● September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment.
					● February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 3% (2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment.
					● This indicates a 3% increase over half of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					● September, 2016 Morris Avenue

					- attendance rate was at 93% - April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% - This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Math	ELLs	Differentiated Math Centers	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate	- September 2016 beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 1% (1 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. - February 2017 Mid-Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 74% (39 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Mid-Year Assessment. - This indicates a 73% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% - April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% - This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.

| Math | ELLs | Intervention Lab | Yes | Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate | ● September 2016 beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 1% (1 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment.
● February 2017 Mid-Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 74% (39 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Mid-Year Assessment.
● This indicates a 73% increase over half of the school year.

*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.

● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93%
● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9%
● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months. |
| ELA | Economically Disadvantaged | Small group reading instruction. | Yes | Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and | ● September 2016 DRA indicates 5 % (6/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment).
● February 2017 DRA indicates 60% |

				attendance rate	(61/102) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). ● This indicates a 53% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 0% (0/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. ● February 2017 scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 8% (9/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. ● This indicates an 8% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 1% (1/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Beginning of the Year Assessment.

					● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 57% (60/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (Score of 80 or higher) on the Treasures End of Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 56% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Intervention Lab	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	● September 2016 DRA indicates 5 % (6/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). ● February 2017 DRA indicates 58% (61/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). ● This indicates a 53% increase over half of the school year.

					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					- September, scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 0% (0/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. - February 2017 scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 8% (9/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. - This indicates an 8% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 1% (1/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Beginning of the Year Assessment. - February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 57% (60/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (Score of 80 or higher) on the Treasures End of Year Assessment. - This indicates a 56% increase over

					half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. • September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% • April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% • This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Triumphs Tier 3 Reading Intervention	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	• September 2016 DRA indicates 5 % (6/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). • February 2017 DRA indicates 58% (61/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). • This indicates a 53% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. • September, scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 0% (0/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored

					80% or greater on the assessment. ● February 2017 scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 8% (9/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. ● This indicates an 8% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 1% (1/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 57% (60/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (Score of 80 or higher) on the Treasures End of Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 56% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue

Math	Economically Disadvantaged				attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Differentiated Math Centers	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate	● September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 5 % (5/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Mid- Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 72% (76/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math End of Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 67 % increase over the duration of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Intervention Lab	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase,	● September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 5 % (5/106) of Economically

				attendance rate	Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment.
					● February 2017 Mid- Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 72% (76/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math End of Year Assessment.
					● This indicates a 67 % increase over the duration of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93%
					● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9%
					● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.

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	ELA Intervention Program Funded through Title 1	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	- September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. - February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (24/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures End of the Year Assessment. - This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.

					● September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/53) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● February 2017 DRA indicates 49% (26 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). ● This indicates a 49% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80 % or higher on the assessment. ● February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 3% (2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment. ● This indicates a 3% increase over half of the school year.

					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Math	ELLs	Math Intervention Program Funded through Title 1	YES	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate	● September 2016 beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 1% (1 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Mid-Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 74% (39 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Mid-Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 73% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9%

					● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	ELA Intervention Program Funded through Title 1	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	● September 2016 DRA indicates 5 % (6/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). ● February 2017 DRA indicates 58% (61/102) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). ● This indicates a 53% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 0% (0/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. ● February 2017 scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 8% (9/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment. ● This indicates an 8% increase over half of the school year.

					- September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 1% (1/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Beginning of the Year Assessment. - February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 57% (60/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (Score of 80 or higher) on the Treasures End of Year Assessment. - This indicates a 56% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% - April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% - This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Math Intervention Program Funded through Title 1	YES	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate	- September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 5 % (5/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. - February 2017 Mid- Year Everyday

| | | | | | Math assessment indicates 72% (76/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math End of Year Assessment. |
| | | | | | ● This indicates a 67 % increase over the duration of the school year. |

*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.

● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93%
● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9%
● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.

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

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Weekly Professional Learning Community based on student data.	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and attendance rate	- September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. - February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (24/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures End of the Year Assessment. - This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/53) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher). - February 2017 DRA indicates 49% (26 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or

					above grade level (score of 3 or higher).
					• This indicates a 49% increase over half of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					• September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment.
					• February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 3% (2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment.
					• This indicates a 3% increase over half of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					• September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93%
					• April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9%
					• This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.

