


# 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: LONG BRANCH	School: Joseph M. Ferraina Early Childhood Learning Center
Chief School Administrator: MICHAEL SALVATORE	Address: 80 Avenel Blvd
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: msalvatore@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: K
Title I Contact: Bridgette Burtt	Principal: Mrs. Loretta Johnson
Title I Contact E-mail: bburtt@longbranch.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: ljohnson@longbranch.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-571-2868	Principal's Phone Number: 732-571-4150

**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.

Loretta Johnson \_\_\_\_\_  
 Principal's Name (Print)

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

5/28/15 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

### Critical Overview Elements

- The School held \_\_\_\_\_11\_\_\_\_\_ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ 405,258, which comprised 100% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$691,459, which will comprise 96.4% 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
Extended Day Learning Program Tutors & Supplies	Priority Problems 1 & 2	Extended Learning Time and Extended Day	100-100 & 100-600	\$6,451.84
Parent Involvement	Priority Problem 3	Family and Community Engagement	200-800	\$1,000
Professional Development	Priority Problems 1, 2 and 3	PD provided to create best practices for all intervention strategies	200-300	\$5,000


**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
Loretta Johnson	School Staff-Administrator	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Betsy Callaghan	Community Groups	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kimberly Walker	PIRT Specialist/ I & RS	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Laura Bland	Preschool Classroom Teacher/Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Nicole Daniele	Math/Reading Classroom Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Meghan Ronan	Preschool Classroom Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Francline Van Brunt	Math/Reading Classroom Teacher	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Bridgette Burt	Funded Grants Supervisor	Yes	Yes	Yes	

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

Dianne Panduri	Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes		<i>Dianne Panduri</i>
Renee Whelan	School Staff Director	Yes	Yes	Yes		<i>Renee Whelan</i>

**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
March 30, 2015	JMFECLC	Overview of Transition from Targeted to School Wide	yes		yes	
April 15, 2015	JMFECLC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment School Wide Plan Development	yes		yes	
April 17, 2015	JMFECLC	Review of Data for Comprehensive Needs Assessment School Wide Plan Development	yes		yes	
April 20, 2015	JMFECLC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment School Wide Plan Development	yes		yes	
April 21, 2015	LWC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment School Wide Plan Development and Evaluation	yes		yes	

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

May 6, 2015	JMFECLC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Collection and Analysis	yes	yes		
May 8, 2015	JMFECLC	Clarification regarding Evaluation of 2014-2015 School Wide Program Priority Problems Data Collection and Analysis	yes	yes		
May 12, 2015	JMFECLC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Collection and Analysis Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them Teacher and I.A. Credentials and Qualifications	yes	yes		
May 15, 2015	JMFECLC	Comprehensive Needs Assessment Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them Family and Community Engagement	yes	yes		
May 19, 2015	540 Broadway	Question/Answer forum Link It Representative discussed data and ways to print out needed information for report and what information is pertinent to include	yes	yes		
May 22, 2015	JMFECLC	Finalization of Title 1 NCIB Plan	yes	yes		

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

*\*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?

<p><b>What is the school's mission statement?</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>JMFECLC Mission Statement</u></p> <p>At JMFECLC our Intended purpose is to appropriately meet and exceed the social/emotional, cognitive, and academic needs of all our students so that they can be successful and achieve their goals. We strive to set high expectations in order to meet and exceed the NJ Department of Education's Preschool and Kindergarten Early Learning Standards. It is all stakeholders' responsibility to support each student's development and learning through teacher and family engagement with consistent collaboration between teachers, administration, support staff, families and community organizations. We are committed to improve an ongoing reflective cycle, analysis of data, and provide ongoing professional development in all targeted areas.</p>
---	---

**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? **Not Applicable – JMFECLC was not School Wide in 2014-2015**
2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?
3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?
4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?
5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?
6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?
7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?
8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?
9. How did the school structure the interventions?
10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?
11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?
12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

***\*Provide a separate response for each question.***

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

**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 <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> 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	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> 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

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

**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	TSG no longer in use -n/a * not school wide	Students that are Still developing in following areas: 39% letter recognition 45% letter sounds 57% student writing level 77% verbal planning 45% language acquisition 58% vocabulary 46% listening comprehension 59% phonological awareness * pending June data	PLC, Parent meetings, parent workshops, one on one instruction, I & RS, ELL consultation	Wi-fi not available throughout the entire building, there is a lack of additional computer stations, not enough time in schedule, lack of parent follow through, and lack of teacher follow through with I & RS action plans and interventions. Additionally, monitoring and follow through by case manager is needed.
Kindergarten	Kindergarten students were not housed in JMFECLC in 2013-2014	As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (42 out of 124) scored below proficient (below 70%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. <i>Pending end of year data.</i> As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 124) scored a	RTI, Lexia, Homework Incentives, Reading clubs, I & RS Action Plans	Lack of computer stations, wi-fi is not available throughout the entire building, lack of parent follow through, not enough time in the schedule, need to request additional Lexia Accounts for Kindergarten students for the 2015-2016 school year, and lack of teacher follow through with PIRT I & RS action plans and interventions. Additional monitoring and follow through by case manager is needed.

