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.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: MOUNT HOLLY	School: John Brainerd School
Chief School Administrator: MR. JAMES DIDONATO	Address: 100 Wollner Drive – Mount Holly, NJ 08060
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: jdidonato@mtholly.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: PS – 2nd
Title I Contact: Dr. Michael Ostroff	Principal: Joseph Convery
Title I Contact E-mail: mostroff@mtholly.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: jconvery@mtholly.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 609-267-7200 x6105	Principal's Phone Number: 609-267-3600

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.

Joseph Convery
Principal's Name (Print)

Joseph Convery
Principal's Signature

6/15/15
Date

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA§1114*

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held ___4___ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ 8,609,977.87, which comprised __43% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 8,220,921.48, which will comprise 44% 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
Salary	Closing the Achievement Gap in ELA (1), Math (2)	Intervention #1 – pertaining to Basic Skills - ELA and Math	100-100 (TPAF)	42500
Salary	ELA (1); Mathematics (2)	Extended Day Program	100-100 (FICA Only)	17500
Salary	ELA (1); Mathematics (2)	Family Nights; Parent Workshops	100-100 (FICA Only)	2,600
Supplies	ELA (1); Mathematics (2); Attendance (3)	Reading/Writing; READ 180; Math in Focus; PARCC; Extended Day Program; Technology (BSI, ED)	100-600	37,500
Professional Development	ELA (1); Mathematics (2)	NJ Network for Closing the Achievement Gap;	200-300; 200-500	12,000

		Best Practices in ELA; Best Practices in Mathematics; Integrating Writing in Content Areas; Special Education Strategies		

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
Joseph Convery	Principal of Brainerd School	Yes	Yes	Yes	Joseph Convery
Michael Ostroff	Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Yes	Yes	Yes	[illegible]
Nicole Rowland	Brainerd Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nicole Rowland
Kim Feeley	Brainerd Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	Kimberly Feeley
Kristine Koengetter	Brainerd Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	Kristine Koengetter
Vicki Sneed	Community Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	[illegible]
Carrie Campagna	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Carrie Campagna
Anastasia Reed	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Anastasia Reed

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

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

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

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

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
September 2, 2014	Holbein School	School wide Plan Review	X		X	
October 21, 2014	Brainerd School	Reviewed 3 Smart Goals with Community Stakeholders	X		X	
May 5, 2014	Brainerd School	Program evaluation for 14-15 school year and Needs Assessment for the 15-16 school year	X		X	
May 11, 2015	Brainerd School	Finalize and Review 15-16 NCLB Plan	X		X	

Add rows as necessary.

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

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?	***We believe in the worth of all students and their right to have the opportunity to obtain the knowledge and skills necessary to prosper in an increasingly global world. The mission of the Mount Holly Township Public Schools is to provide a caring, nurturing, safe environment that challenges all students to develop their full potential – intellectually, socially, emotionally, and physically in cooperation with parents, staff, Board of Education, and community. The District is committed to the mastery of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards and the Common Core Standards.***

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

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? **Yes**

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process? **In using the 'Math in Focus" Math Program the First and Second Grade students' chapter test scores increased 10% by comparing 2013-2014 to 2014-2015. Teachers are continuing to keep anecdotal notes to analyze target areas for all students in reading and math. In the Extended Day program, the focus was small group math instruction. This further differentiating in math during the school day and the Extended Day Program, First and Second Grade students' chapter test scores on average have increased 10% across the board.**

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter? **In Second Grade we had 2 first year teachers learning the Math in Focus program for the first time. Due to the fact that the Math in Focus program has a lot of reading components to its math programs, many struggling readers need a lot of support. There are many struggling readers who require early intervention strategies and support.**

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation? **Our strengths were the improvement of students scores on Math chapter tests and DRA scores in reading. The weaknesses were the training of new staff as well as parent comprehension of the newer math program and scheduling constraints of holding Data Conferences, along with student growth conferences and two evaluation conferences. In reviewing the results, small group differentiated instruction is still needed for Special Education students and basic skills students in reading and math.**