Math	ELLs	Professional Learning Community	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate	- September 2016 beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 1% (1 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. - February 2017 Mid-Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 74% (39 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Mid-Year Assessment. - This indicates a 73% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% - April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% - This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Weekly Professional Learning Community based on student data.	Yes	Increase in student DRA levels, increase in Treasure ELA assessment scores, increase in Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment scores, and	September 2016 DRA indicates 5 % (6/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment).

				attendance rate	● February 2017 DRA indicates 58% (61/102) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners were reading on above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment).
					● This indicates a 53% increase over half of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					● September, scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 0% (0/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment.
					● February 2017 scaffolded writing dynamic assessment indicates 8% (9/106) of the Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored 80% or greater on the assessment.
					● This indicates an 8% increase over half of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					● September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 1% (1/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the

					Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 57% (60/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (Score of 80 or higher) on the Treasures End of Year Assessment. ● This indicates a 56% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Community	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores, increase, attendance rate	● September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 5 % (5/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. ● February 2017 Mid- Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 72% (76/106) of Economically Disadvantaged Kindergartners scored proficient (score of 80 or higher) on the Everyday Math End of Year Assessment.

					● This indicates a 67 % increase over the duration of the school year.
					*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
					● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.

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

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

ELA	ELLs	Family Literacy Night	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On February 23, 2017, 25% of the ELL families (13 out of 53) attended the Morris Avenue School's Family Literacy Night.
ELA	ELLs	Book Clubs	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On October 14, 2016, December 22, 2016, and February 24, 2017 21% of the ELL families (11 out of 53) attended the Morris Avenue School's Book Club morning Event.
ELA	ELLs	Read Across America Parent Readers	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● During the week of February 27, 2017, 13% of the ELL parents (7 out of 53) participated in Morris Avenue School's Read Across America Afternoon Activities.
ELA	ELLs	Tools and Treasures Reading and Writing Parent Visitation program	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On November 22, 2016 & March 17, 2017 26% of the ELL parents (14 out of 53) participated in Morris Avenue School's Tools and Treasures program.
Math	ELLs	Tools and Treasures Math Parent Visitation program	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On January 26, 2017, 17% of the ELL families (9 out of 53) attended the Morris Avenue School's Math Day Afternoon.

Math	ELLs	Makerspace Night	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On April 27, 2017, 43% of the ELL families (23 out of 53) attended the Morris Avenue School's Makerspace night.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Family Literacy Night	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On February 23, 2017, 25% of the Economically disadvantaged families (27 out of 106) attended the Morris Avenue School's Family Literacy Night.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Book Clubs	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On October 14, 2016, December 22, 2016, and February 24, 2017 18% of the Economically disadvantaged families (19 out of 106) attended the Morris Avenue School's Book Club morning Event.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read Across America Parent Readers	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● During the week of February 27, 2017, 29% of the Economically disadvantaged families (31 out of 106) participated in Morris Avenue School's Read Across America Afternoon Activities.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Tools and Treasures Reading and Writing Parent Visitation program	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On November 22, 2016 & March 17, 2017 15% of the Economically disadvantaged families(15 out of 106) participated in Morris Avenue

					School's Tools and Treasures program.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Tools and Treasures Math Parent Visitation program	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On January 26, 2017, 11% of the Economically disadvantaged families (12 out of 106) attended the Morris Avenue School's Math Day Afternoon.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Makerspace Night	Yes	Sign in Sheets	● On April 27, 2017, 34% of the ELL families (36 out of 106) attended the Morris Avenue School's Makerspace night.

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

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

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

_____   _____   _____

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

2017-2018 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

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

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	Treasures Diagnostic Assessment DRA Assessment Attendance Rates	- September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 2% (2/114) of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment. - February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 58% (66/114) of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures Mid- Year Assessment. - This indicates a 56% increase over the duration of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 1% (1/114) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (Score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). - February, 2017 DRA indicates 58% (67/114) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher on the DRA Assessment). - This indicates a 57% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. - September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93%

		● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Academic Achievement - Writing	Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment Attendance Rates	● September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0% (0/114) of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment. ● February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 9% (10/114) of Kindergartners scored an 80% or higher on the assessment. ● This indicates a 9% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Everyday Math Assessment Attendance Rates	● September 2016 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 8% (9/114) of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. ● February 2017 Mid-Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 80% (91/114) of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. ● This indicates an 72% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year. ● September, 2016 Morris Avenue attendance rate was at 93% ● April, 2017 Morris Avenue attendance rate was 93.9% ● This indicates a .9% increase over 7 months.