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §11.14(b)(2)(B)(iii)**

		<p>3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2015.</p> <p>As of May 2015, 29% of the Kindergarten students (36 out of 124) have been absent for 15 or more days. Of these students, 47% (17 out of 36) are below proficient.</p> <p>As of May, 2015 70% of Kindergarten students (87 out of 124) scored below proficient (5 points or below) on the writing portion of the Treasures mid-year assessment. Of those students, 44% (38 out of 87) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3)</p> <p>As of May, 2015 54% of Kindergarten students (67 out of 124) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2)</p> <p>18% (22 out of 124) of</p>	
--	--	--	--

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

		<p>the ELL population scored below proficient (70% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored below proficient, 52% (22 out of 42) are English Language Learners.</p> <p>27% (33 out of 124) of the ELL population scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored 3 or lower, 52% (33 out of 41) are English Language Learners.</p> <p>21% (8 out of 39) of ELL students will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA Spring Assessment results. These students scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment.</p>		
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)**

<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>2013 - 2014</b>	<b>2014 - 2015</b>	<b>Interventions Provided</b>	<b>Describe why the interventions provided <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency. (Be specific for each intervention).</b>
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*

*N/A JMFECCLC was not School Wide in 2014-2015*

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

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

*Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies* **N/A** JMF/ECLC was not School Wide in 2014-2015

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

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

**Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies**

*Professional Development – Implemented in 2014-2015*

*N/A IMFELC was not School Wide 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

*Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2014-2015*

*N/A JMFECLC was not School Wide 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	ELLS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

**Principal's Certification**

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

X 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.

Loretta Johnson

April 22, 2015

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link It Data:</li> <li>• ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• Attendance Data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (42 out of 124) scored below proficient (below 70%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. <i>Pending end of year data.</i></li> <li>• As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 124) scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2015.</li> <li>• As of May 2015, 29% of the Kindergarten students (36 out of 124) have been absent for 15 or more days. Of these students, 47% (17 out of 36) are below proficient.</li> </ul>
Academic Achievement - Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link It Data:</li> <li>• ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of May, 2015 70% of Kindergarten students (87 out of 124) scored below proficient (5 points or below) on the writing portion of the Treasures mid-year assessment. Of those students, 44% (38 out of 87) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3)</li> <li>• As of May, 2015 54% of Kindergarten students (67 out of 124) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2)</li> </ul>
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link It Data:</li> <li>• Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of May 2015, 94% of students (117 out of 124) scored proficient or above (70% or higher).</li> </ul>

**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)
<p>Family and Community Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent surveys</li> <li>• sign in sheets</li> <li>• Feedback forms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the Community Needs Assessment (CNA) results from 2014-2015, Percentages of families indicated their need for trainings as follows: Reading and Writing: 11%, Social/Emotional Development: 12%, Speech/Language: 10%, Parenting and Discipline: 15%, Nutrition Topics: 11%, ESL classes: 8%, and Parent Support Groups: 10%. This indicates that a wide variety of topics are of interest to the parents at JMFECLC. Percentages of Families interested in Community Resources and Information are as follows: Library: 18%, Family Therapy: 11%, Speech/Language Services: 12%, Local Pediatricians/Developmental Specialists: 15%, Food Banks: 12%, and Churches: 12%. (percentages derived from 112 surveys that were returned out of 124 distributed)</li> <li>• Sign in sheets document number of family/community members at each event held during the 2014-2015 school year. The following represents the number of family/community members to attend each event: Kindergarten Orientation: 72 families (60%), Pre-K 3's Orientation: 103 families (90%), Back To School Night: Kindergarten 78 families (63%), Back To School Night: Pre-K 198 families (60%), Pre-k Literacy Book Club Activity: 156 families (48%), November Parent/Teacher Conferences Kindergarten: 116 families (94%), Pre-K: 278 families (100%), December Literacy Book Club Activity: 152 families (48%), Kindergarten Literacy Night: 52 families (42%), and April Parent/Teacher Conferences/Kindergarten: 120 families (98%) Pre-K: 215 families (95%).</li> </ul>
<p>Professional Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLC meetings</li> <li>• Data walks</li> <li>• Professional Development Surveys</li> <li>• Sign In Sheets</li> <li>• Professional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of staff was offered weekly Professional Learning Community Time during common planning periods.</li> <li>• 100% of staff was offered Professional Development hours during half day PD trainings and at weekly faculty meetings. (These meetings are mandatory for all staff )</li> </ul>

