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: NEPTUNE TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DISTRICT	School: GABLES SCHOOL
Chief School Administrator: DR. MICHALE LAKE (INTERIM)	Address: 1 GABLES COURT, NEPTUNE, NJ 07753
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: superintendent@neptune.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: PRESCHOOL – GRADE 5
Title I Contact: AUDRA GUTRIDGE	Principal: SALLY A. MILLAWAY
Title I Contact E-mail: agutridge@neptune.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: samillaway@neptune.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 732-776-2200 EXT. 7805	Principal's Phone Number: 732-776-2200 EXT. 5801

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.

Sally A. Millaway	Sally A Millaway	6/28/15
Principal's Name (Print)	**Principal's Signature**	**Date**

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held 5 (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ 2,878,900, which comprised 93.17 % of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 2,871,900, which will comprise 97.2 % 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
Elementary ELA Supplies	1,2,3	Individualized Learning Instruction	100 – 300	$5,250.00
DRA and Data & Assessment Training	1,2,3	Data Analysis	200 – 300	$5,400.00
Family Engagement Activities	1, 2	Parental Involvement	100 – 100 200 – 600	$1,656.00
Technology	3	Technology Integration	200-300	$6,000.00

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
Sally A. Millaway, Ed.D.	Principal	X	X	X	ON FILE
Karen Watt	LAL Department Chair	X	X	X	ON FILE
Amanda Grace	Teacher/NTEA Rep	X	X	X	ON FILE
Noreen Perry	Teacher /Kindergarten	X	X	X	ON FILE
Karen Poll	Teacher/RIISA Team	X	X	X	ON FILE
Patricia Monroe	Reading Teacher	X	X	X	ON FILE
Dorothea Forte	Math Facilitator	X	X	X	ON FILE
Tiye Goodman	Parent			X	ON FILE
Lorri Legere	Parent		X	X	ON FILE

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
2/23/2015	GABLES SCHOOL CONFERENCE ROOM	PLAN REVIEW PARENT WORKSHOPS	X		X	
3/30/2015	GABLES SCHOOL LIBRARY	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
4/16/2015	GABLES SCHOOL CONFERENCE ROOM	Schoolwide Plan Development REVIEWED PRIORITY PROBLEMS	X		YES-PLAN	
4/30/2015	GABLES SCHOOL CONFERENCE ROOM	Plan Development SCIP, INTERVENTION TEAM	X		YES -Plan	
6/10/2015	GABLES SCHOOL CONFERENCE ROOM	Plan Development	X		YES - Plan	

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?	The Gables School staff is committed to creating a school culture that is safer, kinder and more respectful where students will become confident, resourceful learners. We believe, that with support from our entire school community, our students will: ✓ Read with comprehension, write with skill and communicate effectively and responsibly in a variety of ways and settings. ✓ Know and apply the common core and principles of mathematics, social studies, science, health and fitness. ✓ Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and integrate experiences to form reasoned judgments and solve problems. ✓ Understand the importance of work and how performance, effort and decisions directly affect their future educational opportunities and ultimately, careers. ✓ Develop a concern for the environment, the local and global communities, and the future and welfare of others. We create classroom environments in which our students use assessments to understand what success looks like and how to improve next time, resulting in prospering students who are prepared for the challenges of the 21st century.

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, the Gables School successfully implemented the various components of the 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program.

2. **What were the strengths of the implementation process?**

   The DRA-2 data was utilized to establish Student Growth Objectives. The RIISA sessions aligned nicely to the school's implementation of the Readers and Writers Workshop model.

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

   Time continues to be a challenge in terms of turn-keying professional development.
   Parent interest in PAC/FAC continues to be a struggle, as well as participation in family engagement activities.

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

   - Strengths – Student interest in reading; Collaboration of staff; Students' development of reading strategies
   - Weaknesses – Loss of instructional time due to standardized testing demands, as well as impact on students' access to the library, the technology lab, along with the cancellation of reading and math intervention (due to test administration)

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

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

The various stakeholders were involved in the needs assessment and the development of the plan to address the priority problems. The School Improvement Committee members were instrumental in keeping the staff abreast of the School-wide plan and other components related to the correlation of teacher evaluation and professional development.

