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: PASSAIC CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	School: Roosevelt School No. 10
Chief School Administrator: PABLO MUNOZ	Address: 151 Harrison Street Passaic, NJ 07055
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: pmunoz@passaicschools.org	Grade Levels: 2-6
Title I Contact: Dr. Christine Krenicki	Principal: Steven Cruz
Title I Contact E-mail: ckrenicki@passaicschools.org	Principal's E-mail: stevencruz@passaicschools.org
Title I Contact Phone Number:	Principal's Phone Number: (973) 470-5510

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

❑ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

_____ _____ _____

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

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - *ESEA*§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held ____10_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ 7,924,895, which comprised ____97____% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $ 8,637,061, which will comprise ___97____% 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
Instructional Chair-SPED	1	ELA	200-100	158,090

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
Steven Cruz	Principal	X	X	X	
John Ciuppa	Assistant Principal	X	X	X	
Daniel Lungren	Assistant Principal	X	X	X	
Julie Koffler	Teacher	X	X	X	
Jeanna Paine	Teacher	X	X	X	
Yolanda Ortiz	Teacher	X	X	X	
Marcia Velez	Teacher	X	X	X	
Elaba Garciz	Parent Liaison	X	X	X	
Ruby Morales	Parent	X	X	X	

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
May 27, 29 June 3,4,5,8,9,10,11 15	Teachers Room, Assistant Principal's Office	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X			
May 27, 29 June 3,4,5,8,9,10,11 15	Teachers Room, Assistant Principal's Office	Schoolwide Plan Development	X			
May 27, 29 June 3,4,5,8,9,10,11 15	Teachers Room, Assistant Principal's Office	Program Evaluation	X			

***Add rows as necessary**.

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

School's Mission

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

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

What is the school's mission statement?	Roosevelt School No. 10, together with all the stakeholders (parents, students, teachers, administrators, and the community) will develop meaningful learning experiences that motivate students as they grow into independent learners and critical thinkers with the motivation, skills, and abilities necessary for lifelong learning. Therefore, it is necessary to create a learning environment which is centered on students, facilitated by teachers and administrators, and supported by parents and the community. Towards this end, School No. 10 commits available resources to ensure that… 1. We provide an environment which is orderly, safe, and inviting. 2. Teachers are motivated, enthusiastic, and experience continued professional growth. 3. The staff collaborates, shares and works as a team toward student success. 4. Positive experiences encourage students' success and self-esteem at School No. 10. 5. Our parental community feels welcomed and valued as full participants in their child's education. 6. The leadership is supportive, encouraging, and fosters positive changes as well as

	building a cooperative connection between home, school, and community.

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?

   We were not able to implement the plan in entirety for the 2014-2015 school year. The configuration of the school has changed drastically from the prior year. In 2013-2014, the school was comprised of Kindergarten, First, Second, Third and Fourth Grade classes. Currently, it is comprised of Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Grade Classes. The amount of staff members at the school has also changed. The Data Coach position was eliminated throughout the districts. This has made the gathering of data more difficult for the classroom teacher. Basic Skills Instructors (BSI) were eliminated as well from our school. The students that were identified as those in need of improvement were not serviced through a pullout program, but had to be served in classrooms with in class interventions. Also eliminated was the Remedial Reading Teacher. The lowest 20% of students who scored partially proficient on the NJ ASK or below the 50% NCE on the TerraNova/Super were not serviced as was planned. Classroom teachers provided small group instruction and intervention to those who were in need. The district mandated before/after school programs were implemented for all grade levels.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   The teachers used data from this year and the prior year to help drive instruction. Teachers were able to use scientifically based reading research materials such as Orton-Gillingham and Achieve 3000.

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

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

   The absence of the Data Coach, Basic Skills Teachers and the Reading Remedial Teacher has made it difficult for the teachers since they do not have the support staff planned on to implement the Common Core State Standard and gather as much data as they have used in the past.

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

   The strengths of the programs included the continued implementation of Achieve 3000, smaller class sizes for the majority of the classes, SIOP strategies and differentiated instruction.

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

   District initiatives (Achieve3000, Guided Reading, Writer's Workshop) were built into the regular daily schedule, facilitated during center/group work in daily instruction. This allowed teachers to carry out these initiatives as a part of their daily functioning, rather than as additional duties.

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

   Staff provided feedback on initiatives in grade level/faculty meetings throughout the year. Additional professional development in Achieve3000 and In Class Support came out of discussions and feedback from teachers. No formal tool was utilized to measure or quantify teacher perceptions.

