

# NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## OFFICE OF TITLE I



## 2013-2014 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN\*

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

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: LONG BRANCH	School: Morris Avenue School
Chief School Administrator: MICHAEL SALVATORE	Principal: Matthew Johnson
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: mjohnson@longranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact: Kevin Carey	Principal's Phone Number: 732.571.3139
Title I Contact E-mail: kcarey@longbranch.k12.nj.us	

### Principal's Certification

**The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Note:** Signatures must be kept on file at the school.

I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of Schoolwide Plan. I have been an active member of the planning committee and provided input to the school 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

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

### Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

**Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.**

Note: For continuity, some representatives from this needs assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder group planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the needs assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office for review. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. \*Add lines as necessary.

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Matthew Johnson	School Staff-Administrator	YES	YES	YES	
Meghann Cavanagh	School Staff- Literacy Specialist	YES	YES	YES	
Kelly Stone	School Staff- Math Specialist	YES	YES	YES	
Michael Sheckler	School Staff- Guidance	YES	YES	No	
Kim Corso	School Staff- Classroom Teacher	YES	YES	No	
Michelle Newberry	School Staff- Classroom Teacher	YES	YES	No	
Judy Acer	School Staff- NCLB Tutor	YES	YES	No	

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

### Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

The purpose of this committee is to organize and oversee the needs assessment process; lead the development of the schoolwide plan; and conduct or oversee the program's annual evaluation.

List the dates of the meetings when the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the needs assessment and Schoolwide Plan development. \*Add rows as necessary.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
		Needs Assessment	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Tuesday, November 27, 2012		Review School wide Goals: discuss implementation of new programs, discussion of standardized assessment results, data collection discussion	<b>x</b>		<b>x</b>	
Tuesday, December 18, 2012		Data check: Discussion of attendance data, discussion of parental involvement, discussion of allocation of funds, discussion of professional development opportunities with a member of the school PD committee	<b>x</b>		<b>x</b>	
Tuesday, January 29, 2013		Data Check: Review of assessment results, conduct data walk (benchmark data review, attendance of students scoring below grade	x		x	

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

		level, reading data, math data, afterschool program data) , discussion of how to implement school wide goals				
Tuesday, February 26, 2013		Data Collection	x		x	
Tuesday, March 12, 2013		Plan Development	x		x	
Tuesday, April 16, 2013		Program Evaluation	x		x	

### School's Vision

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our purpose here?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work here?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

<b>What is the school's vision statement?</b>	Our vision is to inspire students to reach to their highest potential by establishing a supportive learning community that meets the needs of each individual student.
---	--

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

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

### Evaluation of 2012-2013 Schoolwide Program

1. Was the program implemented as planned?

Majority of the plan was implemented as planned. All of the new programs were implemented with monitoring and accountability, with the exception of the program, “Reading Eggs” for our grade 1 students. This program was not available for use.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

The strengths of the implementation process were the communication and collaboration for most of the team/leadership team in the building to ensure that the plans were carried out and that there was accountability.

3. What were the barriers or challenges during the implementation process?

Barriers would be providing not having much available after school hours for at risk 1<sup>st</sup> grade students in the areas of ELA and Mathematics.

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

Initially staff was excited about the new program and was provided with district level and school level professional development and support to begin implementation. Teachers were investing much time into understanding and preparing materials for lessons.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

Because of the amount of time spent preparing materials, teachers were not always as well planned as the facilitators and principals would like to see.

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

The buy in was not very difficult because most of the initiatives were district wide and being implemented throughout the school district and supported by central office administration.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff?

The staff was very excited about the newly implemented ELA Core reading program. A new program aligned to the Common Core was needed to help in student mastery of the standards. With the new program came a large amount of planning time needed.

This was a challenge for staff members. The staff also faced challenges with PLC's being teacher driven. They perceived PLCs as adding even more to their work load and dedicated little of their time to the planning of what needed to be addressed, discussed, and planned during this time. In its third year of implementation the math program have 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.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

### 7. What were the perceptions of the community?

The community perception was overall pleased with the opportunities students would be receiving with a new Core Reading Program as well as the availability of the Core program in Spanish for the bilingual student population. They were pleased that the new program would support the new Common Core Standards. Majority of the community was pleased with the opportunity some students had to be a part of the afterschool tutorial with Study Island. One downfall was that we had to cap the number of participants per session due to number of computers and tutors afterschool and there were parents requesting their children to be a part of the program.

The parents of the community were pleased with the community involvement activities to support both ELA and Mathematics and were pleased to have translation available.