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

Surveys were used to measure the perception of the grade level professional learning communities, as well of the district-wide professional learning communities of the special area teachers.
During a staff meeting, a collaborative activity was conducted where teachers worked in groups to share the work of their grade level professional development sessions, and then identify a priority problem. Problems were written on post-it notes and then placed on large chart paper. A similar activity was conducted in regards to professional development needs. The ScIP team members then reviewed the post-it notes, identifying common themes and incorporating them into the plan.

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

Parent surveys and feedback from the PTO consistently reflect a positive attitude toward the teaching staff and the academic programs offered at Gables School. We continue to try to increase the use of technology to strengthen the connection to our families. The PTO recently started a Facebook page keeping parents abreast of upcoming events, and sharing articles related to the importance of reading and other ways to support your child's schooling.

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

- Reading Intervention – tiers ranging from differentiated instruction within the classroom, small group and one-on-one
- Math Intervention – in-class support and small group
- Summer Academy – small group

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

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

Reading intervention is tiered. Through the use of the Readers and Writers Workshop model, the classroom teacher provides the first tier of intervention through differentiation. The second tier is provided by the classroom teacher and/or the in-class support/intervention teacher in a small group. For students requiring additional support, a one on one intervention model is used. For reading instruction, the Leveled Literacy Intervention program is used on an 12 week cycle. Math intervention is provided through in-class support as well as a flexible grouping for one on one support based on data and teacher observation. Aimed at preventing summer loss, the NASA summer academy provides additional targeted instruction in small group.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Interventions were provided on a daily basis, with different tiers on an as needed basis.

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

- DRA-2 Management System
- Link-it
- Accelerated Reader
- TEACHscape
- School Messenger
- District Website/ School webpage
- Social Media

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

Technology strengthened the data analysis through the use of the DRA-2 Management System for reading levels, Link-it for benchmark data, and TEACHscape for instructional observation data. Accelerated Reader provided individualized learning.
School messenger, the school webpage and social media was utilized to strengthen the home-school connection.

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 *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	23	Not Available Yet	New LAL curriculum aligned to common core standards; Increased rigor; NASA Summer Academy, LLI used in grades 1-3	Yes – New Jersey School Performance report 100% in terms of Showing Growth. Although students showed growth there are still a large number considered at risk. 24% (11) students scored below 40% on the LAL End of Year assessment
Grade 5	33	Not Available Yet	New LAL curriculum aligned to common core standards; Increased rigor; NASA Summer Academy	Yes – New Jersey School Performance report 100% in terms of Showing Growth. Although students showed growth there are still a large number considered at risk. The 2013-2014 cohort of students was consistently at-risk, and impacted by mobility. 24% (11) scored below 40% on the LAL End of Year assessment.
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

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	8	Not Available Yet	Differentiation integrated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator	Yes – 100% of the showing growth targets were met as reported in the NJ Performance Report. 20% (9) students scored below 40% on the Math End of Year assessment. 20% (9) students scored above 80%.

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

Grade 5	20	Not Available Yet	Differentiation integrated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator	Yes – 100% of the showing growth targets were met as reported in the NJ Performance Report. The 2013-2014 cohort of students was consistently at-risk. Impacted by mobility. 22% (11) students scored below 40%. 6% (3) students scored above 80%.
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance
Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** **or** ***did not*** **result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	Early Childhood Program – Tools of the Mind Work Sampling System is utilized for data collection	Yes – High quality program; District longitudinal data indicate improving student achievement for socio-economically disadvantaged students and improved writing performance for African American students
Kindergarten	27	29 as of Jan. 2015	Work Sampling System, DRA-2	Work sampling looks at the whole child and by collecting pieces of work over time, teachers can see the progress students are making. January mid-year DRA data
Grade 1	25 in Jan 4 in June	31 as of Jan. 2015	Revised LAL curriculum; Reading and Writing Workshop model; Tiered reading intervention including LLI	Yes –8% (4) students scored below 40% on LAL End of Year assessment. 47% (23) students scored above 80%.
Grade 2	21 in	12 as of	Revised LAL curriculum; Reading and Writing	No – 37% (21) students scored below 40% on the LAL