Family and Community Engagement	Sign in Sheets Parent Surveys Feedback Forms	• The average attendance by parents for all school hour activities was 26%. • The average attendance by parents for all evening and after school activities was 41%. • 96% of Parents completed the Parent Survey.
Professional Development	PLC meetings 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. • 100% of staff completed the Professional Development Survey • 100% of staff was offered Professional Development hours during half day PD trainings and at weekly faculty meetings. • These meetings are mandatory for all staff.
Leadership	Principal Learning Network Meetings Management Meetings	• The Building administrator (principal) was in attendance for 100% of the Principal Learning Network meetings. • 100% of Leadership and Administration team was offered the opportunity to meet weekly to develop and monitor school wide data. They also had the opportunity to attend specific trainings to target the needs of their building based upon aggregated data.
School Climate and Culture	Teacher, student and parent Surveys. School Climate Surveys	• 100% of staff completed the perception survey in November, 2016. • 100% of Kindergartners completed the student perception survey on school climate. • 96% of parents of kindergartners completed the parent perception survey on school climate.
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A
Homeless Students	N/A	N/A
Migrant Students	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	Link It Data:	• September 2016 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (81 or higher)

| | ELA Treasures Diagnostic Assessment.

DRA Assessment.

Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment

Everyday Math Assessment | on the Treasures Beginning of the year Assessment.
● February 2017 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 45% (24/53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Treasures End of the Year Assessment.
● This indicates a 45% increase over half of the school year.

*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.

● September 2016 DRA Assessment indicates 0% of the ELL population (0/53) of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher).
● February 2017 DRA indicates 49% (26 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners were reading on or above grade level (score of 3 or higher).
● This indicates a 49% increase over half of the school year.

*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.

● September, 2016 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 0 % (0/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored 80% or higher on the writing rubric of the assessment.
● February 2017 Scaffolded Writing Dynamic Assessment indicates 3% (2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners scored 80% or higher on the writing rubric of the assessment.
● This indicates a 3% increase over half of the school year.

*A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.

● September 2016 beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 1% (1 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Beginning of the Year Assessment. |

		- February 2017 Mid-Year Everyday Math assessment indicates 74% (39 out of 53) of the ELL population of Kindergartners scored proficient (80 or higher) on the Everyday Math Mid-Year Assessment. - This indicates a 73% increase over half of the school year. *A 3rd Assessment will be administered at the end of May, which will show growth reflective of the whole school year.
Economically Disadvantaged	Lunch Status Application Genesis Database	92% (97 out of 106) of students in Kindergarten receive free lunch. 8% (9 out of 106) of students in Kindergarten receive reduced lunch.

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

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

Our school conducted a comprehensive needs assessment using teacher perception surveys, standardized assessments, and local assessments. The Title 1 Committee analyzed data gathered. Results from the surveys along with all standardized assessments and students' achievement on local assessments were analyzed and discussed at PLC meetings and faculty meetings. This report focuses on goals in the area of Language Arts Literacy and Writing. The report addresses the needs of specialized populations as identified in the information gathered as well as the effectiveness of Parent Involvement activities throughout the school year.

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

Data collected for language arts literacy were the DRA and the Treasures reading assessments Data collected for writing were the Dynamic Writing Assessment and the Tools of the Mind Writing samples. Data collected for both language arts and writing were attendance data, professional development feedback surveys, perception survey data, as well as teacher observations and evaluations.

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

The quantitative data from the collection methods is valid and reliable because the assessment tools measure what they intend to measure and the assessments will yield same results on repeated occasions as proven through research. The surveys used to collect qualitative data are both established and reliable (The New Jersey School Climate Survey). The surveys are also translated and the parents complete the surveys in their native language.

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

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

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

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

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

Student achievement data is reviewed quarterly by the school leadership team. At risk students are targeted and interventions are put into place by the I&RS team. The school leadership team developed timelines to implement the interventions. The interventions are then either modeled by a

team member or monitored to ensure follow through. The team reconvenes every four to six weeks to review, update, and modify individual student goals as well as share data with all stakeholders who will in turn share with the staff as well as the school SKIP team for further planning in the area of professional learning.