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

The methods of delivery varied with each program. For example, the PLCs were a transition from Facilitator lead component meetings and trainings to teacher lead Professional Learning Communities. The delivery of the new Core Reading Program began with summertime district level staff training from the Company and was followed up with facilitator trainings, school level trainings given by the facilitators, grade level trainings given by the facilitators and one on one coaching provided to individual teachers by the facilitator.

### 8. How were the interventions structured?

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

Interventions were structured by 8 week data review cycles by the school leadership team. When reviewing the data the team identified at risk students based on multiple indicators. Once students were identified, collaboration then took place with classroom teachers of the identified students to target even more specific areas that need to be addressed and academic plans were put in place with either in class, pull out or afterschool interventions.

9. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Instructional intervention took place on a daily basis during ELA and math instruction. These programs are structured in such a way to provide intervention at small group and centers everyday. Some students received push in assistance daily, some biweekly by NCLB reading tutors as well as ESL support staff. Some students received pull out instruction in reading daily in grades 1 and 2.

10. What technologies were utilized 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 and students had access to classroom computers, a computer lab and a laptop cart. All students in grade 2 had access to Study Island and Achieve3000 online programs. Additional intervention strategies included after school tutoring both through the bilingual department as well as Study Island available for students below grade level in both mathematics and ELA.

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

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

Technology did contribute to the success for the program. Students using both Study Island and Aceive3000 showed growth.

### Evaluation of 2012-2013 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	2011-2012	2012-2013	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency.
Kindergarten	n/a	134	Small Group Reading instruction	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency. This was the first year of implementation for guided small group reading teachers were in need of more training in small group reading instruction.</p> <p>By June of 2013, 108 kindergarten students (80.5%) were reading at least 10 words correct per minute or better. By June of 2013, 64 kindergarten students (47%) were reading at least 20 words correct per minute or better.</p>
Kindergarten	n/a	134	Alternate program intervention materials used for instruction	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency. This was the first year of implementation and many teachers need to further develop their lesson planning for student intervention.</p> <p>By June of 2013, 108 kindergarten students (80.5%) were reading at least 10 words correct per minute or better. By June of 2013, 64 kindergarten students (47%) were reading at least 20 words correct per minute or better.</p>
Grade 1	n/a	115	Small group reading instruction	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency. This was the first year of implementation for guided small group reading teachers were in need of more</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

				<p>training in small group reading instruction.</p> <p>77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year. This result supports the interventions in place for students that were falling below grade level.</p>
Grade 1	n/a	72	Alternate program intervention materials used for ELA instruction	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency. This was the first year of implementation and many teachers need to further develop their lesson planning for student intervention.</p> <p>22/72 (30.5%) of the Bilingual population of grade 1 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>26/74 (35%) of the Bilingual population of grade 1 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 4.5% increase from baseline to end of year. This result supports the interventions in place for students that were falling below grade level.</p>
Grade 1	n/a	13	Pull out for small group reading instruction with NCLB tutor	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency. These students began the year well below proficiency and did make gains. This population of students is at risk and most are referred to INRS.</p> <p>11/13 showed growth in the words correct per minute</p>

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION**

				<p>score throughout the school year                  2/13 were considered on grade level for WCMP based on the end of year assessment                  Though 84% of the students provided this intensive instruction showed improvement, only 7% (2 students) were able to achieve grade level by the June assessment.</p>
Grade 2	n/a	107	Small group reading instruction	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency.                  This was the first year of implementation and many teachers need to further develop their lesson planning for student intervention.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year. This result supports the interventions in place for students that were falling below grade level.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment)</p> <p>79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment.</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

				<p>This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year. This result supports the interventions in place for students that were falling below grade level.</p>
Grade 2	n/a	38	Alternate program intervention materials used for ELA instruction	<p>Though students demonstrated growth, standard of achievement was below proficiency. This was the first year of implementation and many teachers need to further develop their lesson planning for student intervention. ELL teachers are in need of further training on English instruction.</p> <p>14/38 (36%) of the Bilingual population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>19/42 (45%) of the Bilingual population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 9% increase from baseline to end of year. This result supports the interventions in place for students that were falling below grade level.</p> <p>8/38 (21%) of the Bilingual population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment. 24/42 (57%) of the Bilingual population of grade 1 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 36% increase from the November Assessment to end of year. This result supports the interventions in place for students that were falling below grade level.</p>
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>Interventions Provided</b>	<b>Describe why the interventions provided <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency.</b>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