**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)
	Development/In Service Trainings	
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLN meetings</li> <li>• Management meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of Leadership and Administration team met weekly to develop and monitor school wide data. They also attended specific trainings to target the needs of their building based upon aggregated data.</li> </ul>
School Climate and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher perception survey</li> <li>• school climate survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of staff was asked to participate in a school climate/perception survey. Of the 55 surveys given, 55 were completed</li> <li>• 100% of teachers were offered specific PD trainings in order to increase student test scores in ELA and Math.</li> <li>• 100% of staff were asked to complete a Professional Development Survey.</li> </ul>
School-Based Youth Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable at this level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable at this level</li> </ul>
Students with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link It Data:</li> <li>• ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6% of the Kindergarten students (7 out of 124) have an IEP for special education and related services. Of those students, 4 out of the 7 scored below proficient (70%).</li> </ul>
Homeless Students * As of June 2015, the JMFECLC has one documented homeless student.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genesis Database</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable at this time.</li> </ul>
Migrant Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable at this time.</li> </ul>

**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)
English Language Learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link It Data:</li> <li>• ELA Treasures Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• DRA2 Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• Everyday Math Beginning, Mid-Year, and Final Assessment.</li> <li>• WIDA Model Grade K Assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18% (22 out of 124) of the ELL population scored below proficient (70% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored below proficient, 52% (22 out of 42) are English Language Learners.</li> <li>• 27% (33 out of 124) of the ELL population scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored 3 or lower, 52% (33 out of 41) are English Language Learners.</li> <li>• 21% (8 out of 39) of ELL students will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA Spring Assessment results. These students scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment.</li> </ul>
Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lunch Status Application</li> <li>• Genesis Database</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 63% (79 out of 124) of students in Kindergarten receive free lunch.</li> <li>• 11% (14 out of 124) of students in Kindergarten receive reduced lunch.</li> <li>• 77% (72 out of 93) of students in Kindergarten that receive free/reduced lunch scored below proficient on the ELA Treasures Assessment based on mid-year scores.</li> </ul>

**2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process\***

*Narrative*

1. **What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?** The Joseph M Ferraina School conducted a comprehensive needs assessment using teacher surveys, standardized assessment data, and local assessment data. The committee analyzed the data gathered. Results from the data was analyzed and discussed at PLC and faculty meetings. This report focuses on goals in the areas of English Language Arts, Writing, and our English Language Learners. The report also addresses the needs of specialized populations as identified in the information gathered. The ELL students were identified as a large majority of the total number of students scoring below proficient in Reading and Writing.
2. **What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?** District administrators, building administrators, master teachers, student advisors, and teachers analyze results from state assessments, benchmark assessments, and curriculum based assessments. The data is analyzed and categorized by all subgroups. Once analyzed, the data is used to create action plans with regards to professional development and curriculum revision in an effort to address marked areas of strengths and weaknesses.
3. **How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?** The Everyday Math Assessment, Treasures Reading Assessment, WIDA Model for ELL Assessment, and DRA2 Assessment are valid and reliable; therefore, reports generated from Link It are a result of a reliable collection method. The JMFECLC uses the Link It Database system to document and monitor all assessments. These are all researched based programs that are in place.
4. **What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?** As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (42 out of 124) scored below proficient (below 70%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. 33% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 124) scored a 3 or lower on the

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

DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2015. 70% of Kindergarten students (87 out of 124) scored below proficient (5 points or below) on the writing portion of the Treasures mid-year assessment. Of those students, 44% (38 out of 87) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, and W.K.3). 54% of Kindergarten students (67 out of 124) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, and K.OA.A.2). 94% of students (117 out of 124) scored proficient or above (70% or higher) on the Everyday Math Assessment. As a result, teachers may benefit from additional professional development assisting them with differentiating their instruction to reach the needs of all students, with an increased focus on our Hispanic (ELL) population. Additionally, a comprehensive writing curriculum would be beneficial to increase scores in the area of writing as it applies across all curriculum areas.

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

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

Parents are invited throughout the year to various workshops which offer information so they can assist their children at home. The school and I &RS team addresses at weekly meetings all at risk students referred to the team for academic, behavior, or attendance concerns.