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs? **The teachers asked to have learning consultants come out and work with them in both Reading and Math. The District complied with that request by securing substitutes, hiring professional consultant and creating a schedule to benefit all stakeholders. The professionals who came out to visit the school not only taught the lesson but gave feedback after observing our educators teaching the lesson in reading and math.**

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions? **A 10 question survey was created and distributed to staff by the building principal. The District PD Committee also surveyed the staff. The perception of the staff was**

positive on all levels. The staff gave positive feedback on the benefits of having the reading and math professionals come out to meet with them. The superintendent had a parent advisory committee were feedback was solicited from all stakeholders.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions? **In the third year of the Math in Focus program, the community had even more of a buy in and is still trying to adjust to the new Math program. A Parent Advisory Committee meetings were held and feedback was solicited at these meetings.**

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)? **Teachers were encouraged to use Chapter Test data and DRA data, as well as Mathematics formative assessments in team meetings as they collaborated on instruction improvement strategies. Through the use of reading assessments and writers workshop portfolios, teachers are able to track data to better differentiate their instruction on an individual basis. BSIP reading program was "push-in" small group, sometimes one:one. The focus was reading, using the Leveled Literacy Intervention program, and moving students forward on the reading continuum. Professional development was provided to increase math small group differentiation and for meeting the common core standards in both mathematics and English Language Arts. In the Extended Day program, the focus was small group math instruction or 1:1 support.**

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Schoolwide:

- **IDEAL model to include whole group, guided reading, and independent centers. A gradual release of responsibility of the core standards from grade level text to instructional level text to independent level text. Use of grade level scope and sequence and grade level assessments, and pacing calendar for horizontal articulation and consistency.**
- **The continued use of the *Math in Focus*, U.S. edition of Singapore's top-ranking math program. *Math in Focus* introduces fewer topics in each grade, but teaches them to greater depth. *Math in Focus* is highly visual, following a concrete-to-pictorial-to-abstract progression. *Math in Focus* provides students with the tools they need to break down complex concepts and problems, which in turn develops positive attitudes. Teachers follow the implementation guide and daily structure: teach/learn, guided practice, individualized practice or differentiated/small group intervention.**

In addition:

- **Title I Basic Skills Instruction is a push-in model, using the Fountas and Pinnell LLI program to target instruction and provide differentiated guided reading lessons to the students who are below reading level**
- **The Title I Extended Day and Extended Year Program focused on both math and reading interventions, with an emphasis in the after school program on mathematics lessons (as BSIP focused on reading intervention).**
- **Reading Wonders**
- **Promethean Boards**
- **Teaching Strategies Gold**
- **Preschool Online Assessments**

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions? **Daily**

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program? **Think Central, DRA Online, Promethean Boards, Teaching Strategies Gold, Ipads, Ipods, Google Chrome Books, and Dell Laptop Cart**

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how? **In using the above technology resources and software programs, teachers were able to run reports that showed weaknesses in reading and math they were able to differentiate instruction based on these weaknesses.**

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	
Grade 5			n/a	
Grade 6			n/a	
Grade 7			n/a	
Grade 8			n/a	
Grade 11			n/a	

Grade 12			n/a	

Mathematics	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	
Grade 5			n/a	
Grade 6			n/a	
Grade 7			n/a	
Grade 8			n/a	
Grade 11			n/a	
Grade 12			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	10	15	In using our first year Creative Curriculum, we used Teaching Strategies Gold to document and collect student progress and reviewed data. Based off of this data we continued the 3-5s Program, where 5 students/5 days a week/ for at least 5 minutes daily, instructed by teacher assistants. 5-5-5 targeted teacher assistant log books keeping targeted notes. Reviewed and changed Preschool registration and orientation	In using the Creative Curriculum and Teaching Strategies Gold and in reviewing this data as well as the 5-5-5, teachers were able to target students who scored 80% or below and meet their needs so they could score at 80% or above in the AM and PM classes.