Grade 1	n/a	133	Small group / differentiated math instruction	<p>98/133 or 73.7% First grades performed on or above grade level on Part A of the Everyday Math Unit Assessments. 108/133 or 92.3% of 1<sup>st</sup> grades were on or above grade level on the Everyday math Mid Year Assessment while 78/133 or 58.6% were proficient on the End of the Year Assessment.</p> <p>100% of students demonstrated growth from pre assessment data to the Unit Assessment Data in Math Unit Assessments</p>
Grade 1	n/a	17	Individual math tutoring	<p>11/17 students or 64.7% of students showed some growth in Part A of Unit Math Assessments while receiving tutoring</p>
Grade 2	n/a	107	Small group / differentiated math instruction	<p>66/107 or 61.4% of Second Graders perform on or above grade level on Part A of the Everyday Math Unit Assessments. 44/107 or 41.1% scored on or above grade level on the Everyday Math Mid Year Assessment while 27/107 or 25.2% of students scored on or above grade level on the Everyday Math End of the Year Assessment</p> <p>100% of students demonstrated growth from pre assessment data to the Unit Assessment Data in Math Unit Assessments</p>
Grade 2	n/a	18	After school tutoring Study Island	<p>13/18 or 72.2% of students showed some growth in Part A of Unit Math Assessments while receiving tutoring</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

### Evaluation of 2012-2013 Interventions and Strategies

***Interventions to Increase Student Achievement*** Implemented in 2012-2013

1 Interventions	2 Content/Group Focus	3 Effective Yes-No	4 Documentation of Effectiveness	5 Measurable Outcomes
Implementation of new Core Reading Program	ELA	Yes	Increase in students reading on grade according to the WCPM and SRI.	<p>77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment)</p> <p>79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
ELA Assessments	ELA	Yes	Increase in students reading	77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students,

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
<p>administered every 8 weeks and student data reviewed to ensure proper student placement for reading instruction.</p>			<p>on grade according to the WCPM and SRI.</p>	<p>were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment. 81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment. 73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment) 79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
<p>Grade Level Professional learning Community Meetings (PLCs)</p>	<p>ELA</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Increase in students reading on grade according to the WCPM and SRI.</p>	<p>77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment. 81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION**

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a Lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment)</p> <p>79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
Peer Coaching	ELA	Yes	Increase in students reading on grade according to the WCPM and SRI.	<p>77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment.</p> <p>This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment)</p> <p>79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
Implementation of the Standards Based Report Card	ELA	Yes	WCPM SRI	<p>77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.</p> <p>73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
				<p>achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment)            79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
Implementation of New core reading program in Spanish	ELLs/ELA	Yes	Increase in students reading on grade according to the WCPM and SRI.	<p>22/72 (30.5%) of the Bilingual population of grade 1 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.            26/74 (35%) of the Bilingual population of grade 1 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4.5% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>14/38 (36%) of the Bilingual population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.            19/42 (45%) of the Bilingual population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 9% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>8/38 (21%) of the Bilingual population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment.            24/42 (57%) of the Bilingual population of grade 1 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 36% increase from the November Assessment to end of year.</p>



## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
				27/107 or 25.2% of students scored on or above grade level on the Everyday Math End of the Year Assessment
Math Assessments	Mathematics	Yes	Increase in number of students proficient in math	<p>98/133 or 73.7% First grades performed on or above grade level on Part A of the Everyday Math Unit Assessments. 108/133 or 92.3% of 1<sup>st</sup> grades were on or above grade level on the Everyday math Mid Year Assessment while 78/133 or 58.6% were proficient on the End of the Year Assessment.</p> <p>66/107 or 61.4% of Second Graders perform on or above grade level on Part A of the Everyday Math Unit Assessments. 44/107 or 41.1% scored on or above grade level on the Everyday Math Mid Year Assessment while 27/107 or 25.2% of students scored on or above grade level on the Everyday Math End of the Year Assessment</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

### Extended Day/Year Interventions Implemented in 2012-2013 to Address Academic Deficiencies

Interventions	2 Content/Group Focus	3 Effective Yes-No	4 Documentation of Effectiveness	5 Measurable Outcomes
Study Island After School Tutorial	Mathematics/EL			