8. **How does the school address the needs of migrant students?** Not applicable
9. **How does the school address the needs of homeless students?** JMFECLC currently has 1 student identified as homeless.
10. **How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?** Elected members of the teaching and support staff serve on the No Child Left Behind/Title I Committee as well as the Professional Development Committee. At these committee meetings, data is gathered, presented and utilized to determine school wide goals and implementation of new programs to reach these goals. All classroom teachers are a part of professional learning communities that analyze data and make informed instructional decisions based on their analysis. The NCLB in turn shares the input from all stakeholders at monthly meetings.

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

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

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 school wide plan? All available data was collected, shared, and analyzed by the NCLB Committee. From this process we identified the top three priority problems and explored their possible root causes.

*\*Provide a separate response for each question.*

**SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §11114 (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 Language Arts	Writing (Across All Curriculum Areas)
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (42 out of 124) scored below proficient (below 70%) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. <i>Pending end of year data.</i></p> <p>As of May, 2015 33% of Kindergarten students (41 out of 124) scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. The target score was level 4 or higher by June, 2015.</p> <p>As of May 2015, 29% of the Kindergarten students (36 out of 124) have been absent for 15 or more days. Of these students, 47% (17 out of 36) are below proficient.</p>	<p>As of May, 2015 70% of Kindergarten students (87 out of 124) scored below proficient (5 points or below) on the writing portion of the Treasures mid-year assessment. Of those students, 44% (38 out of 87) are English Language Learners. (RF.K.3.a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3)</p> <p>As of May, 2015 54% of Kindergarten students (67 out of 124) scored below proficient on the writing portion of the Everyday Math Assessment (standard K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2)</p>
Describe the root causes of the problem	<p>Teachers received ongoing professional development from outside providers as well as job embedded trainings. However, teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how to effectively use assessments to guide instruction. Teachers are continuing to work towards refining the implementation of the program. Though teachers received professional development and support to incorporate weak curriculum areas, there was a lack of consistency from classroom to classroom. Teachers continue to refine DRA2 and analyzing the results.</p> <p>Targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic reading knowledge; stronger ability to differentiate</p>	<p>Teachers received ongoing professional development from outside providers as well as job embedded trainings. However, teachers are continuing to learn the components of the program and how to effectively use assessments to guide instruction. Teachers are continuing to work towards refining the implementation of the program. Though teachers received professional development and support to incorporate weak curriculum areas, there was a lack of consistency from classroom to classroom.</p> <p>Targeted PD to gain a stronger grasp of concepts and basic writing knowledge; stronger ability to differentiate instruction to students needs.</p>

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

	instruction to students needs.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	All
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English Language Arts	Writing
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Treasures Reading/ Writing Program Tier 2 Interventions Lexia On-line Intervention Program	Writer's Workshop Treasures Writing Program Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Curriculum
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Treasures Reading/Writing Program, Lexia are aligned with the Common Core State Standards Reading Standards for Literature- K Reading Standards for Information Text- K Reading Standards: Foundational Skills- K Writing Standards- K Speaking and Listening Standards- K Language Standards- K	Writer's Workshop, Treasures Writing Program, and Tools of the Mind Scaffold Writing Curriculum RF.K.3-a, W.K.1, W.K.2, W.K.3, K.CC.A.3, K.OA.A.1, K.OA.A.2

**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 (continued)***

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	English Language Learner proficiency for ELA, Writing, and Cross Curricular Instruction.	N/A
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	18% (22 out of 124) of the ELL population scored below proficient (70% or lower) on the Treasures Mid-Year Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored below proficient, 52% (22 out of 42) are English Language Learners.  27% (33 out of 124) of the ELL population scored a 3 or lower on the DRA2 Assessment. Therefore out of the total number of students who scored 3 or lower, 52% (33 out of 41) are English Language Learners.  21% (8 out of 39) of ELL students will continue to receive ELL support in First Grade based on the WIDA Spring Assessment results. These students scored a 4.5 or less on the WIDA Assessment.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Teachers were not exposed to a large amount of Professional Development focused on addressing the Special Education and ELL students.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELL	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	English Language Arts and Writing	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address	WIDA, Treasures Reading/Writing Program, and Lexia	

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

<p>priority problems</p>		
<p>How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?</p>	<p>WIDA, Treasures Reading/Writing Program, and Lexia are aligned with the Common Core State Standards            Reading Standards for Literature- K            Reading Standards for Information Text- K            Reading Standards: Foundational Skills- K            Writing Standards- K            Speaking and Listening Standards- K            Language Standards- K</p>	