Kindergarten	10	10	Continued the 3-5s Program, where 5 students/5 days a week/ for at least 5 minutes daily, instructed by teacher assistants. 5-5-5 targeted teacher assistant log books keeping targeted notes. In the Extended Day program, the focus was small group math and reading instruction .	In continuing to use the 5-5-5 targeted program, and in reviewing the Teaching Strategies Gold results in October, teachers were able to target students who scored 80% or below and meet their needs so they could score at 80% or above in the AM and PM classes In analyzing the 5-5-5 targeted results and the Teaching Gold results, Extended Day teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Extended Day students. Although the data revealed stated we did not reach 100% proficiency for all Extended Day students, we did see growth on analyzing DRA Reading levels and Math and Reading chapter test scores.
Grade 1	17	7	Continued DRA II – Monthly Running Record form were collected on a monthly basis and reviewed with teachers In the Extended Day program, the focus was small group math and reading instruction and utilizing chapter tests results in Reading and Math. BSIP reading program was "push-in" small group, sometimes one-on-one. The focus was reading, using the Leveled Literacy Intervention program, and moving students forward on the reading continuum.	The interventions were a tremendous success with students in the 1st and 2nd grade. Teachers used anecdotal notes and running records, along with Reading chapter tests and DRA data to target below level students. In analyzing the Reading chapter test scores and DRA data, Extended Day teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Extended Day students. Although the data revealed we did not reach 100% proficiency for all Extended Day students, we did see growth when analyzing Reading chapter tests and DRA data. In analyzing the Reading chapter tests and DRA data, Basic Skills teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Basic Skills students. In reviewing the results, small group differentiated instruction is still needed for basic skills students in reading.

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

Grade 2	16	13	Continued DRA II – Monthly Running Record form were collected on a monthly basis and reviewed with teachers In December the building principal went to every class and reviewed student writing binders In the Extended Day program, the focus was small group math and reading instruction and utilizing Readings Eggs, Study Island and MAP reports. BSIP reading program was "push-in" small group, sometimes one:one. The focus was reading, using the Leveled Literacy Intervention program, and moving students forward on the reading continuum.	The interventions were a tremendous success with students in the 1st and 2nd grade. Teachers used anecdotal notes and running records and DRA data to target below level students. In analyzing the chapter tests, Extended Day teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Extended Day students. Although the data revealed we did not reach 100% proficiency for all our Extended Day students, we did see growth when analyzing the chapter tests. In analyzing the Reading chapter tests and DRA2 monthly running records, Basic Skills teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Basic Skills students. In reviewing the results, small group differentiated instruction is still needed for basic skills students in reading.

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	10	15	Continued the 3-5s Program, where 5 students/5 days a week/ for at least 5 minutes daily, instructed by teacher assistants. 5-5-5 targeted teacher assistant log books keeping targeted notes. Reviewed and changed Preschool orientation	In continued use of the 5-5-5 targeted program, teachers were able to target students who scored 80% or below and meet their needs so they could score at 80% or above in the AM and PM classes

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

Kindergarten	10	10	Continued the 3-5s Program, where 5 students/5 days a week/ for at least 5 minutes daily, instructed by teacher assistants. 5-5-5 targeted teacher assistant log books keeping targeted notes. Reviewed and changed Kindergarten orientation Followed Math In Focus structure for small group and differentiation	In continued use of the 5-5-5 targeted program, teachers were able to target students who scored 80% or below and meet their needs so they could score at 80% or above
Grade 1	17	7	Collected chapter test data throughout the school year to differentiate instruction and target students who fell below 80%. Followed Math In Focus structure for small group and differentiation	Teachers used anecdotal math notes, along with Math chapter tests to target below level students. In analyzing the Math chapter test scores Extended Day teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Extended Day students. Although the data revealed we did not reach 100% proficiency for all Extended Day students, we did see growth when analyzing Math chapter tests. In Math chapter tests, Basic Skills teachers were able to target students who were below grade level and better meet the needs of the Basic Skills students. In reviewing the results, small group differentiated instruction is still needed for basic skills students in math.

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	• targeted instruction • extended school year • extended day • new reading program • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training	Yes	DRA II Running Monthly Record Monthly Anecdotal Notes Conducted the DRA2 Full Assessment 3 times a year SGO Data Report Cards	80% of students increased at least one reading level. 85% of special education teachers met their SGO

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	Students with Disabilities	• targeted instruction • extended school year • extended day • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training • Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2	Yes	SGO Data Chapter Assessment Data Report Cards	More than 100% of teachers met their SGO for the 2014-15 school year. Based on the Chapter Test, the majority of students improved on tested information.

