NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2015-2016 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
Chief School Administrator: DR. MICHAEL SALVATORE	Address: 318 Morris Avenue
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: PrK3-K
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Matthew 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**

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held _____5_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.

- State/local funds to support the school were $ _____, which comprised _____% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.

- State/local funds to support the school will be $_____, which will comprise _____% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.

- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

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 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	
Meghann Cavanagh	Classroom Teacher	YES	YES	YES	
Michael Gatta	Special Education Teacher	YES	YES	YES	
Nicole Trainor	Guidance	YES	YES	YES	
Gail Becker	Guidance	YES	YES	YES	
Tessy Slmoes	Classroom Teacher	YES	YES	YES	
Laura Iandoli	Classroom Teacher	YES	YES	YES	
Judy Acer	NCLB Tutor	YES	YES	YES	
Luz Ramirez	Parent Representative	YES	YES	YES	

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
3/25/15	Morris Avenue Conference Room	• Review school wide goals with the committee. • Prepare a list of data measures to collect and analyze Kindergarten data. • Discuss the school's current plan and progress in implementing the programs and initiatives. • Applicability and revisions of last year's plan to the new 2014-2015 Preschool-K school configuration. • Review efficacy of all data measures. • Program funds- i.e. Special education initiatives and other new goals. • Professional Development and Teacher Survey • Student Feedback.	X		X	
3/31/15	Morris Avenue Conference Room	• Review data assessment results in Title 1 Plan. • Analyze all available data to include reading and math benchmark data. • Determine how an ineffective strategy or intervention will be addressed. • Plan to review school-wide goals and findings from data analysis with the staff. • Dissemination of perception surveys to parents, students, and teachers.	X		X	

		• Discuss plan to analyze all survey results when returned. • Share overall survey results with the staff.				
4/15/15	Morris Avenue Conference Room	• Update on how perception surveys are going. • Have the student surveys begun? When is their completion expected?	X		X	
4/21/15	Morris Avenue Conference Room	• Discuss parent Involvement Activities thus far. What was successful and what was not. What will take place before the end of the year? • Is there any plan to add another program or Kindergarten initiative for the remainder of the school year?	X		X	
5/28/15	Morris Avenue Conference Room	• Review all Kindergarten data In Link It to complete the 2015 report. • It's time to begin writing the 2015 report! Evaluate goals. • Review the Vision and Mission Statements to see if they need to be updated. • Based on the data collected during the year, identify the priority problems for 2015-2016. • Submit Final Title I Schoolwide Plan to Mrs. Burtt by June 1, 2015.	X		X	

Add rows as necessary.

School's Mission

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 intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?

- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	The singular aim and sole commitment of our school system is to equip every Long Branch student with the competence and confidence to shape his/her own life, participate productively in our community, and act in an informed manner in a culturally diverse global society. Our District Leadership Team diagnostically crafted an Instructional Focus, which will serve as a roadmap for making Long Branch Public Schools a benchmark of excellence among school districts in New Jersey. The roadmap is built on four foundations, or four pillars namely: • Holding students and adults to high expectations of conduct and performance. • Ensuring that all students master the academic standards. • Working collaboratively and basing decisions on fact, not opinion. • Building strong partnerships with families and communities. New and refined school wide programs in reading, writing and math are incorporated to raise student achievement. Parental involvement activities are offered to build a stronger community partnership to enhance the education of our students.

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 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

   The plan was implemented as planned. All of the new programs were implemented with monitoring and accountability.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The strengths of the implementation process was 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 implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

   There are currently no before or after school programs for at risk students in the areas of ELA or Mathematics.

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

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

   development and support.

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

   The buy in was not very difficult because most of the initiatives were district wide and being implemented throughout the

   school district and supported by central office administration.

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 Common Core, were implemented to help in student mastery of the standards. Teachers were receptive being it was the third year of the 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 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 fifth year of implementation the 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?

   The community perception survey showed that the community was overall pleased with the opportunities students would be receiving with a core reading program as well as the availability of the core program in Spanish for the bilingual student population that is all aligned to the Common Core Standards. The parents of the community were pleased with the community involvement activities to support both ELA and Mathematics as well as Community resource night 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 varied with each program. For example, the PLCs were a combination of Administrative and Support Staff lead component meetings and trainings to teacher lead Professional Learning Communities.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

    Interventions were structured by quarterly 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. This was completed following the I&RS process lead by the student facilitator.

10. 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 every day. Some students received push in assistance daily, some biweekly by I&RS Teachers as well as ESL support staff.

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

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

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 not all classrooms were equipped with student computers.