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ELA	Students with Disabilities	In Class Support Services and Rethink	Teacher, Administrator, In-Class Support Teacher, O.T./P.T. Specialist, Speech and Language Specialist.	By June 2016, 100% of teachers will participate in specific PD trainings in order to increase students test scores in ELA. Link It Report Card Rethink	What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" Intervention Report, November 2013  "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" Practice Guide, February 2009  "Estimated Impacts of number of years of preschool attendance on vocabulary, literacy, and math skills at Kindergarten entry" <i>National Institute for Early Education Research, 2006 – nieer.org</i>  Phonological Awareness Training (Early Childhood Education for Children with Disabilities) Intervention Report, June 2012
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	Homeless* We have one documented	N/A	N/A	N/A

		homeless student in the JMFECLC.			
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLS	Professional Development to staff of ELL students and ESL support Lexia tutoring program, before and after tutoring, PLC meetings, additional one-on-one support with student advisor	Teacher, Administrator, In-Class Support, Bi-Lingual Supervisor.	By June 2016, 100% of teachers will participate in specific PD trainings in order to increase students test scores on the WIDA. Link it Report Cards	What Works Clearinghouse: "Teaching Academic Content and Literacy to English Learners in Elementary and Middle School" <i>Practice Guide, April 2014</i>  "Estimated impacts of number of years of preschool attendance on vocabulary, literacy, and math skills at Kindergarten entry" <i>National Institute for Early Education Research, 2006 – nieer.org</i>  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report, November 2013</i>  "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" <i>Practice Guide, February 2009</i>



					<b>"Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction For English Language Learners in the Elementary Grades"</b> <i>Practice Guide, December 2007</i>
Math	ELLS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Free and Reduced Lunch, Free and Reduced Before and After School Care (Champions) Lexia tutoring program, before and after tutoring, PLC meetings, additional one-on-one support with student advisor	Administrative Assistants, Student Advisors, Administrators Teachers, Instructional assistants	Genesis Database Link It Database Report Cards	NJDOE Database  "Estimated impacts of number of years of preschool attendance on vocabulary, literacy, and math skills at Kindergarten entry" <i>National Institute for Early Education Research, 2006 – nieer.org</i>  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report, November 2013</i>  "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" <i>Practice Guide, February 2009</i>

Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	All Kindergarten students not meeting grade level standards and expectations	Lexia tutoring, PLC meetings, Before and After School tutoring, additional one-on-one student advisor support	Administrators and Teachers, Instructional Assistant, Student Advisor	Link It Database Report Cards 100% of teachers will participate in professional development on the Link It dashboard program in order to help increase student achievement. During the 2015-2016 school year 100% of teachers will meet quarterly to analyze data and to establish goals with specific target dates. During the 2015-2016 school year, additional Lexia accounts need to be available for students below proficient in ELA. Therefore additional computer workstations and wi-fi throughout the building is also needed.	What Works Clearinghouse: "Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision" <i>Making Practice Guide, September 2009</i>  "Estimated impacts of number of years of preschool attendance on vocabulary, literacy, and math skills at Kindergarten entry" <i>National Institute for Early Education Research, 2006 – nieer.org</i>  "Shared Book Reading" (Early Childhood Education) <i>Intervention Report, April 2015</i>  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report, November 2013</i>

					<p><b>"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" Practice Guide, February 2009</b></p> <p>Macaruso, P., Hook, P.E., &amp; McCabe, R. (2006). "The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students" <i>Journal of Research in Reading</i>, 29, 162-172</p> <p><b>"Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers" Practice Guide, June 2012</b></p>
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ELA	Students with Disabilities	Summer Enrichment Camp Before and After School tutoring	Camp Facilitator, Administrators, and Teachers	Based on reports that measure daily attendance, JMFECLC students will attend Summer Enrichment Camp during the summer of 2016 and before/after school tutoring in an effort to bridge the achievement gap. Link It Report Card	Frazier, J.A., & Morrison, F.J. (1998). "The Influence of Extended-Year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School" <i>Child Development</i> , 69 (2), 495-517  Macaruso, P., Hook, P.E., & McCabe, R. (2006). "The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary Students" <i>Journal of Research in Reading</i> , 29, 162-172  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report</i> , November 2013  "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" <i>Practice Guide</i> , February 2009
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ELA	Homeless	Homeless* We have one documented homeless student in the JMFECLC.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLs	Summer Enrichment Camp Before and After School tutoring,	Camp Facilitator, Administrators, and Teachers	Based on reports that measure daily attendance, JMFECLC students will attend Summer Enrichment Camp during the summer of 2016 and before/after school tutoring in an effort to bridge the achievement gap. Link it Report Card	Frazier, J.A., & Morrison, F.J. (1998). "The influence of Extended-Year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School" <i>Child Development</i> , 69 (2), 495-517  Macaruso, P., Hook, P.E., & McCabe, R. (2006). "The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students" <i>Journal of Research in Reading</i> , 29, 162-172	