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

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

   The community was very supportive which has helped strengthened the home-school connection. The community's perceptions were based on the high attendance rate to Back to School Night and Parent/Teacher conferences, as well as attendance at monthly parent workshops and programs.

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

   Whole group instruction followed by small group differentiated instruction that took into account multiple learning styles and SIOP strategies.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

   Teachers' classroom interventions were differentiated based on individual students' needs, and the data the was collected from various sources (teachers, school, district assessments and state assessments). The weekly master schedule of the district created a once a week intervention/enrichment period.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

    Teachers provided interventions as often as they could, based on their individual classroom needs. The before school and after school program provided additional support for the students.

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

    Teachers utilized SmartBoards, ChromeBooks and Notebooks to access computer programs such as Achieve 3000,

Reading A-Z.com, and FASTTMath. FASTTMath and Achieve 3000 could also be accessed by the students at home or at the Public Library. Students are also using Googledocs to continue their classwork/projects at home. Most classroom teachers have received lap tops to use and some have used tablets to collect data and use with students.

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

The contribution of technology addressed multiple learning styles, enhancing student engagement and achievement, but in many classes technical difficulties with technology hampered the implementation of these efforts to build this effort. Additionally, Chromebook carts did not arrive until less than three weeks prior to PARCC testing, leaving the teachers only perhaps a week and a half to share the seven (7) Chromebook before they were set aside solely for testing. Even after the Performance Based Assessment of the PARCC, Chromebook use had to be limited due to the impending Spring EOY PARCC four weeks later.

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		167	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Program 3. Achieve 3000 4. SIOP 5. Differentiated Instruction 6. Small Group Instruction 7. Orton-Gillingham 8. Intervention Kits	1. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 2. Teachers provided help for those students that were struggling with homework. 3. Achieve3000 was utilized during and after school hours. 4. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the day to enhance learning for all students. 5. Small group instruction allowed the provision of intervention and differentiation at various levels. 6-8. Tier 3 instruction was provided based on the DRA levels and Terranova/Supera, and NJASK test scores. Teachers trained in Orton-Gillingham techniques used those strategies, as well as Intervention Kits, SIOP strategies, and Intervention Kits to strengthen phonemic awareness and comprehension skills. Students showed progress in self-confidence and an increase in decoding, comprehending, and reading with fluency. Although improvement has been shown, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 18% and our SPED population making up 7.78% of the total population

				of 4th grade. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our Reading Remedial teacher and BSI teachers were eliminated.
Grade 5	N/A	141	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Program 3. Achieve 3000 4. SIOP 5. Differentiated Instruction 6. Small Group Instruction 7. Orton-Gillingham 8. Intervention Kits	1. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 2. Teachers provided help for those students that were struggling with homework. 3. Achieve3000 was utilized during and after school hours. 4. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the day to enhance learning for all students. 5. Small group instruction allowed the provision of intervention and differentiation at various levels. 6-8. Tier 3 instruction was provided based on the DRA levels and Terranova/Supera, and NJASK test scores. Teachers trained in Orton-Gillingham techniques used those strategies, as well as Intervention Kits, SIOP strategies, and Intervention Kits to strengthen phonemic awareness and comprehension skills. Students showed progress in self-confidence and an increase in decoding, comprehending, and reading with fluency. Although improvement has been shown, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 10% and our SPED population making up 10% of the total population of 5th grade. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our Reading Remedial teacher and BSI teachers were eliminated.
Grade 6	N/A	133	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Program 3. Achieve 3000 4. SIOP	1. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 2. Teachers provided help for those students that were struggling with homework.

			5. Differentiated Instruction 6. Small Group Instruction 7. Orton-Gillingham 8. Intervention Kits	3. Achieve3000 was utilized during and after school hours. 4. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the day to enhance learning for all students. 5. Small group instruction allowed the provision of intervention and differentiation at various levels. 6-8. Tier 3 instruction was provided based on the DRA levels and Terranova/Supera, and NJASK test scores. Teachers trained in Orton-Gillingham techniques used those strategies, as well as Intervention Kits, SIOP strategies, and Intervention Kits to strengthen phonemic awareness and comprehension skills. Students showed progress in self-confidence and an increase in decoding, comprehending, and reading with fluency. Although improvement has been shown, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 6% and our SPED population making up 13.53% of the total population of the 6th grade. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our Reading Remedial teacher and BSI teachers were eliminated.
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