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

Multiple opportunities are available for academically at risk students such as daily small group reading tutorial pull out and push in services and the district academic summer camp program. All students are instructed using research based programs. Tier II interventions such as the Before School Tutoring Program, Before School Speech/Language Groups, and Intervention Lab were utilized to provide interventions/support to at-risk students. Parents are invited to various workshops which offer information so that they can assist their children at home.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

Grade level representatives and elected members of the teaching staff serve on the Title I/ESSA committee as well as the Professional Development committee. At these committee meetings, data is gathered, presented and utilized to determine school wide goals and implementation of new programs to reach these goals. All classroom teachers are a part of professional learning communities that analyze data and make informed instructional decisions based on their analysis.

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

Transitional Professional Learning Communities are in place for preschool and Kindergarten Teachers. Kindergarten teachers are able to visit

preschool classrooms. Preschool students and their teacher visit kindergarten classrooms monthly starting in February of their four-year-old school year. The kindergarten students visit their future school and tour the building and visit first grade classes.

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

Data was gathered and carefully analyzed by the school wide Title I Committee. The comprehensive needs assessment was used. This is a thorough document and input is gathered by all stakeholders. The team selected the priority problems for this plan after analyzing the comprehensive needs assessment.

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	Reading	Writing
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	According to DRA and Treasures Diagnostic assessment administered Mid-Year: · 58 % of the total Kindergarten population (67 out of 114) are reading on or above grade level as of February 2017 (Score of 3 or higher) on the DRA · 51% of the ELL population of Kindergarten students (27 out of 53) are not reading on grade level (Score of 3 or below) on the DRA assessment in February 2017 The data represents a need for improvement in the area of Reading Instruction.	According to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment administered Mid-Year: ● 9% of the total Kindergarten population(10/114) was writing on a proficient level as of 2/17 with a score of 80% or higher on the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment. ● 3% (2/53) of the ELL Population of Kindergartners was writing on a proficient level with a score of 80% or higher on the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment as of 2/17 The data represents a need for improvement in the area of Reading Instruction.
Describe the root causes of the problem	ELL learners lack understanding of the main language (English) and lack Oral Language Development due to a limited amount of exposure. Though teachers have participated in professional learning in regard to ELL and ESL students, there is still a need for continued professional learning experience addressing the needs of	ELL learners lack understanding of the main language (English) and lack Oral Language Development due to a limited amount of exposure. These students also experience difficulty in the mechanics of writing, a lack of fine motor skills, as well as expressing their ideas orally and in writing. Though teachers have participated

	ELL and ESL students.	in professional learning in regard to ELL and ESL students, there is still a need for continued professional learning experience addressing the needs of ELL and ESL students.
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL, Economically Disadvantaged	ELL, Economically Disadvantaged
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA/Reading	ELS/Writing
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Treasures and Triumphs	Tools of the Mind Writing Program
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The Treasures reading program as well as Triumphs Tier 3 intervention program are fully aligned to the Common Core State Standards.	Tools of the Mind Writing Program is fully aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

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

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

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Parent and Community Involvement	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	There is insufficient percentage of parental involvement for during and after school programs, including programs that pertain to parents supporting the developing mathematics and language skills in children at home. Events with student performances are highly attended venues. Events such as curriculum visitation days are moderately attended by pa rents. Events which include light refreshments with a school event may increase parental involvement and encourage family time. Offering transportation during inclement weather could increase attendance for families that oftentimes walk. In addition, planning rain dates for events which occur during in climate weather. The use of the districts' auto-dialer for reminders of events in three languages may yield a higher turn-out rate for events. ● 28% of parents volunteered during Read Across America to participate in classroom literacy activities. 27% of families attended Kindergarten Tools and Treasures Reading and Writing Day.	

Describe the root causes of the problem	Language, work hours, weather and transportation	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL, Economically Disadvantaged	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA Reading and Writing	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	What Works Clearinghouse- Shared Book Reading http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=458 (April 2015)	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Through the New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders, staff will build relationships with parents, guardians, families and agencies to support student learning (standard 9).	