					<p>What Works Clearinghouse:  <i>"Reciprocal Teaching" Intervention Report, November 2013</i></p> <p><i>"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" Practice Guide, February 2009</i></p> <p><i>"Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades"</i>  <i>Practice Guide, December 2007</i></p>
Math	ELLS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Summer Enrichment Camp Before and After School tutoring	Camp Facilitator, Administrators, and Teachers	Based on reports that measure daily attendance, JM/FECLC students will attend Summer Enrichment Camp during the summer of 2016 and before/after school tutoring in an effort to bridge the achievement gap. Link It Report Card	Frazier, J.A., & Morrison, F.J. (1998). "The Influence of Extended-Year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School" <i>Child Development, 69 (2), 495-517</i>

					<p>Macaruso, P., Hook, P.E., &amp; McCabe, R. (2006). "The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students" <i>Journal of Research in Reading</i>, 29, 162-172</p> <p>What Works Clearinghouse:  <b>"Reciprocal Teaching" Intervention Report, November 2013</b></p> <p><b>"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" Practice Guide, February 2009</b></p>
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	All Kindergarten students not meeting grade level standards and expectations.	Summer Enrichment Camp Before and After School tutoring	Camp Facilitator, Administrators, and Teachers	Based on reports that measure daily attendance, JM/FECLC students will attend Summer Enrichment Camp during the summer of 2016 and before/after school tutoring in an effort to bridge the	<p>Frazier, J.A., &amp; Morrison, F.J. (1998). "The Influence of Extended-Year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School" <i>Child Development</i>, 69 (2), 495-517</p>

				<p>achievement gap. Link It Report Card</p>	<p>Macaruso, P., Hook, P.E., &amp; McCabe, R. (2006). "The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students" <i>Journal of Research in Reading</i>, 29, 162-172</p> <p>What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report</i>, November 2013</p> <p>"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" <i>Practice Guide</i>, February 2009</p> <p>"Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction For English Language Learners in the Elementary Grades" <i>Practice Guide</i>, December 2007</p> <p>"Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers" <i>Practice Guide</i>, June 2012</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

Math	N/A	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**

ELA	Students with Disabilities	PLC, Data Walks, Article Studies, and Peer Coaching, Treasures Reading Specialists	Administrators, Teachers, and Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings. Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness.  100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations Link It Report Card McREL Teacher Evaluation	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R. (2011). "Promoting professional learning from within" <i>International Schools Journal</i> , Vol. 30, Issue 2  Rose, S., 2009. "Personal professional development through coaching" <i>CEDER Yearbook</i> , p199-214  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report</i> , November 2013
-----	----------------------------	--	---	--	---

						<i>"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" Practice Guide, February 2009</i>
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Homeless	Homeless* We have one documented homeless student in the JMFECLC.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	ELLS	PLC, Data Walks, Article Studies, and Peer Coaching, Treasures Reading Specialists	Administrators, Teachers, and Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings. Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness.	100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R. (2011). <i>"Promoting professional learning from within" International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2</i>

				during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations Link It Report Card MCREL Teacher Evaluation	Rose, S., 2009. "Personal professional development through coaching" <i>CEDER Yearbook</i> , p199-214  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report</i> , November 2013  "Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" <i>Practice Guide</i> , February 2009
Math	ELLs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PLC, Data Walks, Article Studies, and Peer Coaching, Treasures Reading Specialists	Administrators, Teachers, and Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings. Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness.  100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R. (2011). "Promoting professional learning from within" <i>International Schools Journal</i> , Vol. 30, Issue 2  Rose, S., 2009. "Personal professional development through coaching" <i>CEDER Yearbook</i> , p199-214

				development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student populations Link It Report Card McREL Teacher Evaluation	What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report, November 2013</i>
					"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" <i>Practice Guide, February 2009</i>
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	All Kindergarten students not meeting grade level standards and expectations.	PLC, Data Walks, Article Studies, and Peer Coaching, Treasures Reading Specialists	Administrators, Teachers, and Curriculum Supervisor	100% of teachers will take part in weekly PLC meetings. Teachers will self reflect and self analyze to determine their areas of weakness.  100% of teachers in the school will complete an article study during PLCs or professional development days. Articles will be selected on specific needs of our target student population Link It	Magnuson, P., and Mota, R. (2011). "Promoting professional learning from within" <i>International Schools Journal, Vol. 30, Issue 2</i>  Rose, S., 2009. "Personal professional development through coaching" <i>CEDER Yearbook, p199-214</i>  What Works Clearinghouse: "Reciprocal Teaching" <i>Intervention Report, November 2013</i>