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

	Jan 13 in June	Jan. 2015	Workshop model; Tiered reading intervention including LLI	End of Year assessment. 2%(1) student scored above 80%
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

Mathematics	**2013 - 2014**	**2014 - 2015**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Pre-Kindergarten	N/A	N/A	Tools of the Mind Preschool Program	Yes - District longitudinal data indicate improving student achievement for socio-economically disadvantaged students
Kindergarten	0	Not Available Yet	Early Childhood Education; Differentiation integrated into Everyday Math program; Tools of the Mind emphasizes executive functions	Yes - Majority of student population attended district's preschool program. 88% scored above 80% on End of Year assessment. Only one student scored below 60%.
Grade 1	0	Not Available Yet	Differentiation integrated into Everyday Math program	Yes – 76% (37) students scored over 80% on the End of Year math assessment
Grade 2	4	Not Available Yet	Differentiation integrated into Everyday Math program	Yes – 27% (11) students scored over 80% on the End of Year math assessment
Grade 9	N/A	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A	N/A		

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

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Leveled Literacy Intervention used by Reading teacher; Readers and Writers Workshop; DRA-2, Reading Eggs, Raz-kids, Reading A to Z, Writing A to Z NASA Summer Academy	Yes	DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	LLI is used with 20 students. Of the 20 students, 100% have increased at least one level, with some increasing multiple levels from June 2014 to January 2015. They will be reassessed in June 2015. Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
Math	Students with Disabilities	EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2; Differentiation incorporated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator; NASA Summer Academy	Yes	Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Homeless	Leveled Literacy Intervention used by Reading teacher; Readers and Writers Workshop; DRA-2, Reading Eggs, Raz-kids, Reading A to Z, Writing A to Z NASA Summer Academy RIISA	Yes	DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	LLI is used with 20 students. Of the 20 students, 100% have increased at least one level, with some increasing multiple levels from June 2014 to January 2015. They will be reassessed in June 2015. Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50% However, mobility is negatively impacting this sub-group as many don't finish out the school year due to relocation. NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
Math	Homeless	EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2; Differentiation incorporated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator	YES	Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66%

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)
		NASA Summer Academy			NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	N/A			
Math	ELLs	N/A			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Leveled Literacy Intervention used by Reading teacher; Readers and Writers Workshop; DRA-2, Reading Eggs, Raz-kids, Reading A to Z, Writing A to Z NASA Summer Academy RIISA	YES	DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	LLI is used with 20 students. Of the 20 students, 100% have increased at least one level, with some increasing multiple levels from June 2014 to January 2015. They will be reassessed in June 2015. Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2; Differentiation	YES	Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels

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)
		incorporated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator NASA Summer Academy			Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
ELA					
Math					

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	Extended School Year NASA Summer Academy	YES	Summer Progress Reports DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	Designed to avoid summer regression Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows

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	Extended School Year NASA Summer Academy	YES	Summer Progress Reports Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Designed to avoid summer regression Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	N/A			
Math	ELLs	N/A			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	NASA Summer Academy Extended School Year	YES	DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	Designed to avoid summer regression Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5.

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)
					Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	NASA Summer Academy Extended School Year	YES	Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Designed to avoid summer regression Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66% NASA – 41 students attended / 5 No Shows
ELA					
Math					

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	Readers and Writers Workshop RIISA Professional Learning Communities	YES	Danielson Instructional Observation Data PLC Minutes PLC Survey Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	80% of Gables teachers were rated effective and 20% of Gables teachers were rated highly effective The average of the staff's Danielson summative scores (without mSGP) was 3.34. The average SGP for Gables teachers was 3.0.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Professional Development related to EDM4 Common Core alignment grades K-2; Professional Learning Communities	YES	Danielson Instructional Observation Data PLC Minutes, PLC Survey Results, Math Benchmarks SGO Data	80% of Gables teachers were rated effective and 20% of Gables teachers were rated highly effective The average of the staff's Danielson summative scores (without mSGP) was 3.34. The average SGP for Gables teachers was 3.0.
ELA	Homeless	Readers and Writers Workshop RIISA Professional Learning Communities	YES	Danielson Instructional Observation Data PLC Minutes PLC Survey Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	80% of Gables teachers were rated effective and 20% of Gables teachers were rated highly effective The average of the staff's Danielson summative scores (without mSGP) was 3.34. The average SGP for Gables teachers was 3.0.
Math	Homeless	Professional Development related to EDM4 Common Core alignment grades K-2;	YES	Danielson Instructional Observation Data PLC Minutes, PLC Survey Results, Math Benchmarks SGO Data	80% of Gables teachers were rated effective and 20% of Gables teachers were rated highly effective The average of the staff's Danielson summative scores (without mSGP) was 3.34.