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	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 - Reading	ELLs	Triumphs Reading Intervention Program	Classroom Teacher, Bilingual Teacher	59% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by February 2018. This will show a 10% growth from February, 2017	Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade What Works Clearinghouse (2016) https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/wwc_foundationalreading_070516.pdf **"Reciprocal Teaching"** Intervention Report, (November 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved

					from:
					http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=626
					Ford, K. L., Cabell, S. Q., Konold, T. R., Invernizzi, M., & Gartland, L. R. (2013). Diversity among Spanish-speaking English language learners: Profiles of early literacy skills in kindergarten. *Reading and Writing, 26(6)*, 889-912. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-012-9397-0
ELA - Reading	ELLs	Intervention Lab	Special Education Teacher, Student Advisor	59% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by February 2018. This will show a 10% growth from February, 2017	**"Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School"** Practice Guide, (April 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19 EVIDENCE REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INTERVENTIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, VERSION 2.2 (January, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_ell_protocol_v2.2.pdf

ELA - Writing	ELLs	Small Group Writing Instruction during Exploration Stations	Classroom Teacher	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf Writing Considerations for ELLs. Retrieved from: https://www.brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/teaching-diverse-learners/writing
ELA - Writing	ELLs	Intervention Lab	Special Education Teacher, Student Advisor	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	EVIDENCE REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INTERVENTIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, VERSION 2.2 (January, 2013). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_ell_protocol_v2.2.pdf Writing Instruction and Assessment for English Language Learners K-8. By Susan Lenski and Frances Verbruggen. Copyright © 2010. (Chapter 3 Facilitating Writing Fluency). Retrieved from: http://www.guilford.com/excerpts/lenski2.pdf

ELA - Reading	Economically Disadvantaged	Triumphs Reading Intervention Program	Classroom Teacher, Bilingual Teacher	70% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by February 2018.

This will show a 12% growth from February, 2017 | Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School. (April, 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Practice Guide.aspx?sid=19 |
| ELA - Reading | Economically Disadvantaged | Intervention Lab | Special Education Teacher, Student Advisor | 70% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by February 2018.

This will show a 12% growth from February, 2017 | Booker, K. C., Invernizzi, M. A., & McCormick, M. (2007). "Kiss your brain": A closer look at flourishing literacy gains in impoverished elementary schools. *Reading Research and Instruction, 46(4),* 315-339. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19388070 709558474 |
| ELA - Writing | Economically Disadvantaged | Small Group Writing Instruction during Exploration Station | Classroom Teacher | 28% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018.

This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017 | Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/P racticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf

Meier, J., & Sullivan, A. K. (2004). Spotlight schools: Success stories from high-risk kindergartens. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 20(3),* |

					285-304. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10573560490429104
ELA - Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Intervention Lab	Special Education Teacher, Student Advisor	28% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf **Strategies for Closing the Gap: Predicting Student Performance in Economically Disadvantaged Schools.** Tajalli, Hassan; Opheim, Cynthia. *Educational Research Quarterly*, v28 n4 p44-54 2005 Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ718119

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

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

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA - Reading	ELLs	ELA Intervention Program Funded through Title 1	Before School Tutors	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Studying_ Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural_Schools.pdf
ELA - Writing	ELLs	ELA Intervention Program Funded through Title 1	Before School Tutors	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf
ELA - Reading	Economically Disadvantaged	ELA Intervention	Before	70% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of	Teaching Academic Content and

| | | Program Funded through Title 1 | School Tutors | Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by February 2018.

This will show a 12% growth from February, 2017 | Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School (April 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/19

Addressing Summer Reading Setback among Economically Disadvantaged Elementary Students
Allington, Richard L.; McGill-Franzen, Anne; Camilli, Gregory; Williams, Lunetta; Graff, Jennifer; Zeig, Jacqueline; Zmach, Courtney; Nowak, Rhonda
Reading Psychology, v31 n5 p411-427 (2010)
http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ900788 |
| ELA - Writing | Economically Disadvantaged | ELA Intervention Program Funded through Title 1 | Before School Tutors | 28% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018.

This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017 | Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf

Booker, K. C., Invernizzi, M. A., & McCormick, M. (2007). "Kiss your brain": A closer look at flourishing literacy gains in impoverished elementary |

				schools. *Reading Research and Instruction, 46(4),* 315-339. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19388070709558474

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA-Reading	ELLs	Professional Learning Communities	Teachers, principal	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according	Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School.