### Evaluation of 2012-2013 Interventions and Strategies

### Professional Development Implemented in 2012-2013

1 Strategy	2 Content/Group Focus	3 Effective Yes-No	4 Documentation of Effectiveness	5 Measurable Outcomes
Grade Level Professional learning Community Meetings (PLCs) ELA	ELA	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2 No	Increase in students reading on grade level due to continued professional growth.	Grade 1 SRI June 2012 70% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 1 SRI June 2013 100% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 30% increase in the number of students reading on grade level.  Grade 2 SRI June 2012 81% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 2 SRI June 2013 74% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 7% decrease in the number of students reading on grade level.
Peer Coaching	ELA	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2 No	Increase in students reading on grade level due to continued professional growth from feedback provided through peer coaching.	Grade 1 SRI June 2012 70% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 1 SRI June 2013 100% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 30% increase in the number of students reading on grade level.  Grade 2 SRI June 2012 81% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 2 SRI June 2013 74% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 7% decrease in the number of students reading on grade level.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
Peer coaching	ELA/ELLs	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2 Yes	Increase in Bilingual students reading on grade level due to continued professional growth from feedback provided through peer coaching.	Grade 1 Bilingual: SRI June 2012 57% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 1 SRI June 2013 100% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 43% increase in the number of student reading on grade level.  Grade 2 bilingual: SRI June 2012 29% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 2 SRI June 2013 74% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 45% increase in the number of students reading on grade level.
PD360	ELA	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2 No	Increase in students reading on grade level due to continued professional growth from professional learning based on best practices taught through PD360.	Grade 1 SRI June 2012 70% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 1 SRI June 2013 100% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 30% increase in the number of students reading on grade level.  Grade 2 SRI June 2012 81% of students reading on Grade Level. Grade 2 SRI June 2013 74% of students reading on Grade Level. This is a 7% decrease in the number of students reading on grade level.
Professional learning Community Meetings (PLCs)	Mathematics	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2 No	Increase in students performing on grade level due to continued professional growth from feedback provided through peer coaching.	Grade 1 Unit Assessments 2012 59.1% of students performing on Grade Level. Grade 1 Unit Assessments 2013 73.7% of students performing on Grade Level.  Grade 2 Unit Assessments 2012 76.8% of students performing on Grade Level. Grade 2 Unit Assessments 2013 61.4% of students performing on Grade Level.
Peer Coaching	Mathematics	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2	Increase in students performing on grade level due to continued professional growth from feedback provided through peer coaching.	Grade 1 Unit Assessments 2012 59.1% of students performing on Grade Level. Grade 1 Unit Assessments 2013 73.7% of students performing on Grade Level.  Grade 2 Unit Assessments 2012 76.8% of students performing on Grade Level. Grade 2 Unit Assessments 2013

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
		No		61.4% of students performing on Grade Level.
PD360	Mathematics	Grade 1 Yes  Grade 2 No	Increase in students performing on grade level due to continued professional growth from feedback provided through peer coaching.	Grade 1 Unit Assessments 2012 59.1% of students performing on Grade Level. Grade 1 Unit Assessments 2013 73.7% of students performing on Grade Level.  Grade 2 Unit Assessments 2012 76.8% of students performing on Grade Level. Grade 2 Unit Assessments 2013 61.4% of students performing on Grade Level.

### ***Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2012-2013***

1 Strategy	2 Content/Group Focus	3 Effective Yes-No	4 Documentation of Effectiveness	5 Measurable Outcomes
Attendance Awareness	ELA/Mathematics/ ELL	YES	Each marking period 100% of parents will be given informational attendance handouts at arrival or dismissal. Students who take the bus will be given notices to take home to their parents/guardians.	100% of the families received fliers quarterly sent home, at arrival or dismissal time.
Parent Teacher conferences	ELA/Mathematics/ ELL	YES	100% of all families will attend either fall and spring parent teacher conferences or be given a home visit or phone conference regarding their child's progress.	100% of all families either attended the Fall and Spring conferences, had a phone conference or a home visit.
Curriculum day visits(one per quarter) followed up by a question and answer	ELA/ELL	NO	10% increase of family involvement in all curriculum visitation days	11% of the parents of students in grade kindergarten through 2 <sup>nd</sup> attended the quarterly day visit. This is a 3% decrease from the year prior.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

1	2	3	4	5
session (w/translation available)				
Curriculum Night/take home (w/translation)	ELA/ELLs	NO	10% increase of family involvement in all curriculum visitation days	11% of the parents of students in grade kindergarten through 2 <sup>nd</sup> attended the night visit. This is a 3% decrease from the year prior.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION

### Principal's Certification

**The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Note:** Signatures must be kept on file at the school.

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**

---

**Principal's Signature**

---

**Date**

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

### 2013-2014 Needs Assessment Process *Data Collection and Analysis*

**Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Needs Assessment Process for 2013-2014 Interventions and Strategies** (Results and outcomes must be measurable.)