*Provide a separate response for each question.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 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	2013-2014	2014-2015	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	2013-	2014-	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in

	2014	2015		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 2014-2015 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	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	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	94 WCPM	50 DRA2	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 third 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. Proficiency level are also difficult to compare based on the assessments used. 2013-14 the Words Correct per Minute Assessment was used for fluency whereas in 2014-15 the DRA2 assessment was used.
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

12

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	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

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
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	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
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	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
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	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.	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	ELL's	Triumphs Tier 3 Reading Intervention	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	ELLs	Differentiated Math Centers	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	ELLs	Small group Math instruction	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Small group reading instruction.	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Triumphs Tier 3 Reading Intervention	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Differentiated Math Centers	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Small group Math instruction	Yes	Increase in Everyday Math Assessment scores	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.

Extended Day/Year Interventions – **Implemented in 2014-2015 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

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

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

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – **Implemented in 2014-2015**

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.	No	Student increase in DRA Levels and Developmental Writing Stages	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	ELLs	Professional Learning Community	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Weekly Professional Learning Community based on student data	No	Student increase in DRA Levels and Developmental Writing Stages	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Community	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.

Family and Community Engagement **Implemented in 2014-2015**

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

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	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	ELLs	Literacy Craft Night	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	ELLs	Book Clubs	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	ELLs	Read Across America Parent Readers	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	ELLs	Family Success Dinner	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	ELLs	Math Day	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	ELLs	Family Success Dinner	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Family Literacy Night	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Literacy Craft Night	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Book Clubs	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Read Across America Parent Readers	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Family Success Dinner	No	Increase in student DRA levels	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Math Day	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level.

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Family Success Dinner	Yes	Student increase in the Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA* §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Principal's Certification

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

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

_____   _____   _____

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

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

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2014-2015

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	Treasures Diagnostic Assessment DRA 2 Assessment	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year. September 2014 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 4% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. February 2015 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 50% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. This indicates a 46% increase over the duration of the school year.
Academic Achievement - Writing	Writing Assessment	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year. September 2014 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 4% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. February 2015 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 50% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level.

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		This indicates a 46% increase over the duration of the school year.
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Everyday Math Assessment	September 2014 Beginning of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 7 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 End of the year Everyday Math assessment indicates 81% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 74 % increase over the duration of the school year.
Family and Community Engagement	Sign in Sheets	The average attendance by parents for all school hour activities was 37%. The average attendance by parents for all evening and after school activities was 82%.
Professional Development	Agendas	The average attendance by highly qualified staff members for Professional Learning opportunities provided by the district was 97%.
Leadership	Principal Learning Networks	The Building administrator (principal) was in attendance for 100% of the Principal Learning Network meetings.
School Climate and Culture	Teacher, student and parent surveys	100% of staff completed the perception survey in March 2015. 100% of Kindergartners completed the student perception survey on school climate. 67% of parents of kindergartners completed the parent perception survey on school climate.
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	
Students with Disabilities	N/A	
Homeless Students	N/A	
Migrant Students	N/A	
English Language Learners	Treasures Diagnostic Assessment DRA 2 Assessment	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level.

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year. September 2014 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 4% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. February 2015 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 50% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. This indicates a 46% increase over the duration of the school year.
Economically Disadvantaged	Treasures Diagnostic Assessment DRA 2 Assessment	September 2014 DRA indicates 4 % of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. June 2015 DRA indicates 52% of Kindergartners were on above grade level. This indicates a 48% increase over the duration of the school year. September 2014 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 4% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. February 2015 Treasures ELA Assessment indicates 50% of Kindergartners were on or above grade level. This indicates a 46% increase over the duration of the school year.

2015-2016 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 NCLB Committee analyzed data gathered. Results from the surveys along with all standardized assessments and students' achievement on local 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.

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 Treasures reading assessments. Data collected for mathematics were the Link It Beginning of the Year and End -Year Everyday Math assessments. 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 peer coaching sessions.

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 (Victoria Bernhardt's School Portfolio Perception Surveys).

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

   In LAL, data gathered from DRA and Treasures reading 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.

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 team reconvenes every four to six weeks to review, update and modify individual student goals.

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. 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 weekly in the spring of their four-year-old school year.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 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.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

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

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	English and Language Arts	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	According to DRA assessment administered beginning, middle and end of the year: • 52 % of the student population are reading on or above grade level as of June 2015 The data represents a need for improvement school wide in English and Language Arts for the ELL population.	According to the Everyday Math Beginning, Middle and End of the year assessments: • 81 % of the kindergarten student population scored on or above grade level as of June 2015 The data represents a need for improvement school wide in Mathematics for ELL students.
Describe the root causes of the problem	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.	Root causes of the proficiency levels in mathematics can be attributed to the large number of ELL and ESL students and the lack of understanding of the English language due to a limited amount of exposure. Students were not proficient in reading according to their grade level, this contributes to the deficiencies in mathematics There is a need for continued professional learning experiences to address instructional needs.
Subgroups or populations addressed	Hispanic and ELL	ELL, ESL, Economically Disadvantaged