ELA- Writing	ELLs	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Teachers, principal	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf Miguel Angel Serrano, "Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling" (January 1, 2012). *ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso.* Paper AAI3525792. http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AAI3525792
		PLC's		to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	(April, 2014). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=19 Miguel Angel Serrano, "Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling" (January 1, 2012). *ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso.* Paper AAI3525792. http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AAI3525792
ELA- Writing	ELLs	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Teachers, principal	23% of the ELL population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf Miguel Angel Serrano, "Professional learning communities as a critical structure for ELL schooling" (January 1, 2012). *ETD Collection for University of Texas, El Paso.* Paper AAI3525792. http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/dissertations/AAI3525792

ELA-Reading	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Teachers, principal	70% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by February 2018. This will show a 12% growth from February, 2017	Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). What Works Clearinghouse. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
ELA-Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Teachers, principal	28% of the Economically Disadvantaged population of Kindergartners will be performing on or above grade level according to the Scaffolded Dynamic Writing Assessment by February 2018. This will show a 20% growth from February, 2017	Teaching Elementary Students to be Effective Writers (June 2012). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). What Works Clearinghouse. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for

				Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2017-2018 school year)

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

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2017-2018? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

The schoolwide program will be evaluated monthly by the Title I committee. The team consists of the building administrator, student advisor, PIRT representative, Title 1 tutor representative, special education teacher representative, ESL teacher representative, and two parent representatives.

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

Challenges the school anticipates will be getting the students in need of extended day program to participate in the program (due to transportation difficulties) as well as being able to use student based technology effectively during instruction.

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

The school will obtain necessary buy-in from all stakeholders by keeping all lines of communication opened between the school Title I

team and the teachers through meeting minutes being shared. The school will communicate with families about all available resources for students and families through flyers, school web site and the auto dialer being translated in 3 languages.

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

A school climate/perception survey will be distributed to all staff at the beginning and end of the year. Data will be reviewed and analyzed by all stakeholders on a monthly basis.

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

Parents and community members will receive a survey at the beginning of the year.   The community needs assessment survey will be distributed to all families and data will be used to develop family and community engagement activities throughout the year.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

Student achievement data is reviewed quarterly by the school leadership team. At risk students are targeted and interventions are put into place by the I&RS team. The school leadership team developed timelines to implement the interventions. The interventions are then either modeled by a team member or monitored to ensure follow through. The team reconvenes every four to six weeks to review, update, and modify individual student goals as well as share data with all stakeholders who will in turn share with the staff as well as the school SKIP team for further planning in the area of professional learning. The interventions that are not currently in place will be rolled out to staff during staff meetings and will be focused on individual students' needs. Mid-year Principal/teacher data meetings are held to ensure that all students that are struggling academically are identified and individual goals/plans are established.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

Many interventions will be imbedded in the daily workings of the school day, such as small group reading instruction. Other interventions frequency will be determined in September when schedules and staffing are in place. Other students who need more intensive, targeted interventions will receive either Intervention Lab or the Before School Tutoring program and/or any other specific intervention determined necessary by the I&RS team.

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

Intervention programs such as Triumphs Tier 3 Reading Intervention Program will be used to support the needs of our students.

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

DRA Reading Assessment data, Treasures Diagnostic Assessment and the Dynamic Writing Assessment will be used from the beginning, mid and end of the year administration of the assessments. All academic data will be stored in the Link-It database that allows the data to be sorted by demographic and it can easily be accessed and reviewed by all stakeholders.

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

All data will be presented at staff meetings and PLCs as well as shared with stakeholder groups at monthly Title I meetings.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

SEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services
Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA-Reading	ELLs	Bi-Monthly Curriculum Visitation days in the form of Book Clubs, Read Alouds	Classroom Teacher, Student	45% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime literacy activities.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families

		or Program Component Demonstrations with take home activities.	Facilitator, Building Administrator		
ELA-Writing	ELLs	Bi-Monthly Curriculum Visitation days in the form of Book Clubs, Read Alouds or Program Component Demonstrations with take home activities.	Classroom Teacher, Student Facilitator, Building Administrator	45% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime literacy activities.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families
ELA-Reading	Economically Disadvantaged	Bi-Monthly Curriculum Visitation days in the form of Book Clubs, Read Alouds or Program Component Demonstrations with take home activities.	Classroom Teacher, Student Facilitator, Building Administrator	45% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime literacy activities.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families
ELA-Writing	Economically Disadvantaged	Bi-Monthly Curriculum Visitation days in the form of Book Clubs, Read Alouds or Program Component Demonstrations with take home activities.	Classroom Teacher, Student Facilitator, Building Administrator	45% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime literacy activities.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families

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?