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	ELLs	• ELL classes • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • ELL Progress Reports, Performance Assessments and Rubrics • Continued ESL Training • NJDOE model curriculum training • revised ELL curriculum • Basic Skills • I&RS • Parenting Partners	yes	Full DRA2 Reading Levels assessed 3 times a year. SGO Data Report Cards Chapter Tests assessments	Based on DRA2 data 100% of ELL readers increased their reading levels at least one 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)
Math	ELLs	• ELL classes • revised ELL curriculum • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training • Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2 • ELL Progress Reports, Performance Assessments and Rubrics, • Continued ESL Training • I&RS • Parenting Partners	yes	SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on SGO data 90% of students reached SGO goals. Based on Chapter Test and Unit Test Data the majority of students improved on tested information.

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	• targeted instruction • extended school year • extended day • new reading program • Monitor student progress on a monthly basis using Running Records and Anecdotal Notes as well as full DRA II Assessments 3 times a year. • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training • Basic Skills • I&RS	yes	DRA2 levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on SGO goals more than 85% of economically disadvantaged students have increased their reading levels, at least one grade level. Based on DRA2 data economically disadvantaged students have increased their reading levels at least one grade level. www.pearsonschool.com

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	• targeted instruction • extended school year • extended day • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training • Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2 • I&RS and Basic Skills • Parenting Partners	yes	SGO Data Chapter/Unit assessments Report Cards	Based on SGO data, 80% of students have increased their math fluency in grades K-2

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		• targeted instruction • extended school year • extended day • new reading program • Monitored students' growth using monthly running records and conducted full DRA2 assessments 3 times a year. • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • Parenting Partners • NJDOE model curriculum training • Basic Skills • I&RS	Yes	DRA2 reading levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on SGO data, more than 85% of students have increased their math fluency in grades K-2

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		• targeted instruction • extended school year • extended day • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training • Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2 • Basic Skills • I&RS • Parenting Partners	Yes	SGO Data Weekly unit Assessment Data Report Cards	Based on a comparison of 2013-14 chapter test data, the average percentage from marking periods 1-3 was 85%. In 2014-2015, the average was 90%.

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

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	• Parenting Partners • I&RS	yes	DRA2 reading levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on SGO goals more than 85% of economically disadvantaged students have increased their reading levels, at least one grade level.
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Extended Day Program • Math Fluency Program • Parenting Partners • I&RS • Thinkcentral.com	Yes	SGO Data Chapter/Unit assessments Report Cards	More than 90% of teachers met their SGO for the 2014-15 school year. Based on Unit Data the majority of students improved on tested information.
ELA	ELLs	• Parenting Partners • I&RS • ELL Progress Reports • Performance Assessments and Rubrics • Basic Skills	yes	DRA2 reading levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on DRA2 data 100% of ELL readers increased their reading levels at least one grade level Although ACCESS scores showed average scores in writing, there was tremendous growth in reading, speaking, and listening.

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	ELLs	• Extended Day Program • Math Fluency Program • Parenting Partners • I&RS • Thinkcentral.com • ELL Progress Reports • Performance Assessments / Rubric	yes	SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on SGO data 90% of students reached SGO goals. Based on Chapter Test and Unit Data the majority of students improved on tested information.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• Parenting Partners • I&RS • Basic Skills	yes	DRA2 reading levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter/Unit assessments	Based on SGO goals more than 90% of economically disadvantaged students have increased their reading levels, at least one grade level.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• Extended Day Program • Math Fluency Program • Parenting Partners • I&RS • Thinkcentral.com	yes	SGO Data Chapter Test and Unit assessments Report Cards	Based on SGO data, 80% students have increased their math fluency.

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	• Common Core ELA Training: • Monitor Student Growth through the use of DRA2 • Teaching Strategies and best practices • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training	yes	Full DRA2 reading levels assessments 3 times a year SGO Data Report Cards Weekly/unit assessments	Based on SGO goals more than 85% of economically disadvantaged students have increased their reading levels, at least one 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)
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Common Core Mathematics - Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2 - Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training • Thinkcentral.com	yes	SGO Data Chapter and Unit Assessment Data Report Cards	More than 90% of teachers met their SGO for the 2014-15 school year. Based on Unit Data the majority of students improved on tested information.