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)
		Professional Learning Communities			The average SGP for Gables teachers was 3.0.
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	N/A			
Math	ELLs	N/A			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Readers and Writers Workshop RIISA	YES	Danielson Instructional Observation Data PLC Minutes PLC Survey Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	80% of Gables teachers were rated effective and 20% of Gables teachers were rated highly effective The average of the staff's Danielson summative scores (without mSGP) was 3.34. The average SGP for Gables teachers was 3.0.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Professional Development related to EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2	YES	Danielson Instructional Observation Data PLC Minutes PLC Survey Results Math Benchmarks SGO Data	80% of Gables teachers were rated effective and 20% of Gables teachers were rated highly effective The average of the staff's Danielson summative scores (without mSGP) was 3.34. The average SGP for Gables teachers was 3.0.
ELA					
Math					

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

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	Students with Disabilities	Leveled Literacy Intervention used by Reading teacher; Readers and Writers Workshop; DRA-2, Reading Eggs, Raz-kids, Reading A to Z, Writing A to Z Extended School Year RIISA	YES	Parent Conference Data DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	Fall Parent Conference Participation – 85% Spring Parent Conference Participation – 78% LLI is used with 20 students. Of the 20 students, 100% have increased at least one level, with some increasing multiple levels from June 2014 to January 2015. They will be reassessed in June 2015. Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50%
Math	Students with Disabilities	EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2; Differentiation incorporated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator Extended School Year	YES	Parent Conference Data Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Fall Parent Conference Participation – 85% Spring Parent Conference Participation – 78% Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66%

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Homeless	NASA Summer Academy RIISA	YES	Parent Conference Data DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	Fall Parent Conference Participation – 85% Spring Parent Conference Participation – 78% Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50%
Math	Homeless	EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2; Differentiation incorporated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator; NASA Summer Academy	YES	Parent Conference Data Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Fall Parent Conference Participation – 85% Spring Parent Conference Participation – 78% Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60% Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66%
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	N/A			
Math	ELLs	N/A			

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Leveled Literacy Intervention used by Reading teacher; Readers and Writers Workshop; DRA-2, Reading Eggs, Raz-kids, Reading A to Z, Writing A to Z, NASA Summer Academy, RIISA	YES	Parent Conference Data DRA-2 Results LAL Benchmarks SGO Data	Fall Parent Conference Participation – 85% Spring Parent Conference Participation – 78% LLI is used with 20 students. Of the 20 students, 100% have increased at least one level, with some increasing multiple levels from June 2014 to January 2015. They will be reassessed in June 2015. Language Arts proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in grades 1-5. Grade 1 – from 66% to 60% Grade 2 – from 29% to 43% Grade 3 – from 34% to 48% Grade 4 – from 41% to 51% Grade 5 – from 47% to 50%
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	EDM4 Common Core alignment in grades K-2; Differentiation incorporated into Everyday Math program; Targeted instruction provided by math facilitator NASA Summer	YES	Parent Conference Data Math Benchmarks SGO Data	Fall Parent Conference Participation – 85% Spring Parent Conference Participation – 78% Math proficiency grew from the pre-assessment to the mid-assessment in all grade levels Grade 1 – from 57% to 78% Grade 2 – from 47% to 76% Grade 3 – from 39% to 60%

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)
		Academy			Grade 4 – from 45% to 65% Grade 5 – from 49% to 66%
ELA					
Math					

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.