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

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		167	1. FASTTMath 2. SIOP 3. Small group instruction/intervention 4. Everyday Math games 5.After School Enrichment Program 6. Before School Homework Program	1. FASTTMath was used in some classes. 2. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the day to enhance learning for all students 3. Teachers use various interventions to increase fact fluency and strengthen mathematical concepts such as using geometrical shapes, understanding fractions, and measurement. 4. Everyday math games were used to increase the fluency with mathematical facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division). 5. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 6. Before school homework programs allows students to receive the help they need with homework Improvement has been shown however, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 18% and our SPED population making up 7.78% of the total population of 4th grade. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our BSI teachers were eliminated
Grade 5	N/A	141	1. FASTTMath 2. SIOP 3. Small group instruction/intervention 4. Everyday Math games 5.After School Enrichment Program 6. Before School Homework Program	1. FASTTMath was used in some of the classes. 2. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the day to enhance learning for all students 3. Teachers use various interventions to increase fact fluency and strengthen mathematical concepts such as

				using geometrical shapes, understanding fractions, and measurement. 4. Everyday math games were used to increase the fluency with mathematical facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division). 5. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 6. Before school homework programs allows students to receive the help they need with homework Improvement has been shown however, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 8.83% and our SPED population making up 10%of the total population of 5th grade. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our BSI teachers were eliminated
Grade 6	N/A	133	1. FASTTMath 2. SIOP 3. Small group instruction/intervention 4.After School Enrichment Program 5. Before School Homework Program	1. FASTTMath was used in some of the classes. 2. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the day to enhance learning for all students 3. Teachers use various interventions to increase fact fluency and strengthen mathematical concepts such as using geometrical shapes, understanding fractions, and measurement. 5. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 6. Before school homework programs allows students to receive the help they need with homework

				Improvement has been shown however, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 5.78% and our SPED population making up 13.53% of the total population. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our BSI teachers were eliminated.
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				
Kindergarten				
Grade 1				
Grade 2		173	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Program 3. Achieve 3000 4. SIOP 5. Differentiated Instruction 6. Small Group Instruction 7. Orton-Gillingham	1. Common core based materials were used for the After School Enrichment Program. 2. Teachers provided help for those students that were struggling with homework. 3. Achieve3000 was utilized during and after school hours. 4. SIOP strategies were incorporated throughout the

			8. Intervention Kits	day to enhance learning for all students. 5. Small group instruction allowed the provision of intervention and differentiation at various levels. 6-8. Tier 3 instruction was provided based on the DRA levels and Terranova/Supera test scores. Teachers trained in Orton-Gillingham techniques used those strategies, as well as Intervention Kits, SIOP strategies, and Intervention Kits to strengthen phonemic awareness and comprehension skills. Students showed progress in self-confidence and an increase in decoding, comprehending, and reading with fluency. Although improvement has been shown, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 49.71% and our SPED population making up 8.67% of the total population of the 2nd grade. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our Reading Remedial teacher and BSI teachers were eliminated.
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				
Kindergarten				
Grade 1				
Grade 2		173	1. FASTTMath 2. SIOP 3. After School Enrichment Program	1. Teachers use various interventions to increase fact fluency and strengthen mathematical concepts such as using geometrical shapes, understanding fractions, and

			4. Before School Homework Program	measurement. 2. FASTTMath was used in some of the classes. 3 Everyday math games were used to increase the fluency with mathematical facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division). Improvement has been shown however, we are not at an optimum proficiency level. We believe this is attributed to our ELL population making up 27% and our SPED population making up 8% of the total population. We also feel that we are at a disadvantage due to the fact that our BSI teachers were eliminated.
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

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	1. Guided Reading based on DRA Level 2. SIOP Strategies 3. Achieve 3000 4. After School Enrichment Program 5. Before School Homework Program 6. In-class support Teachers	Yes	DRA and EDL scores Model Curriculum Assessments	The DRA data collected during the fall and spring indicates that our students have made progress, however, the majority of students are not reading on grade level, which adversely affects our standardized test scores. While the vast majority exceeded grade level expectations for growth, mastery levels for the majority of our students are still not present.