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	ELLs	• Common Core ELA Training: • Monitor student growth through DRA2 assessments • Teaching Strategies and best practices (Staff Development Workshops) • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training	yes	DRA2 reading levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter Test and unit assessments	Based on DRA2 and SGO data 100% of ELL readers increased their reading levels at least one grade level Although ACCESS scores showed low scores in writing, there was great growth in reading, speaking, and listening.

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	ELLs	• Common Core Mathematics - Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2 - Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training	yes	SGO Data Report Cards Chapter Test and unit assessments	Based on SGO data 90% of students reached SGO goals. Based on Unit Data the majority of students improved on tested information.

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	• Common Core ELA Training: • Monitored student growth through the use of DRA2 assessments. • Teaching Strategies and best practices (Staff Development Workshops) • Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training	yes	DRA2 reading levels SGO Data Report Cards Chapter test and Unit assessments	Based on SGO goals more than 85% of economically disadvantaged students have increased their reading levels, at least one 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)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• Common Core Mathematics - Singapore Math Workshops and Modeling Accountable Math Talk. Consultant worked with teachers in grades K-2 - Teachers turnkey common core strategies from out-of district workshops • NJDOE model curriculum training	yes	SGO Data Chapter Test and Unit Assessment Data Report Cards Thinkcentral.com	Based on SGO data, 80% of economically disadvantaged students have increased their math fluency.

Family and Community Engagement **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	ALL	Family Reading Nights (3 nights)	Yes	Attendance records	Attendance was very good to high with teacher and parent participation.
Math	ALL	Family Math Nights (3 nights)	Yes	Attendance records	Attendance was moderate to good to high with teacher to parent participation.
ELA/ Math	ALL	District Parent Advisory Committee	Yes	Attendance	Attendance was moderate to good to high with teacher to parent participation.

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.

Joseph Convery	Joseph Convery	6/15/15
Principal's Name (Print)	**Principal's Signature**	**Date**

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

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

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	Leveled Literacy Intervention Records DRA2 Assessment Records	Numerous students in the BSIP pushed in program exited the program after 1 year of targeted instruction via the Leveled Literacy Intervention program.
Academic Achievement - Writing/Grammar	Writing samples Unit/Weekly tests	Writing samples show improvement of writing skills (based on Wonders Reading Program)
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Math in Focus Chapter Tests were analyzed and discussed with Principal at Data Conferences and Grade Level Meetings Teacher created SGO with a Pre and Post-Math Fluency Test.	Math fluency test results indicate more fluency gained by students MIF data indicates improved scores from pre and post data.
Family and Community Engagement	Literacy and Math Family Nights were held. Parent Survey	Sign in Sheets, Agenda and Minutes

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

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Professional Development	**Professional Development School Plan** Professional development that occurred inside the Mount Holly School District. We also held after-school professional development for teaching staff in order to further develop best practices. District staff participated in a series of monthly after-school workshops including the following: • Stronge Workshops • Bloom's Taxonomy • Analyzing data • Infusion of technology • Staff delivered professional development best practices to other staff members • New teacher orientation • Common Core Mathematics Reading and Math Consultants taught lessons and reviewed best practices to each grade level K-2	Sign in Sheets, Agenda and Minutes
School Climate and Culture	School-wide positive behavior and character education program; REAL time discipline reports	Reports show a decrease in detentions and suspensions.
School-Based Youth Services	Parenting Partners	Attendance Records show average involvement levels

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

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Students with Disabilities	Math in Focus Chapter Tests were analyzed and discussed with Principal at Data Conferences and Grade Level Meetings Teacher created SGO with a Pre and Post-Math Fluency Test.	Data is collected and analyzed throughout the year and discussed in teacher/administrator data conferences. The data is used to isolate areas of weakness, target and remediate skills, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each individual student.
Economically Disadvantaged	Math in Focus Chapter Tests were analyzed and discussed with Principal at Data Conferences and Grade Level Meetings Teacher created SGO with a Pre and Post-Math Fluency Test. DRA2 Data Unit/Weekly Assessments	Data is collected and analyzed throughout the year and discussed in teacher/administrator data conferences. The data is used to isolate areas of weakness, target and remediate skills, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each individual student.