Sally A. Millaway, Ed.D.	Sally A Millaway	6/28/15
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	DRA Results NJASK 3, 4 and 5	LLI is used with 20 students. Of the 20 students, 100% have increased at least one level, with some increasing multiple levels from June 2014 to January 2015. They will be reassessed in June 2015. Grade K – 29 students below proficiency (Jan. 2015) Grade 1 – 31 students below proficiency (Jan. 2015) Grade 2 – 12 students below proficiency (only grade with decrease from Jan 2014 data) Grade 3 – 29 students below proficiency (Jan. 2015) Grade 4 – 19 students below proficiency (Jan. 2015) Grade 5 – 26 students below proficiency (Jan. 2015)
Academic Achievement - Writing	LAL Benchmark Data	African Americans – Average LAL Pre Test (Mid-year if available) Grade 1 – 65% pre Grade 2 – 29% pre and 53% mid Grade 3 – 32% pre Grade 4 – 38% pre Grade 5 – 48% pre
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Math Benchmark Data	African Americans – Average Math Pre Test (Mid-year if available) Grade 1 – 57% pre and 78% mid-year Grade 2 – 44% pre and 73% mid-year Grade 3 – 39% pre and 57% mid-year Grade 4 – 44% pre and 64% mid-year

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)
		Grade 5 – 50% pre and 68% mid-year
Family and Community Engagement	Parent Conference Attendance Rates, Parent Portal Use, Parent Surveys, Student Attendance	85% participation during Fall parent conferences 78% participation during Spring parent conferences Student Absenteeism – 9% not meeting target of 6%
Professional Development	Instructional Observation Data	2014 – 2015 Teacher Evaluation – 3.34 average of all scores
Leadership	Principal Evaluation	2014 – 2015 Marshall Rubric Score – 3.54; School SGP - 3
School Climate and Culture	HIB Report; Parent and Staff Surveys	HIB Self-Assessment Score 2013-2014 – 65 out of 75
School-Based Youth Services		
Students with Disabilities	NJASK	NJASK5 Math – 39% proficient; 6% advanced proficient NJASK5 LAL – 11% proficient
Homeless Students	DRA Results/AR levels	2014-2015 – 18 students identified as homeless/displaced in grades preschool through grade 5 Of the 18, 10 are still enrolled as of the writing of this plan DRA results – 50% below grade level, 30% on grade level, 20% above grade level
Migrant Students	N/A	
English Language Learners	N/A	
Economically Disadvantaged	NJASK 3, 4 and 5	2013-2014 NJASK LAL – 34.6 not meeting the target of 56.1 2013-2014 NJASK Math – 57.7 not meeting the target of 75.1

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

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

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

   Standardized test data, DRA benchmark testing and Pre and Mid-Year assessment data for both Language Arts and Mathematics were reviewed.

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

   Benchmark assessments were administered in Link It which has the capability of generating reports that sort by the various sub-groups, as well as by standards. One of the department chairs has the responsibility of running district and school reports. Students are identified as partial and at-risk proficient. Growth by race was also compiled.

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)?**

   Benchmarks have been found to be a good predictor of NJASK performance. Link-it has ensured the reliability and validity of the district assessment.

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

   A review of teacher evaluation data, using the Danielson Framework in TEACHscape, and student data identified a need for Professional Development in the following areas: reading strategies (Readers Workshop), providing meaningful feedback to improve writing (Writers Workshop), Everyday Math and common core alignment, and strengthening data literacy and the PLC.

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

   - The implementation of Readers and Writers Workshop was effective.
   - The use of demonstration lessons and in-class coaching is effective and well received by staff.
   - The use of school and district level staff to turn-key professional development is effective.

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

- Data analysis is conducted during PLCs
- DRA-2 data and writing evaluations are used
- Link It provides historical data
- Language Arts Literacy and Mathematics pre-assessments are administered in September
- DRA is administered to new students in September, if Spring data is not available

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

Tier 1 Intervention – Classroom instruction (differentiation)

Tier 2 Intervention – Classroom instruction (one-on-one targeted instruction) and in-class support

Tier 3 Intervention – Intervention provided by reading teacher and/or math facilitator

Tier 4 Intervention – Referral to Student Staff Support Team and Action Plan developed

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

Students are identified at time of registration (or when the family identifies itself as displaced/homeless). The district liaison is notified ensuring that all services are made available (Title 1 services, transportation, food service, school uniform assistance, in-district health clinic, etc.)