				Lexia Report Card MCREL Teacher Evaluation	"Assisting Students Struggling with Reading" Practice Guide, February 2009
Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

## **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.

- 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 Title I/NCLB Committee will meet with all stakeholders on a monthly basis to review and evaluate the school wide program. Administrators, teachers, and support staff will be responsible for conducting both an internal and external school wide program evaluation for 2015-2016.
- 2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?** Interventions and strategies that are recommended for specific content areas where students score below proficient that are not fully met with 100% fidelity, could pose a challenge in implementing this process.
- 3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?** It is vital that all stakeholders evaluate data consistently to determine needed interventions and support. Data will be reviewed and analyzed during the monthly meetings. Data is analyzed during weekly PLC meetings, weekly faculty meetings, and ScIP meetings. This is to ensure all stakeholders are involved in the data analysis process.
- 4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?** A school climate/perception survey will be distributed to all staff at the beginning and end of the year. Data will be reviewed and analyzed by all stakeholders on a monthly basis

5. **What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?** Parents and community members will receive a survey and the beginning and end of year. The community needs assessment survey will be distributed to all families and data will be used to develop family and community engagement activities throughout the year.
6. **How will the school structure interventions?** Administrators and support staff will develop timelines and schedules in order to effectively implement, model, and monitor strategies put in place.
7. **How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?** Students will receive instructional interventions on a daily basis. The effectiveness of these interventions will be monitored on a bi-weekly basis.
8. **What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?** Wi-Fi throughout the building and additional computers stations/labs will be needed to support the school wide program and implement technology based interventions. RTI and I & RS Action Plans will be used consistently in order to increase student achievement. Leveled Readers and additional curriculum materials will be distributed.
9. **What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?** Data will be available through our district wide data system, Link It, including Everyday Math Assessment, DRA2 Assessment, and Treasures Assessment. The Genesis Database System will assess attendance and parent contact information. Report Card data will be used to determine if students are meeting core curriculum standards. Support staff will monitor effectiveness of RTI/I & RS action plans.
10. **How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?** The information will be disseminated through the Link It and Genesis Database systems on a regular basis and in addition to analysis of the data at the monthly Title I/NCLB meetings with all stakeholders in attendance.

*\*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 (See IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
All content areas	All families	Parent/Teacher Conferences	Teachers/Parents /Support Staff/ Administrators	Based on data collected, 100% of families will attend either fall or spring conferences. Those unable to attend will be offered a phone conference, or home visit to discuss their child's progress. Translators will be provided to all families in need.	IES Practice Guide: "Structuring Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement" <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072_109.pdf">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072_109.pdf</a>
All content areas	All families	Curriculum Day Visits followed with a Q&A session/Translators provided	Administrators/ Teachers/Support Staff	During the 2015-2016 school year, at least 7-10 parents per classroom will attend curriculum visit sessions. Attendance and effectiveness measured by sign in sheets, surveys, and feedback forms.	"Parent Involvement Strongly Impacts Student Achievement" <i>Science Daily (May 2008)</i> - "Parent Involvement in Preschool/Kindergarten: Predictors and the Relation of the Involvement to Pre-literacy Development" <i>School Psychology Review, 2008</i>

**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/Core Curriculum Areas	All Families	Informational Session/ <i>Data Dinner</i> for Parents regarding Kindergarten Core Curriculum Standards and Detailed Description of Student Report Card/Data Assessments	Teachers/ Administrator/ Student Advisor	Based on data collected from 2014-2015, there will be at least a 10% increase in attendance at family involvement events.	IES Practice Guide: "Structuring Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement" <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg.072.109.pdf">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg.072.109.pdf</a>
ELA	ELL students/families	Adult ESL classes for bi-lingual families	ELL Supervisor/ Administrators	Based on data collected from 2014-2015, there will be at least a 10% increase in parental attendance for ESL classes.	"English Language Learners Evidence ,Review, Protocol" <i>Reference Resource, January 2013</i> "Teaching Academic Content to ELL in Elementary and Middle School" <i>IES Practice Guide, April 2014</i>
All content areas	All Families/Students	Parent –School Compact	Student Advisors/ Teachers/ Administrators	100% of parents will sign a parent-school compact	Finn, J., (1998). "Parental engagement that makes a difference" <i>Educational Leadership, Volume 55.</i>
All content areas	All Students/Families	Back To School Night/ Orientation	Administrator and Staff	During the 2015-2016 school year 10% more families will attend Back To School Night	IES Practice Guide: "Structuring Out-Of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement" <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practic">http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practic</a>