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

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

The NCLB Committee worked collaboratively to identify 3 priority problems. The NCLB team then reviewed the Schoolwide Plan to provide further input. The administrative team looked closely at the NJASK data trends and DRA2 data to identify the weakest areas in LAL (Reading and Writing). The data was revealed to the entire staff in the beginning of the year to share the strengths, but more importantly, identify areas in need of improvement. The data of individual students was then shared with individual teachers during data conferences. The goal of the data conferences was to determine the best means to differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of each student. It was critical to determine how this was going to be done. Discussions were established at PTA meetings to share the DRA II scores to gain parental input on the needs assessment.

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

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

Data was compiled by the administration and the disaggregated data was shared with all staff. (Data of the general population, African American, Hispanic and Special Education Population from DRA2 assessments and Math and Reading weekly unit assessments)

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 DRA2 data is complied by student, classroom and grade level. DRA II data corresponds with NJ Common Core Standards. We were able to identify specific areas of weakness especially in the area of Reading using monthly running records and anecdotal note review.

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

While positive progress has been made, there still exists concern with reading below grade level, performing below grade level in math, and performing while writing on demand. There is still a certain concern with the progress of our special education students and our economically disadvantaged students in these areas as well.

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

There is continual need for math training for the new math program and to promote teacher understanding of the common core standards. There needs to be a refresher in Bloom's and how to use essential questioning in the classroom.

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

They are identified by report cards, observation by classroom teacher, parent concerns and Intervention & Referral Services. Students are identified via Unit and Chapter Test data, DRA data, Math assessments, classroom assessments, and teacher observations/recommendations. Scores are then utilized as another multiple measure to analyze at-risk students.

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

Basic Skills Instruction, IEP, RTI, 504, modification to the educational program, before and after school programs, differentiated instruction and flexible grouping. The team teaching model is being utilized in most cases to ensure each student's needs are met. Students who are "at-risk" in LAL are provided Title I services. Data from the student Chapter and Unit Test in Reading and Math, along with DRA2 full assessments is used to identify areas of weakness so that a proper instructional method can be used to remediate those skills.

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

N/A

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

Teachers were encouraged to use Chapter and Unit Test data, DRA data, running records and Mathematics formative assessments in team meetings as they collaborated on instruction improvement strategies. Through the use of reading assessments, math assessments, and Wonders Writing activities, teachers are able to track data to better differentiate their instruction on an individual basis.

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

We conduct a transition day for students. Students visit their new school, meet teachers and speak with students from the school they will attend. Also, a parent transition night is conducted to help answer any questions that might arise prior to the start of the new year.

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

The teachers on the NCLB committee and the building principal used a collaborative approach to identify priority problems, using their own observations and assessment data to select the three most important areas as the school's main focus.

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	Closing the Achievement Gap	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Students with disabilities, African Americans, Economically Disadvantaged have lower Math and Reading chapter test and unit assessments at the beginning and end of year. Lower DRA2 scores for African American and students with disabilities on DRA 2 assessments.	2014-2015 chapter test and unit assessments indicates below average progress for the students classified in the categories BSIP, Special Education and ELL learners compared to the general population. 2014-2015 pre and post math fluency assessments indicate lacking of basic skills and number sense.
Describe the root causes of the problem	Many students are not reading independently at a level sophisticated enough to work with and analyze text. Many students do not have basic math fluency to master complex concepts. Students enter school below grade level expectations in ELA and Math.	In the 4th year of the program there needs to be improved articulation between grades. Common language must be used to improved coherence. Lack of proficiency on basic math facts Students are unable to transfer mathematical skills from year-to-year
Subgroups or populations addressed	All Students with a focus on special education, economically disadvantaged, and African American students.	Special education and continue to address all populations
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Math and Language	N/A

Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Math in Focus and McGraw Hill Reading Wonders, DRA II	*Math in Focus* brings the authentic Singapore math pedagogy to the classroom and is aligned with Common Core State Standards. *Math in Focus* is the mastery program for world-class math instruction and results in the U.S. Standards Solution – Strategies for Improved Academic Performance. Basic Skills instruction based on MIF
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The implementations of the above programs will benefit students through mastering basic fundamental skills, improvement of student understanding of the core content standards. The program is aligned with the NJ CCSS.	It aligns to all Math standards

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process

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

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Parent/Community Involvement	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Based on the Title I needs assessments completed by teachers, parents and community members as well as the poor attendance at the new workshop, Parenting Partners	
Describe the root causes of the problem	High mobility, economically disadvantages, county seat, high level of services offered	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All subgroups.	