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

Students are identified at time of registration (or when the family identifies itself as migrant). The district liaison is notified ensuring that all services are made available (Title 1 services, transportation, food service, school uniform assistance, in-district health clinic, etc.)

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?

The district Professional Development coordinator reviews all feedback sheets following PD sessions. A summer institute including a menu of workshops was made available to all district staff.

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

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

The Early Childhood Advisory Council coordinates a transition program for preschool and kindergarten, kindergarten and first grade, and first grade and second grade providing the opportunity for currently enrolled student to visit the future classes and eat in the cafeteria (for rising preschoolers). This contributes to a smooth transition. There are also two summer Parent Orientation programs for preschoolers and kindergartners and their families. For rising up fifth graders moving to middle school, the assigned counselor visits the 5th grade students. Students select elective courses for the upcoming year. An evening parent information session is held. In August, a two day orientation program is held.

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

Priority problems were identified through a combination of PLC discussion, data analysis of DRA, district assessments and NJASK. During a staff meeting, a collaborative activity was conducted where teachers worked in groups to share the work of their grade level professional development sessions, and then identify a priority problem. Problems were written on post-it notes and then placed on large chart paper. A similar activity was conducted in regards to professional development needs. The ScIP team members then reviewed the post-it notes, identifying common themes and incorporating them into the plan.

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	Reading Skills	Reading Skills
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	DRA data aligns to NJASK data	DRA data
Describe the root causes of the problem	Poor comprehension skills	Fluency; Comprehension skills
Subgroups or populations addressed	All Students	Targeted students reading below grade level
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Language Arts Literacy	Language Arts Literacy
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Teachers College – Readers Workshop model Tools of the Mind – Vygotsky's theories	Use of the Leveled Literacy Intervention program
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Researched based practices that address the skills needed to meet the rigor of the common core and strengthen students' reading strategies.	Researched based practices that address the skills needed to meet the rigor of the common core and strengthen students' reading strategies.

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	Technology Integration	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Teacher feedback and parent feedback	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Resources – limited access/equipment, scheduling, shared staff	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Technology integration	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Best practices for technology integration	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	PARCC is a computer based test requiring students in grades 3 through 5 to be proficient in technology	

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)**
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Readers and Writers Workshop model	Principal Dept. Chair Reading teacher	DRA results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	Students with Disabilities	EDM-4 aligned to Common Core; Math facilitator	Principal Dept. Chair Math facilitator	Math Benchmarks	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Readers and Writers Workshop model	Principal Dept. Chair Reading	DRA results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated

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)
			teacher		Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	EDM-4 aligned to Common Core; Math facilitator	Principal Dept. Chair Math facilitator	Math Benchmarks	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
ELA	All	Readers and Writers Workshop model	Principal Dept. Chair Reading teacher	DRA results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	All	EDM-4 aligned to Common Core; Math facilitator	Principal Dept. Chair Math facilitator	Math Benchmarks	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"

***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)

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)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Revised Curricula Reading and Writing Workshop model ESY Program	Principal Dept. Chair Rdg Teacher .	DRA results LAL Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	Students with Disabilities	Curriculum Alignment to Common Core Everyday Mathematics ESY Program	Principal Dept. Chair Math Fac.	Math Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
ELA	Homeless	Revised Curricula Reading and Writing Workshop model NASA Program	Principal Dept. Chair Rdg Teacher Counselor	DRA results LAL Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	Homeless	Curriculum Alignment to Common Core Everyday Mathematics NASA Program	Principal Dept.Chair Math Facilitator Counselor	Math Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	N/A			
Math	ELLs	N/A			

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

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an 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)
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Revised Curricula Reading and Writing Workshop model NASA Program	Principal Dept. Chairs Reading Teacher	DRA results LAL Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Curriculum Alignment to Common Core Everyday Mathematics NASA Program	Principal Dept. Chairs Math Fac.	Math Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
ELA	All	Revised Curricula Reading and Writing Workshop model NASA Program	Principal Dept. Chairs Reading Teacher	DRA results LAL Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"
Math	All	Curriculum Alignment to Common Core Everyday Mathematics NASA Program	Principal Dept. Chairs Math Fac.	Math Benchmark results	What Works Clearinghouse "The Impact of the Measures of Academic Progress on Differentiated Instruction and Student Achievement"