% of Students with disabilities reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment		% of Students with disabilities reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment	
Second Grade	0%	Second Grade	0%
Third Grade	15%	Third Grade	15%
Fourth Grade	8%	Fourth Grade	8%
Fifth Grade	11%	Fifth Grade	33%
Sixth Grade	0%	Sixth Grade	0%

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

<table>
<tr><th>1
Content</th><th>2
Group</th><th>3
Intervention</th><th>4
Effective
Yes-No</th><th>5
Documentation of
Effectiveness</th><th>6
Measurable Outcomes
(Outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Students with Disability: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Excellent</th><th>Satisfactory</th><th>Needs Improve-ment</th><th>Unsatisfactory</th></tr>
<tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>5%</td><td>8%</td><td>25%</td><td>63%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>1%</td><td>24%</td><td>16%</td><td>59%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fourth Grade</td><td>6%</td><td>26%</td><td>18%</td><td>50%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>9%</td><td>16%</td><td>13%</td><td>62%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sixth Grade</td><td>0%</td><td>7%</td><td>7%</td><td>86%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>1. SIOP Strategies
2. After School Enrichment Program
3. Before School Homework Program
4. FASSTMath
5. In-class Support Teachers</td><td>Yes</td><td>Model Curriculum Assessments.</td><td>Students with Disability: Average % on the Math Model Curriculum Assessment
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Excellent</th><th>Satisfactory</th><th>Needs Improve-ment</th><th>Unsatisfactory</th></tr>
<tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>54%</td><td>15%</td><td>8%</td><td>23%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>47%</td><td>16%</td><td>10%</td><td>28%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fourth Grade</td><td>28%</td><td>17%</td><td>16%</td><td>38%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

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)
					Fifth Grade: 42% / 4% / 9% / 44% Sixth Grade:
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	1. Guided Reading based on DRA Level 2. SIOP Strategies 3. Achieve 3000 4. After School Enrichment Program 5. Before School Homework Program 6. In-class support Teachers	Yes	DRA and EDL scores Model Curriculum Assessments	

% of Bilingual Students Reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment	% of Bilingual Students Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment
Second Grade 5%	Second Grade 2%
Third Grade 2%	Third Grade 9%
Fourth Grade 0%	Fourth Grade 7%
Fifth Grade N/A	Fifth Grade N/A
Sixth Grade N/A	Sixth Grade 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)

% of Transitional Students Reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment	% of Transitional Students Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment
Second Grade 38%	Second Grade 24%
Third Grade 26%	Third Grade 41%
Fourth Grade 84%	Fourth Grade 72%
Fifth Grade 5%	Fifth Grade 76 %
Sixth Grade N/A	Sixth Grade N/A

Bilingual Students: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	%	%	%	%
Third Grade	%	%	%	%
Fourth Grade	%	%	%	%
Fifth Grade	%	%	%	%
Sixth Grade	%	%	%	%

Transitional Students: Average % on the ELA Model

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

<table>
<tr><th>1
Content</th><th>2
Group</th><th>3
Intervention</th><th>4
Effective
Yes-No</th><th>5
Documentation of
Effectiveness</th><th>6
Measurable Outcomes
(Outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Curriculum Assessment
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Excellent</td><td>Satisfactory</td><td>Needs Improve-ment</td><td>Unsatisfactory</td></tr>
<tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fourth Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sixth Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
</table>

Based on Guided Reading data listed above, students entered grades 2 and 3 with single digit percentages of students reading on grade level and comprised over a third of the 2nd grade (36%) , just over a quarter (26%) of the 3rd grade, and just under a fifth (17%) of the third, fourth, and fifth grade populations respectively.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>ELLs</td><td>1. SIOP Strategies
2. After School Enrichment Program
3. Before School Homework Program
4. FASSTMath
5. In-class Support Teachers</td><td>Yes</td><td>DRA and EDL scores
Model Curriculum Assessments</td><td>Bilingual Students: Average % on the Math Model Curriculum Assessment
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Excellent</td><td>Satisfactory</td><td>Needs Improve-ment</td><td>Unsatisfactory</td></tr>
<tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td><td>%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

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	1. Guided Reading based on	Yes	Increased reading	The DRA and EDL data collected during the fall and spring

Fourth Grade	%	%	%	%
Fifth Grade	%	%	%	%
Sixth Grade	%	%	%	%

Transitional Students: Average % on the Math Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	%	%	%	%
Third Grade	%	%	%	%
Fourth Grade	%	%	%	%
Fifth Grade	%	%	%	%
Sixth Grade	%	%	%	%

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)
	Disadvantaged	DRA Level 2. SIOP Strategies 3. Achieve 3000 4. After School Enrichment Program 5. Before School Homework Program 6. In-class support Teachers		levels per DRA and EDL scores Increased overall percentages on the Model Curriculum Assessments.	indicates that our students are making significant progress, however, the majority of students are not reading on grade level, which adversely affects our standardized test scores.