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

Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English and Language Arts	Mathematics
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Treasures, Triumphs, Macmillan McGraw-Hill and On Our Way to English	Everyday Mathematics
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.	The Everyday Mathematics program us fully aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

2015-2016 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 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. The use of the districts' auto-dialer for reminders of events in three languages may yield a higher turn-out rate for events. • 12% of parents volunteered during Read Across America to participate in classroom literacy activities. • 11% of families attended Kindergarten Math Day.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Language, work hours, weather and transportation	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL	

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

Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA and Mathematics	
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* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

		ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) <u>*strengthen the core academic program in the school;*</u>			
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	ELLs	On Our Way to English	Classroom Teacher, Bilingual Teacher	56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	*Beginning to read.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Camilli, G., Vargas, S., & Yurecko, M. (2006).

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
ELA	ELLs	Triumphs Reading Intervention Program	Classroom Teacher, Bilingual Teacher	56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	*Beginning to read.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Camilli, G., Vargas, S., & Yurecko, M. (2006).
Math	ELLs	Small Group Math Instruction on Center Day.	Classroom Teacher	82.9% of Kindergarten math students will be performing on or above grade level according to the Everyday Math assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (September 2010). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/elementary_math/eday_math/index.asp
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	On Our Way to English	Classroom Teacher,	56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade	*Beginning to read.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Camilli, G., Vargas, S., & Yurecko, M. (2006).

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
			Bilingual Teacher	level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Triumphs Reading Intervention Program	Classroom Teacher, Bilingual Teacher	56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	*Beginning to read.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Camilli, G., Vargas, S., & Yurecko, M. (2006).
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Small Group Math Instruction on Center Day.	Classroom Teacher	82.9% of Kindergarten math students will be performing on or above grade level according to the Everyday Math assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less	Intervention: Everyday Mathematics (September 2010). What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved from: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/elementary_math/eday_math/index.asp

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)					
ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) <u>strengthen the core academic program in the school;</u>					
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)
				failures then the year prior.	

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 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

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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	ELLs	After School Tutorial Program using a Tiered 3 Intervention Program (Triumphs)		56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Studying_ Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural_Schools.pdf
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	After School Tutorial Program using a Tiered 3 Intervention		56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing	http://www.mheresearch.com/assets/products/45fbc6d3e05ebd93/Studying_ Effectiveness_of_Treasures_in_Rural_Schools.pdf

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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)
		Program (Triumphs)		on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 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)

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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	ELLs	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Facilitator, teachers, principal	56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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)
					Laboratory Southwest.
Math	ELLs	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Facilitator, teachers, principal	82.9% of Kindergarten math students will be performing on or above grade level according to the Everyday Math assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Facilitator, teachers, principal	56.8% of Kindergarten Reading students will be performing on or above grade level according to the DRA assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

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)
					of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Learning Communities PLC's	Facilitator, teachers, principal	82.9% of Kindergarten math students will be performing on or above grade level according to the Everyday Math assessment data by June 2016. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	What Works Clearinghouse Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.

*Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies *ESEA* §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 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 2015-2016? 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 NCLB committee. The team consists of the building administrator, student facilitators, NCLB tutor representative, special education teacher representative, ESL teacher representative, two classroom teachers and one parent representative.**

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 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 NCLB 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?

   Staff perception will be measured by the use of the Staff Perception Survey.

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

   Community perception will be measured by the use of the Family Perception Survey.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

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.

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 as well as the numbers of identified targeted students.

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

   Intervention programs such as Triumphs Tier 3 Reading Intervention and On Our Way to English 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 will be used as well as the Everyday Mathematics beginning and end of the year assessments.

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 as well as shared with stakeholder groups at monthly NCLB meetings.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

ESEA §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.

2015-2016 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	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	20.8% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime literacy activities. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/

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

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)
Math	ELLs	Bi-Monthly Curriculum Visitation days in the form of Program Component Demonstrations, Hands on Math Center Days with take home activities	Classroom Teacher, Student Facilitator, Building Administrator	19.9% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime math activities. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/
ELA	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	20.8% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime literacy activities. This will represent 10% less failures then the year prior.	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Bi-Monthly Curriculum Visitation days in the form of Program Component Demonstrations, Hands on Math Center Days with	Classroom Teacher, Student Facilitator, Building Administrator	19.9% of Kindergarten families will participate in daytime math activities. This will represent 10% less failures then	http://treasures.macmillanmh.com/new-jersey/families Everyday Mathematics and Parents http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/parents/understanding-em/assisting/

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

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)
		take home activities		the year prior.	

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

2015-2016 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?

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 achievement objectives

   (AMAO) 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 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

   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.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

SCHOOLWIDE: 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	30	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	0	
	0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	23	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, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0	
	0	

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

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

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

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
The Personnel 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.	**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.**