   Parents need to be informed of the importance of education and student attendance in relation to student success in Reading and Writing. To increase parental involvement in the school and to strengthen the home-school connection, parental involvement activities in reading and writing will be implemented. To see and encourage parental involvement further, we will continue to maintain web pages, school Twitter accounts and District Facebook accounts to remain in daily contact with all families to encourage positive participation in their child's education. Incentives and rewards will be provided to families in attendance, and classrooms with the highest percentage of attendees will be recognized.

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

   The school will engage parents by having them give input into the procedures that are established within the district parent involvement policy by inviting parents to take part on the Title I committee. In addition, parents will be given surveys or questionnaires that will provide valuable input in regards to the district's parent involvement 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 in the beginning of the school year and it will be posted on the school district's website so that it will be accessible to all families and community stakeholders. Paper copies (translated into student's native language) will be provided, as needed.

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

   The school will engage parents in the development of school-parent compact by inviting parents to become stakeholders on the Title I committee as well as completing all parent surveys and questionnaires and offering invitations to all school events.

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

   The school-parent compact is sent home with students. Parents are asked to sign the document and return it to the school. Teachers and the Student Advisor will follow-up, by way of phone calls and home visits, to ensure a compact is returned for every student.

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

   School achievement data is reported to the public via the school report card, Parent Involvement Activities, Board Meetings and notifications sent home.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?

   If the district has not met their annual measurable objectives, parents will be notified by letter.

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

Disaggregated assessment results are reported via the school report card. Additionally, a public presentation is given at a designated board meeting.

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

    Parent representatives are members of the school Title I committee.

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

    Parent/Teacher conferences will be held 2 times per year. Report cards will be sent home at the end of each marking period. Parents of students at risk will be contacted through phone calls and letters home to invite them to attend Intervention and Referral Team Meetings, as needed.   Parents will be active members of the I&RS Team and will help to develop Action Plans to increase their child's achievement.   If available, letters will be sent home inviting students to attend before/during school tutoring sessions focusing on specific and measurable goals. All contact with parents will be documented on Genesis Database.

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

    Funds will be allocated for supplemental supplies, light refreshments as well as materials for parent research based handouts during curriculum nights, family fun nights, parent curriculum walks.

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	36 100%	Offer a variety of in-district and out of district workshop opportunities. Teachers will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, classroom guidance and management, parent involvement and discipline. Coaches will visit classrooms and model lessons, strategies and techniques. Credentials are located in the Main Office
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0 0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	22 100%	Offer a variety of in-district and out of district workshop opportunities. Paraprofessionals will be offered an abundance of professional development activities dealing with subject area content, classroom guidance and management, parent involvement and discipline. Coaches will visit classrooms and model lessons, strategies and techniques. 60 credits or Para Pro Test
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	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 Assistant Superintendents, as well as the District Administrators attends college and university fairs to recruit highly qualified teachers. Job openings are also posted in the local newspapers and on the district's website. The district offers a high-quality mentoring program for new teachers, as well as an extensive new teacher induction program. This program is conducted throughout the school year and attendance is mandatory for all new teachers. Highly qualified specialists and district personnel are used to help new teachers achieve success in their classroom. Every new teacher is assigned a veteran teacher to help them with the routine problems and concerns that face new teachers. This program coupled with an extensive interview process has helped the district to retain highly qualified teachers. Teachers are afforded the opportunity to advance their studies by attending in-services, workshops, and conferences in and out of the district. Every Instructional Assistant in the district has met the NCLB requirement. With the onset of the new legislation, Long Branch entered into an agreement with the Brookdale Community College to offer courses to all of the paraprofessionals in the district. This was done at the expense of the district and enabled many paraprofessionals to receive their Associate of Arts Degree and become highly qualified. Those who did not attend Brookdale courses attended prep sessions so that they were able to take the Para-Pro test. Retention rate of paraprofessionals is high in the Long Branch School District.	Primarily the Assistant Superintendents in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff, Principals, and Supervisors.