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes
Academic Achievement – Reading	8 Week Reading Assessment Data including Assessment Summary reflecting the Words Correct Per Minute as well as the Scholastic Reading Inventory	<p>77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment. 81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment. 73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment) 79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
Academic Achievement - Writing	Benchmark Assessments in LAL	77% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes
	(Writing)	<p>81% (115 students) Total population of grade 1 students, were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 4% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>70/107 (65%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute baseline assessment. 73/103 (70.8%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Words Correct Per Minute end of year assessment. This is a 5.8% increase from baseline to end of year.</p> <p>62/105 (58%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory November assessment (student had to achieve a lexile score of 300L or higher by this assessment) 79/106 (74%) of the Total population of grade 2 students were reading on Grade level based on the Scholastic Reading Inventory end of year assessment. This is a 16% increase from baseline to end of year.</p>
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Unit Assessments in Mathematics	<p>Unit Assessments are given at the completion of each unit in mathematics to evaluate proficiency based on content taught</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 26.3% of all first graders scored below proficient in mathematics where as 40.1% scored below proficient in the previous school year.</li> <li>• 38.4% of all second grades scored below proficient in mathematics where as 24.7% scored below proficient in the previous school year.</li> </ul>
Family and Community Engagement	Parent curriculum nights Spring and Winter concerts	<p>83% of the parents were in attendance for Kindergarten Orientation for the 2012-2013 school year, and 88% were in attendance for the 2011-2012 school year. This is a 5% increase from the year prior.</p> <p>14% parent visit to reading classes for the 2011-2012 school year, and 11% for the 2012-2013 school year. This is a 3% decrease from the year prior.</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes
		<p>43% of the families were in attendance for the 2011-2012 Math Night, and 39% were present for the 2012-2013 school year. This is a 4% decrease from the year prior.</p> <p>60% attendance at Back to School Night for the 2012- 2013 school year and 60% were in attendance for the 2011-2012 school year. There is no change.</p> <p>100% attendance for both winter and spring parent-teacher conferences for the 2012-2013 school year (including home visits and conference calls)</p> <p>73% Winter Wonderland attendance , 81% in attendance for the 2012-2013 school year. This is a 8% increase from the prior year.</p>
Professional Development	Perception Survey Sign in Sheets	<p>100% of staff completed the perception survey in February 2012, and again in February of 2013.</p> <p>94% of the teachers completed at least 20 hours for the 2012-2013 school year, this was a 1% increase from the 2011-2012 school year.</p>

### 2013-3014 Needs Assessment Process

#### *Narrative*

**1. What process did the school use to conduct its needs assessment?**

Our school conducted a comprehensive needs assessment using teacher perception surveys, standardized assessments, and local assessments. The NCLB Committee analyzed data gathered. Results form the surveys along with all standardized assessments and students' achievement on local

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

assessments were analyzed and discussed at component and faculty meetings. This report focuses on goals in the area of Language Arts Literacy and Mathematics. The report also addresses the needs of specialized populations as identified in the information gathered.

In October the NCLB committee reviewed the school's Mission and Vision and presented the statements at the faculty meeting for input and feedback. Data necessary to complete the tables were discussed and members of the teams were assigned specific data to gather and present to the team throughout the year. Programs and initiatives related to goals were discussed to assure that we are following through with our 2012-2013 plan. December's monthly meeting focused on professional development plans with the school Professional Development Committee. Data from tables of our 2012-2013 Unified Plan was presented by members and discussed to reflect. During January, data from the Benchmark Assessment was reviewed and perception surveys were distributed to all teachers. Extended Learning Programs were implemented and data was discussed. In February, Extended Day programs were discussed and planned based on data results. Results of the perception survey were discussed. Data was updated and presented. The month of March focused on data gathering; review data needed to complete Unified plan for the upcoming school year. In April the team completed evaluation of the 2012 plan and began writing and data analysis of the 2013 plan. In May and June, writing continued and priority problems are identified based on data. The month of July will conclude writing the plan with a peer review of plan.

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

Data collected for language arts literacy were the 8 week reading assessments including both words correct per minute assessments and the Scholastic Reading Inventory. Data collected for mathematics were the math unit assessments and the mathematics benchmarks as well as achievement in math fact fluency. Data collected for both language arts and mathematics were attendance data, professional development feedback surveys, perception survey data, as well as teacher observations and evaluations and curriculum facilitator feedback from learning walks and coaching sessions.

### 3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the needs assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?<sup>1</sup>

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 (Victoria Bernhardt's School Portfolio Perception Surveys). For example, the Scholastic Reading inventory (SRI) has been the subject of many scientific validation studies. The SRI research ranges from a norm study with a sample of 512,224 students to an analysis of gender, race, and ethnic differences among 19,000 fourth through ninth grade students.

---

<sup>1</sup> Definitions taken from "Understanding Research Methods" by Mildred Patten  
Patten, M. L. (2012). Understanding Research Methods. Glendale, California: Pycszak Publishing

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

In LAL, data gathered from Grade Summary Forms as well as benchmark assessments 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.