***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.

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Readers and Writers Workshop; Professional Learning Communities; Fundations	LAL Dept. Chair Principal Teachers	Danielson Framework for Teaching reports	Teachers' College of Columbia University; DuFour and Marzano (2011) Leaders of Learning
Math	Students with Disabilities	Everyday Math ED4 – Common Core Alignment	LAL Dept. Chair Principal Teachers	Danielson Framework for Teaching reports	Standards Based Instruction (Marzano)
ELA	Homeless	RIISA	Principal Select teachers	Danielson Framework for Teaching reports	Teachers' College of Columbia University; DuFour and Marzano (2011) Leaders of Learning
Math	Homeless	RIISA	Principal Select teachers	Danielson Framework for Teaching reports	Standards Based Instruction (Marzano)
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Fundations; RIISA; ECERS-3; PLCs	Principal Teachers	Danielson Framework for Teaching reports	Teachers' College of Columbia University; DuFour and Marzano (2011) Leaders of Learning

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)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	RIISA; ECERS-3; PLCs	Principal Teachers	Danielson Framework for Teaching reports	Standards Based Instruction (Marzano)
ELA					
Math					

***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.

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 School Improvement Panel members, along with representatives from the Parent/Family Advisory Council will evaluate the plan, incorporating data analysis following the administration of assessments.

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

   Time continues to be the greatest challenge. Meeting the requirements of AchieveNJ consumed a large amount of PLC time. The plan attempts to utilize protocols to structure the use of PLC time and maximize the use of time that teachers have together to collaborate.

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

   Because the various stakeholders contributed to development of the plan, it is believed that the consensus will result in buy-in. The multiple measures of data reviewed in drafting the plan are evident of consistent priority problems and the need for interventions.

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

   Throughout the year, the school district utilizes surveys and administrators facilitate Professional Learning Community sessions which provide the opportunity to get formal and informal feedback. Post conferences following instructional observations will also provide feedback.

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

   Gables School families are surveyed regularly.

6. **How will the school structure interventions?**

   Through the use of the DRA-2 and STARS testing (Accelerated Reader program), data will be collected to identify at-risk students. Following the 4-tier structure below, interventions will be provided.

   Tier 1 Intervention – Classroom instruction (differentiation)
   Tier 2 Intervention – Classroom instruction (one-on-one targeted instruction) – in-class support
   Tier 3 Intervention – Intervention provided by the reading teacher and/or math facilitator
   Tier 4 Intervention – Referral to Student Staff Support Team and action plan developed

7. **How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?**

Students receiving Tiers 1 and 2 will receive them as needed, being available on a daily basis. A flexible group model within the classroom will be utilized. For students receiving the Leveled Literacy Intervention program, services will be offered 4-5 days a week.

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

Link It will be the technological data warehouse. Assessments will be administered within Link It providing the opportunity for quick turn-around for data analysis. This will also support out students in terms of preparing for PARCC, the online state assessment. DRA data will be managed utilizing the DRA-2 online management system supporting individualized learning and flexible grouping. Accelerated reader will also allow for differentiation, reading support, online testing and data analysis.

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

- DRA-2 results for students receiving the Leveled Literacy Intervention
- DRA-2 results for all students
- Benchmark data

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

One of the district department chairs has the responsibility of generating school and district reports analyzing school performance, grade level performance and sub-group performance. These will be shared in a presentation made by the building principal. Data is also shared with teaching staff at grade level meetings. This data is then used for teachers' student growth objective (SGO) development.