% of Economically Disadvantaged Students on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment	**% of Economically Disadvantaged Students Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment**
Second Grade 31%	Second Grade 19%
Third Grade 33%	Third Grade 31%
Fourth Grade 32%	Fourth Grade 51%
Fifth Grade 54%	Fifth Grade 67%
Sixth Grade 65%	Sixth Grade 65%

Economically Disadvantaged Students: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	5%	8%	25%	63%
Third Grade	1%	24%	16%	59%
Fourth Grade	6%	26%	18%	50%

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

<table>
<tr><th>1
Content</th><th>2
Group</th><th>3
Intervention</th><th>4
Effective
Yes-No</th><th>5
Documentation of
Effectiveness</th><th>6
Measurable Outcomes
(Outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>9%</td><td>16%</td><td>13%</td><td>62%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sixth Grade</td><td>0%</td><td>7%</td><td>7%</td><td>86%</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>Economically Disadvantaged</td><td>1. SIOP Strategies
2. After School Enrichment Program
3. Before School Homework Program
4. FASSTMath
5. In-class Support Teachers</td><td>Yes</td><td>Increased reading levels per DRA and EDL scores
Increased overall percentages on the Model Curriculum Assessments.</td><td>
Economically Disadvantaged Students: Average % on the Math Model Curriculum Assessment
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Excellent</td><td>Satisfactory</td><td>Needs Improve-ment</td><td>Unsatisfactory</td></tr>
<tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>54%</td><td>15%</td><td>8%</td><td>23%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>47%</td><td>16%</td><td>10%</td><td>28%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fourth Grade</td><td>28%</td><td>17%</td><td>16%</td><td>38%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>42%</td><td>4%</td><td>9%</td><td>44%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sixth Grade</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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

Extended Day/Year Interventions – **Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			
Math	Students with Disabilities	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			
Math	ELLs	1. After School Enrichment Program			

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)
		2. Before School Homework Program			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			
ELA	General Education	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			
Math	General Education	1. After School Enrichment Program 2. Before School Homework Program			

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	Co-Teacher Model training	Yes	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations
Math	Students with Disabilities	Co-Teacher Model training	Yes	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	SIOP/Biliteracy	Yes	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations
Math	ELLs	SIOP/Biliteracy	Yes	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations	Walkthroughs, Teachers Observations
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Please See ELA and Math explainations			.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Please See ELA and Math explainations			

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		District Professional Development Days	Yes	Evaluations forms, surveys, walk-through documentation, teacher feed-back	Improvement in teacher performance as evidenced by teacher observation and evaluations, ILT walk-throughs, and improvement of student performance as evidenced by data analysis.
		Weekly Grade Level meeting and common planning time	Yes	Improvement in teacher effectiveness and performance as evidenced by teachers' daily instruction and pedagogical practices as well as observation reports.	Teachers utilized grade level meetings to discuss implementation of district initiatives, to analyze students' data, to maintain current and accurate portfolios, and to share ideas/strategies to accommodate students' needs.
		Danielson's framework for Teaching	Yes	PD Surveys Teacher /Staff feedback Teacher Evaluation program Teacher Evaluations	Data analysis from professional development surveys, teachers/staff feedback, teacher-administrator pre and post conferencing. Participation in the program showed progress in content knowledge and pedagogy as well as having a better understanding of the framework.
Math		District Professional Development Days	Yes	Evaluations forms, surveys, walk-through documentation, teacher feed-back	Improvement in teacher performance as evidenced by teacher observation and evaluations, ILT walk-throughs, and improvement of student performance as evidenced by data analysis
		Weekly Grade Level	Yes	Improvement in teacher effectiveness and	Teachers utilized grade level meetings to discuss implementation of district initiatives,

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)
		meeting and common planning time Danielson's framework for Teaching	 Yes	performance as evidenced by teachers' daily instruction and pedagogical practices as well as observation reports. PD Surveys Teacher /Staff feedback Teacher Evaluation program Teacher Evaluations	to analyze students' data, to maintain current and accurate portfolios, and to share ideas/strategies to accommodate students' needs. Data analysis from professional development surveys, teachers/staff feedback, teacher-administrator pre and post conferencing. Participation in the program showed progress in content knowledge and pedagogy as well as having a better understanding of the framework.

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	Workshop offered by district, led by Dr. Trim	Yes	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Workshop offered by district, led by Dr. Trim	Yes	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	PARCC Readiness Parent Grade Level Meetings Family Literacy Book Club Parent University Achieve 3000 Poison Awareness School Safety Procedures	Yes for all programs	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.