In mathematics data from math unit assessments showed that only 73.7% of 1st grade students, 61.6% of 2nd grade students scored an average of 85% or better. Black and Hispanic subgroups are shown to be the subgroups with the lowest number of students performing on or above grade level based on the unit assessments in mathematics.

### 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?

Standardized assessment data, fall and winter benchmark assessments, 8 week reading assessments (WCPM and SRI), Weekly and unit tests from the Treasures Reading Program in ELA, math unit assessments, facts mastery data, Standards based report cards per quarter, student portfolios in ELA and Math, observations by teachers, curriculum facilitators, and, weekly attendance data, and discipline referrals. These data help teachers, curriculum facilitators, student facilitators, and administrators to assess students and identify them for support.

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

Multiple opportunities are available for academically at risk students such as daily small group reading tutorial pull out and push in services, extended day/year programs such as Study Island After School tutorial for math and language art literacy, and the district academic summer camp

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

program. Students with attendance concerns are placed in a morning Sunshine Club. All students are instructed using research based programs. Parents are invited to various workshops which offer information so that they can assist their children at home.

**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 No Child Left Behind 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?

Professional Learning Community is in place for preschool and Kindergarten Teachers. Kindergarten teachers are able to visit preschool classrooms. Preschool students and their teacher visit kindergarten classrooms in the spring of their four-year-old year. The district kindergarten facilitator held parent workshops on transition as well as communicated needs for smooth social and academic transition to both preschool facilitators as well as kindergarten academic facilitators to share with staff.

**12.** How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2013-2014 schoolwide plan?

Data, from a variety of sources, was gathered and carefully analyzed by the school wide NCLB Committee. The team selected the priority problems for this plan after analyzing the data.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

### 2013-2014 Needs Assessment Process

#### *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them*

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

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	English and Language Arts	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>According to Words correct per minute reading data analyzed every 8 weeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% of the student population across the grade spans 1st through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade are reading on or above grade level as of June 2013</li> <li>• 76.5% of all Hispanic students across grades 1st through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade are reading on or above grade level as of June 2013</li> <li>• 51% of all ELL students across grade 1st through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade are reading on or above grade level as of June 2013</li> </ul> <p>The data represents a need for improvement school wide in English and Language Arts</p>	<p>Students show proficiency in Mathematics with a score of 85% or better on benchmarking as well as math unit assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data from math unit assessments showed that 73.7% of 1st grade students scored an average of 85% or better on unit assessments increasing 14.6 from 2011-2012.</li> <li>• Data from math unit assessments showed that 61.6% of 2nd grade students scored an average of 85% or better on unit assessments decreasing 17.4% from 2011-2012.</li> </ul> <p>The data represents a need for improvement school wide in Mathematics.</p>
Describe the root causes of the problem	<p>ELL and ELS student 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 and ELS students.</p>	<p>Root causes of the proficiency levels in mathematics can be attributed to the large number of ELL and ELS students and the lack of understanding of the English language and a limited amount of exposure.</p> <p>Students were not proficient in reading according to their grade level contributing to the deficiencies in mathematics</p> <p>There is a lack of purposeful planning and preparation to align with common core and best teaching practices. This can be</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

		<p>attributed to the continued new adaptation to the Common Core for Mathematics.</p> <p>There is also a lack of parental involvement in the school.</p> <p>There is a need for continued professional learning experiences to address these needs.</p>
Subgroups or populations addressed	Hispanic and ELL	ELL, ESL, Economically Disadvantaged
Related content area missed	n/a	n/a
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Treasures, Macmillan McGraw-Hill	Everyday Mathematics
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The program is aligned with the Common Core Standards with the intention that teachers are ultimately responsible for implementation of the CCSS as the standards do not dictate curriculum or teaching methods.	The program is aligned with the Common Core Standards with the intention that teachers are ultimately responsible for implementation of the CCSS as the standards do not dictate curriculum or teaching methods.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

### 2013-2014 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	<p>Insufficient percentage of parental involvement for before, during and after school programs, including programs that pertain to parents supporting the developing mathematics and language skills in children at home.</p> <p>Events with student performances are highly attended venues.</p> <p>Events such as curriculum visitation days are moderately attended by parents. Events which combine breakfast/lunch/dinner with a school event may increase parental involvement and provide a meal while encouraging family time. Offering transportation during inclement weather could increase attendance for families that oftentimes walk. In addition, planning rain dates for events which occur during in climate weather. More direct call or parent contact prior to events and functions may yield a higher turn out rate for events.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14% of families attended Family Math Game Night. This marks a 19% decrease from the previous year.</li> <li>▪ 11% of families attended Treasures night and day visits, and 14% were in attendance for Language Arts day and night events in 2011-2012. This marks a 3% decrease from the previous year.</li> </ul>	