**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 focusing on home school and community connections	Students/families/ staff and community organizations	<b>Unity in the Community Luncheon:</b> Families, students, and local community organizations will collaborate and consult in order to increase student achievement	Student Advisor/ITRS Team/Administrators	Attendance and effectiveness measured by sign in sheets, surveys, and feedback forms.	"The Family Checkup with High Risk Indigent Families: Preventing Problem Behavior by Increasing Positive Behavior Support" <i>Wiley Online Library, 2008</i>
All content areas	Early Childhood Advisory Council Members (administrators, parents, staff, NIDOE, and community members	Early Childhood Advisory Council Meetings will include an increased amount of parents and community members	Student Advisor/CPIs/ Administrators	Sign in sheets, agenda, and minutes from all meetings. The ECAC will increase the amount of parents and community member stakeholders by 10%. Effectiveness measured by feedback forms and surveys.	See NIDOE website under the Early Childhood Department for mandates regarding the effectiveness of ECAC input in NJ School Districts

*\*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?** To increase parental involvement in the school and to strengthen the home-school connection, parental involvement activities in ELA and writing will be implemented. To see and encourage parental involvement further, we will continue to maintain web pages to remain in daily contact with all families to encourage positive participation in their child's education. Incentives and rewards will be provided to families in attendance, and classrooms with the highest percentage of attendees will be recognized.
2. **How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?** Parents will serve on the School wide NCLB/Title 1 Committee. In addition, parents will be given surveys or questionnaires that will provide valuable input in regards to the district's parent involvement policy.
3. **How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?** The school will distribute its written parent involvement policy through the school-parent compact being sent home with students and it will be posted on the school district's website so that it will be assessable to all families and community stakeholders. Paper copies (translated into student's native language) will be provided, as needed.
4. **How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?** The school will engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact using input from School-climate surveys, and NCLB/Title 1 meetings.

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

5. **How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?** Parents are asked to sign the document and return it to school. Teachers and student advisors will follow up, by way of phone calls and home visits to ensure a compact is returned by every student.
6. **How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?** Student achievement data is reported to the public via the school report card, at monthly board meetings, and through notifications sent home. Teachers will discuss individual data with families at parent teacher conference, I&RS meetings, and at home visits throughout the school year.
7. **How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?** If the district has not met their annual measurable objectives, parents will be notified by letter.
8. **How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?** The school will inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results via the school report card. Additionally, central office presents a public agenda meeting to address these results.
9. **How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I School wide Plan?** The school involves families and community in the development of the Title 1 School wide plan by having parent representatives attend NCLB monthly meetings and through yearly parent surveys. Increased family involvement and community engagement at Early Childhood Advisory Council Meetings will assist the school and all stakeholders in the development of the NCLC/Title 1 School-wide Plan.

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

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

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds? The JMFECLC School will use its 2015-2016 parental involvement funds in a multitude of ways. First, the funds will be allocated to hold several events that are intended to promote a positive school culture and climate that includes the learning of social skills and study habits that promote student achievement. One example of this is Open House/Back To School Night in which the building principal will introduce and inform the parents of school wide initiatives. Second, the school funds will be allocated to promote the awareness of curriculum and common core state standards. Third, allocations will be set aside for the recognition of student achievement and parental involvement.

*\*Provide a separate response for each question.*

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**

		Credentials are located in the Main Office	
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	29		
	100%		
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	N/A		
	0		
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by ESEA (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	23	60 credits or Para Pro Test	
	100%		
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by ESEA (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	N/A		
	0		

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

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.

<p>The personnel director and District Administrators attend college and university fairs to recruit highly qualified teachers. Job openings are also posted in the local newspapers and on the district's website. The district offers a high-quality mentoring program for new teachers, as well as an extensive new teacher induction program. This program is conducted throughout the school year and attendance is mandatory for all new teachers. Highly qualified specialists and district personnel are used to help new teachers achieve success in their classroom. Every new teacher is assigned a veteran teacher to help them with the routine problems and concerns that face new teachers. This program coupled with an extensive interview process has helped the district to retain highly qualified teachers. Teachers are afforded the opportunity to advance their studies by attending in-services, workshops, and conferences in and out of the district.</p> <p>Every Instructional Assistant in the district has met the NCLB requirement. With the onset of the new legislation, Long Branch entered into an agreement with the Brookdale Community College to offer courses to all of the paraprofessionals in the district. This was done at the expense of the district and enabled many paraprofessionals to receive their Associate of Arts Degree and become highly qualified. Those who did not attend Brookdale courses attended prep sessions so that they were able to take the Para-Pro test. Retention rate of paraprofessionals is high in the Long Branch School District.</p>	<p>Primarily the District Manager of Personnel and Special Projects in collaboration with the Board of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Central Office Staff, and Principals.</p>
--	--