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

Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	N/A	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Family leadership incorporated www.parentingpartners.com http://www.strengtheningfamilies.com/ www.familyleadership.org	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	A continual focus on how students who enter our school will be assisted in all of the strategies that are directed toward achievement and improvement of student understanding of the core content standards.	

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) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
LAL	All students below reading level (BSIP)	Level Literacy Intervention	Principal, Director of Curriculum, Supervisors and Teachers	LLI Benchmarks – DRA2 Scores – Students exiting BSIP program	DRA II https://www.draoms.com/login.cfm?
Math	All students	Math in Focus	Principal, Director of Curriculum, Supervisors and Teachers	Continued growth in students' benchmark and weekly assessments.	Math in Focus – thinkcentral.com
Extended Day Program Extended School Year	Math/LAL	Special Education and At-risk students	Principal Curriculum Supervisor Extended Day Teachers	Demonstrated growth on SGO test data. School Pace Data	DRA II https://www.draoms.com/login.cfm? Math in Focus – thinkcentral.com
PRIDE Program	ALL	ALL	ALL	Test scores; attendance and discipline records	PRIDE is a grass root home grown program developed by the principal and teachers that promotes a positive culture and a climate of success.

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

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
All Content Areas	All Teachers	Differentiated Instruction; Chapter Test and Unit Assessments	Curriculum Director; Principal	Evaluations;	http://www.rtinetwork.org/essential/tieredinstruction/tier1/effectiveteaching

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 extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
LAL/Math	At Risk Students	Extended Year Program	Curriculum Director, Principal, Extended	Extended year program assessment data	In collaboration with Math in Focus www.thinkcentral.com DRA 2

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 extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Day Teachers		https://www.draoms.com/login.cfm?
LAL/Math	Special Education Students	Extended Year Program	Principal, Director of Special Education	DRA II reports and math and reading assessment data	Math in Focus www.thinkcentral.com DRA 2 https://www.draoms.com/login.cfm?
LAL/Math	Special Education Students At risk students	Extended Day Program	Curriculum, Director, Principal, Director of Special Education	DRA II reports and math and reading assessment data	Math in Focus www.thinkcentral.com DRA 2 https://www.draoms.com/login.cfm?

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	All k-2 teachers	*Reading Wonders PD	Curriculum Director	Surveys on effectiveness and applicable of PD strategies	Reading Wonders – mhschool.com
Math	All K-2 teachers	Math in Focus PD	Curriculum Director	Surveys on effectiveness and applicable of PD strategies	Math in Focus program – thinkcentral.com

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 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.

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

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?

It will be reviewed internally by the Director of Curriculum, Principal and the NCLB Committee 4 times a year.

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

The teachers continue to struggle with the Math in Focus program. There are many struggling readers who require early intervention strategies and support. At times, we have a lack of parental support and a large economical disadvantaged students and lastly, funding.

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

Especially with the first year implementation of the new LAL curriculum Reading Wonders, learning consultants continue to work with them in both Reading and Math. The District complied with that request by securing substitutes, hiring professional consultant and creating a schedule to benefit all stakeholders. Building and district parent advisory meetings and numerous family nights were continued to be held throughout the school year. The district continued with the program, Parenting Partners, a workshop to offer parenting skills.

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

A 10 questions survey was created and distributed to staff by the building principal. The District PD Committee surveyed the staff. A needs assessment was also distributed to the entire staff. The perception of the staff was positive on all levels, they loved having the reading and math professionals come out to meet with them.