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Describe the root causes of the problem	Language	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL and ESL	
Related content area missed	ELA and Mathematics	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems		
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) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies . . . “*

### 2013-2014 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

***ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;***

Name of Intervention	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Treasures Reading Program	ELA	Total Population Grade 1	Classroom teachers, principal, ELA facilitator	88.3% of Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures than the year prior.	<i>Beginning to read.</i> Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Camilli, G., Vargas, S., & Yurecko, M. (2006).
Treasures Reading Program	ELA	Total Population Grade 2	Classroom teachers, principal, ELA facilitator	68.5% of Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures than the year prior.	<i>Beginning to read.</i> Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Camilli, G., Vargas, S., & Yurecko, M. (2006).
Everyday Mathematics	Mathematics	Total Population	Classroom Teachers Math Facilitator	By June 2014, there will be a 10% increase of Math students	Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (September 2010). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/elementary_math/eday_math/index.asp">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/elementary_math/eday_math/index.asp</a>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES

### ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) *strengthen the core academic program in the school;*

Name of Intervention	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Principal	performing on or above grade level from previous year.	
Treasures Reading program	ELA	ELLs Grade 1	Classroom teachers, principal, ELA facilitator	41.5% of ELL students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures than the year p r i o r .	What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) review for beginning readers focuses on reading interventions for students in grades K–3. <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/br_protocol_v2.0.pdf">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/br_protocol_v2.0.pdf</a>
Treasures Reading program	ELA	ELLs Grade 2	Classroom teachers, principal, ELA facilitator	42.4% of ELL students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures than the year p r i o r .	What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) review for beginning readers focuses on reading interventions for students in grades K–3. <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/br_protocol_v2.0.pdf">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/br_protocol_v2.0.pdf</a>
Everyday	Mathematics	Total	Classroom	By June 2014,	Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (September 2010). What Works

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES

### *ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;*

Name of Intervention	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Mathematics		Population	Teachers Math Facilitator Principal	there will be a 10% increase or 71% of second graders and 80.1% of first grade Math students performing on or above grade level from previous year.	Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/elementary_math/eday_math/index.asp">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/elementary_math/eday_math/index.asp</a>

\*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

### 2013-2014 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

#### *ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;*

Name of Intervention	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
*Reading Eggs	ELA	grade 1 students	Classroom teachers, Technology Advisor, principal	88.3% of Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures then the year	Allington, R. L. (2005). <i>What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research based Programs</i> 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition. Allyn & Bacon.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES

***ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;***

Name of Intervention	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				prior.	
Study Island	ELA	2 <sup>nd</sup> grade students	Classroom teachers, Technology Advisor, principal	68.5% of Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures than the year prior.	A Foundational Research Study Connecting Response to Intervention Research to the <i>Study Island</i> Program - <i>Magnolia Consulting, LLC</i> February 13, 2009 <a href="http://www.studyisland.com/web/uploadedFiles/www.studyisland.com/Content/Results/Research/Study%20Island%20RTI%20Research%20Report.pdf">http://www.studyisland.com/web/uploadedFiles/www.studyisland.com/Content/Results/Research/Study%20Island%20RTI%20Research%20Report.pdf</a>
Study Island	Mathematics	2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	Classroom Teachers Math Facilitator Principal	By June 2014, there will be a 10% increase of Math students performing on or above grade level from previous year. Resulting in 71% of students performing on or above grade level	A Foundational Research Study Connecting Response to Intervention Research to the <i>Study Island</i> Program - <i>Magnolia Consulting, LLC</i> February 13, 2009 <a href="http://www.studyisland.com/web/uploadedFiles/www.studyisland.com/Content/Results/Research/Study%20Island%20RTI%20Research%20Report.pdf">http://www.studyisland.com/web/uploadedFiles/www.studyisland.com/Content/Results/Research/Study%20Island%20RTI%20Research%20Report.pdf</a>

### 2013-2014 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

***ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES

Name of Strategy	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Professional Learning Communities PLC's	ELA	Total Population Grade 1 & Grade 2	Facilitator, teachers, principal	68.5% of grade 2 Reading students And 88.3% of grade 1 students will be performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. This will represent 10% less failures than the year prior.	What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). <i>Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement</i> (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
PD360	All	ELL / Staff All	Facilitators, Teachers, principal	100% of teachers will receive at least 2 PD360 links in coaching feedback and/or administrative evaluations pertaining to classroom instruction observed.	Updated Findings regarding the Impact of PD 360 on Student Proficiency Rates (2009) <a href="http://schoolimprovement.com/pd_360_impact_assessment.pdf">http://schoolimprovement.com/pd_360_impact_assessment.pdf</a>
Peer Coaching	ELA	All Students	Facilitator, Teachers, Principal	68.5% of grade 2 Reading students And 88.3% of grade 1 students	What Work Clearinghouse Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: REFORM STRATEGIES

***ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.***

Name of Strategy	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
				w i l l b e performing on or above grade level according to the quarterly reading assessment data by June 2014. T h i s w i l l represent 10% less failures than the year prior.	(2007) <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=6">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=6</a>  An Interaction-Based Approach to Enhancing Secondary School Instruction and Student Achievement (2012) <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/quick_reviews/myteachingpartner_022212.pdf">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/quick_reviews/myteachingpartner_022212.pdf</a> Teacher and Leader Effectiveness (September 30, 2011) <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Topic.aspx?sid=16">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Topic.aspx?sid=16</a>

\*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

*ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance . . . such as family literacy services*

Research continues to demonstrate that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. Therefore, it is important that schoolwide plans 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.

### 2013-2014 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Name of Strategy	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Curriculum day visits(one per quarter) followed up by a question and answer session (w/translation available)	ELA	ELL	Facilitator, principal, classroom teacher	At least 19.9% parent participation is expected. This reflects 10% less of the parents not in attendance.	<a href="http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families">http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families</a>  Everyday Mathematics and Parents <a href="http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/">http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/</a>
Curriculum Night/take home(one per quarter) activities for parents (w/translation)	ELA/Math	Total population	Facilitators, classroom teachers, principal	At least 19.9% parent participation is expected. This reflects 10% less of the parents not in attendance.	<a href="http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families">http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families</a>  Everyday Mathematics and Parents <a href="http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/">http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/</a>

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Name of Strategy	Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (from IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Curriculum day visits (one per quarter) followed up by a question and answer session (w/translation available)	Mathematics	Total population	Facilitator, principal, classroom teacher	At least 10% participation Increase from the prior year having at least 4 to 5 parents attend per classroom.	<a href="http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families">http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families</a>  Everyday Mathematics and Parents <a href="http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/">http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/</a> (2011)

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

### 2013-2014 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 LAL and mathematics.

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

The school will engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy by inviting parents to take part on the NCLB committee.

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

The school-parent compact is sent home with students. Parents are asked to sign the document and return it to the school. A teachers and Solutions Team Advisors follow-up, by way of phone calls and home visit, to ensure a compact is returned for every student.

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 take part on the NCLB committee.

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

## SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The school-parent compact is sent home with students. Parents are asked to sign the document and return it to the school. A teachers and Solutions Team Advisors follow-up, by way of phone calls and home visit, 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 objectives for Title III?**

If the school is in status, parents are notified via US mail prior to students returning in September. Letters are also placed on the districts website.

**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 NCLB committee.

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

Upon receipt from the testing company, Individual Student Score Reports are mailed home.

**11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2013-2014 parent involvement funds?**

## **SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Funds were used for supplies, food and beverages as well as materials for parent research based handouts during curriculum nights, family fun nights, parent curriculum walks and parent teacher conferences.

## SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF

### *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 section 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	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.
	100%	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A		
Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by ESEA (education, ParaPro test, portfolio assessment)	14	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.
	100%	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by ESEA (education, ParaPro test, portfolio assessment)*		

## **SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF**

\* The district must assign these 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: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF

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. Therefore, the schoolwide plan must describe the strategies it will use to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
<p>The Personnel Directory and District Administrators attend college and university fairs to recruit highly qualified teachers. Job openings are also posed in the local newspapers and on the district’s web site.</p>	<p>Primarily the District Manager of Personnel and Special Projects in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, central Office Staff, Principals, and Supervisors.</p>

## SCHOOLWIDE: FISCAL REQUIREMENTS

*ESEA (b)(1)(J) Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.*

### School Budget Pages

School level budget pages in Excel must be completed along with each school's Title I Schoolwide Plan to identify how the Title I, Part A school allocation is budgeted for schools operating schoolwide programs that **do** and do **not** blend their funds

Budget Detail pages and a Budget Summary are available as an Excel program at the following location:

[www.nj.gov/education/grants/entitlement/nclb/](http://www.nj.gov/education/grants/entitlement/nclb/).

Complete the Excel budget pages for each school and upload the file on the Title I Schoolwide upload screen in the *ESEA-NCLB* Consolidated Application. These budget pages are in addition to the Title I Schoolwide Plan for each school operating an approved schoolwide program.

Budget Detail pages must be signed by the district's Business Administrator.