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Parent/Family Advisory Council/District PAC	Principal Title 1 Chairperson	Membership and Attendance Surveys (automated calls) Surveys/Feedback Sheets	Comer Whole School Reform – School Development Program (Yale University)
Math	Students with Disabilities	Parent/Family Advisory Council/District PAC	Principal Title 1 Chairperson	Membership and Attendance Surveys (automated calls) Surveys/Feedback Sheets	Comer Whole School Reform – School Development Program (Yale University)
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent/Family Advisory Council/District PAC	Principal Title 1 Chairperson	Membership and Attendance Surveys (automated calls) Surveys/Feedback Sheets	Comer Whole School Reform – School Development Program (Yale University)

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent/Family Advisory Council/District PAC	Principal Title 1 Chairperson	Membership and Attendance Surveys (automated calls) Surveys/Feedback Sheets	Comer Whole School Reform – School Development Program (Yale University)
ELA	All	Parent/Family Advisory Council/District PAC	Principal Title 1 Chairperson	Membership and Attendance Surveys (automated calls) Surveys/Feedback Sheets	Comer Whole School Reform – School Development Program (Yale University)
Math	All	Parent/Family Advisory Council/District PAC	Principal Title 1 Chairperson	Membership and Attendance Surveys (automated calls) Surveys/Feedback Sheets	Comer Whole School Reform – School Development Program (Yale University)

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?**

   School goals will be communicated to parents through a variety of venues including:
   - Parent Orientations, First Friday Program, Back to School Night
   - District PAC Sessions, Preschool Advisory Council Parent Information Sessions
   - PTO Programs and PAC Programs

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

   The original Gables School Parent Involvement Policy was drafted by the PAC committee with support from the building principal. Each year, members of the PAC, as well as teaching staff members review the existing policy minor revisions are made.

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

   The parent involvement policy is sent home with students on the first day of school and is also posted on the district's webpage.

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

   The school-parent compact is sent home with students on the first day of school and is also posted on the district's webpage.

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

   The compact outlines the various responsibilities of the stakeholders. It is signed by the parent, teacher, principal, and student when appropriate. Signed compacts are returned to the main office and kept on file.

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

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

When standardized test results are received they are mailed home to parents. DRA results are communicated to parents in parent conferences and/or by being sent home. In some grades, students maintain a reading log that reflects their ZPD, their reading goal and the progress made toward the goal. These logs are then reviewed and signed off by parents. There is a link to NJ School Performance reports for each school on the district's website. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment also presents the data to the Board of Education.

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?

A publication is sent home from the district indicating that the district has not met their annual objectives. The community is also notified via the Neptune Township School District website.

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

- Parents are informed during a Title I event
- School report card is posted on the district website
- At the district level, the Assistant Superintendent presents a State of the District report which includes but is not limited to student achievement, state test score results, programmatic offerings and enhancements and school progress targets. During this presentation, there is an opportunity for community follow up and feedback.

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

- PAC, PTO and School Climate committee representatives
- Family Surveys
- Representation on district committees including the Standards Based Report Committee

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 Orientations held in August
- Back to School Night
- Parent Portal gives parents 24 hour access to teacher grade books (parents can request weekly reports be emailed)
- Quarterly Progress Reports
- Quarterly Report Cards
- Parent Conferences twice a year, with evening conferences available and online scheduling to accommodate parents' schedules
- Showcases (Inform-ances, Concerts)
- Student Staff Support Team Meetings
- Child Study Team Meetings/Annual Reviews
- 504 Meetings and Revisits
- Data Sent Home
    - Standardized test data (as appropriate)
    - DRA and STARS test results
    - Progress reports from the Reading Teacher
    - Benchmark Results
    - Accelerated Reader reports (Parents also have this access online from home)
    - Classroom communications

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

Parent engagement opportunities (parent information sessions)

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	28 100%	The district conducts an orientation for new teachers each summer. Additionally, teachers receive training in the core programs at each school and are supported through work with teachers during PLC and grade level meetings.
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	-0- -0-	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	8 100%	The district conducts an orientation for new teachers/staff each summer and professional development offerings are given regularly throughout the year.
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	-0- -0-	

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

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

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

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
The Neptune Township School District conducts an orientation for new teachers each summer. Additionally, teachers receive training in core programs and are supported through work with grade level colleagues during weekly Professional Learning Communities sessions. A Professional Development Coordinator was also introduced during the 2012-2013 school year and is in its third year. A series of mentor/new teacher meetings and trainings are held throughout the year. A variety of strategies were utilized to support teachers including the use of peer observations and the TEACHscape 360 camera.	**Assistant Superintendent and Professional Development Coordinator**