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

A Parent Advisory Committee was formed; all parents in the community were invited to join. A representative from Brainerd School attended all these meetings that were led by the Superintendent of Schools. Numerous staff and the building principal attended many of these meetings.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

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

Reading Wonders curriculum is used to include whole group, guided reading, and independent centers. A gradual release of responsibility of the core standards from grade level text to instructional level text to independent level text. Use of grade level scope and sequence and grade level assessments, and pacing calendar for horizontal articulation and consistency.
The continued use of the *Math in Focus*, U.S. edition of Singapore's top-ranking math program. *Math in Focus* introduces fewer topics in each grade, but teaches them to greater depth. *Math in Focus* is highly visual, following a concrete-to-pictorial-to-abstract progression. *Math in Focus* is sequenced in a way that ensures students develop and maintain strong number sense. This provides the foundation necessary to move on to more complex and abstract thinking. *Math in Focus* utilizes model-drawing strategies that help students solve both routine and non-routine problems. *Math in Focus* provides students with the tools they need to break down complex concepts and problems, which in turn develops positive attitudes. Teachers follow the implementation guide and daily structure: teach/learn, guided practice, individualized practice or differentiated/small group intervention.
Reading Wonders intervention kits were used to teach students numerous reading skills
A BSIP program and an extended day instruction program were implemented. There was an increase in technology in the classroom. Numerous school surveys were also conducted

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

An extended day program was offered 2x a week (3 hours weekly) for 25 weeks. Students receive Math and Reading instruction daily, with more of a focus on Math. ELL is offered daily. Basic Skills students receive reading instruction through the LLI program 45 minutes a day.

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

Individual Level Classroom Libraries, Math Manipulatives kits, Promethean Boards, Think Central, DRA Online, Google Chrome Books, Ipods, Ipads.

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

The principal held Data Conferences with staff throughout the year. At these conferences, the principal reviewed Anecdotal notes in Reading and Math and Excel Reading Running Records on all students. DRA2 reports were also analyzed at these meetings.

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

These results were discussed at District Parent Advisory, Faculty, PTA and NCLB Meetings, as well as Parent Conferences. The Basic Skills Teachers continue to use detailed progress report to keep parents informed of their child's continual development throughout the school year. The data is gathered through DRA2 running records and the LLI Reading program.

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)
All content areas	All Students	Service Learning Projects	Principals	Increased participation by parents	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen
All content areas	All Students	Open House	All staff	Increase participation by parents	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen
All content areas	All Students	Teacher/Parent Conferences	All staff	Increase participation by parents	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen
All content areas	At-risk students	Parenting Partners Workshops	Principals, Director of Curriculum	Participation Rate	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen
All content areas	All Students	Parent Advisory Group	Principals	Increased participation by parents	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen

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)
All content areas	All Students	PreK Early Childhood Committee	Principals	Increased participation by parents	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen
Reading, Math, Technology and Science	All Students	Family Nights	Principals, Technology Teachers	Participation Rate	Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis By: Xitao Fan and Michael Chen

Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

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

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 do not have a thorough understanding of the ELA and mathematics curriculum. In addition, they are not familiar with the content and scoring procedures. Though parenting workshops, family nights, parent conferences, weekly Principal messages, newsletters, and email blasts, the school will be able to deliver this very important information to families.

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

Discuss and solicit input to our school leadership team about issues and topics that directly relate to the students and activities within the school. At the beginning of each year parents are invited to be a part of the process though the parent advisory committee survey and discussion at the district and building level.

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

District Webpage, distribute to students, email blasts

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

Parents are included in the process from the start and are invited to attend leadership meetings that discuss this topic.

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

Parents are called to remind them to sign and return. Also, copy of the Compact will be placed on the school's district web page and take home for parents to view, copy, sign and return.

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

Through the use of report cards, progress reports, parents are informed about chapter and math test assessments and DRA2 results.

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

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?

Brainerd School will send letters to parents if there is notification that it has not met the annual AMAO for Title III.

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

A presentation is given at a public Board of Education meeting and the Director of Curriculum reviews this data.

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

Parents are included on the district and building school improvement team and their input in equally taken amongst the other members.

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

Report Cards, Progress Reports, DRA2 reports, are distributed to parents

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

Provide a separate response for each question.

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		
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A		
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)		
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*		

* 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