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)
		Computer classes Bullying Awareness Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes, SIOP, Breast Cancer Awareness UPO, State Testing Workshop, Passaic Gifted and Talented			
Math	ELLs	PARCC Readiness Parent Grade Level Meetings Parent University Poison Awareness School Safety Procedures Computer classes Bullying Awareness Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes, SIOP, Breast Cancer Awareness UPO,	Yes for all programs	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.

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)
		State Testing Workshop, Passaic Gifted and Talented			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PARCC Readiness Parent Grade Level Meetings Family Literacy Book Club Parent University Achieve 3000 Poison Awareness School Safety Procedures Computer classes Bullying Awareness Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes, SIOP, Breast Cancer Awareness UPO, State Testing Workshop, Passaic Gifted and Talented	Yes for all programs	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PARCC Readiness Parent Grade Level Meetings Parent University Poison Awareness School Safety Procedures Computer classes Bullying Awareness Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes, SIOP, Breast Cancer Awareness UPO, State Testing Workshop, Passaic Gifted and Talented	Yes for all programs	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.
ELA		PARCC Readiness Parent Grade Level Meetings Family Literacy Book Club Parent University	Yes for all programs	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase

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)
		Achieve 3000 Poison Awareness School Safety Procedures Computer classes Bullying Awareness Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes, SIOP, Breast Cancer Awareness UPO, State Testing Workshop, Passaic Gifted and Talented			communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.
Math		PARCC Readiness Parent Grade Level Meetings Parent University Poison Awareness School Safety Procedures Computer classes Bullying Awareness Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes, SIOP,	Yes for all programs	Surveys, evaluations, Parent feedback Observations	A majority of the parents who attended the workshops and meetings have indicated that the information was useful and used at home with the children. The workshops helped increase communication with parents and the community to help students succeed/excel in school and increase test scores.

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)
		Breast Cancer Awareness UPO, State Testing Workshop, Passaic Gifted and Talented			

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

Principal's Certification

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

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

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

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

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, Model Curriculum	**% of Monolingual Students Reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment**	**% of Monolingual Students Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment**
		Second Grade 49%	Second Grade 32%
		Third Grade 50%	Third Grade 41%
		Fourth Grade 52%	Fourth Grade 72%
		Fifth Grade 60%	Fifth Grade 76%
		Sixth Grade 65%	Sixth Grade 65%
		% of Bilingual Students Reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment	**% of Bilingual Students Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment**
		Second Grade 5%	Second Grade 2%
		Third Grade 2%	Third Grade 9%
		Fourth Grade 0%	Fourth Grade 7%
		Fifth Grade N/A	Fifth Grade N/A

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)

Sixth Grade N/A	Sixth Grade N/A

% of Transitional Students Reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment	**% of Transitional Students Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment**
Second Grade 38%	Second Grade 24%
Third Grade 26%	Third Grade 33%
Fourth Grade 84%	Fourth Grade 38%
Fifth Grade 5%	Fifth Grade 24%
Sixth Grade N/A	Sixth Grade N/A

% of Students with Disabilities Reading on Level Fall 2014 per DRA assessment	**% of Students with Disabilities Reading on Level Spring 2015 per DRA assessment**
Second Grade 0%	Second Grade 0%
Third Grade 15%	Third Grade 15%
Fourth Grade 8%	Fourth Grade 8%
Fifth Grade 11%	Fifth Grade 33%
Sixth Grade 0%	Sixth Grade 0%

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)

Monolingual Students: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	5%	8%	25%	63%
Third Grade	1%	24%	16%	59%
Fourth Grade	6%	26%	18%	50%
Fifth Grade	9%	16%	13%	62%
Sixth Grade	0%	7%	7%	86%

Bilingual Students: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	%	%	%	%
Third Grade	%	%	%	%
Fourth Grade	%	%	%	%
Fifth Grade	%	%	%	%
Sixth Grade	%	%	%	%

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)

Transitional Students: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	%	%	%	%
Third Grade	%	%	%	%
Fourth Grade	%	%	%	%
Fifth Grade	%	%	%	%
Sixth Grade	%	%	%	%

Students with disabilities: Average % on the ELA Model Curriculum Assessment

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improve-ment	Unsatisfactory
Second Grade	5%	8%	25%	63%
Third Grade	1%	24%	16%	59%
Fourth Grade	6%	26%	18%	50%

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

<table>
<tr><th>Areas</th><th>Multiple Measures Analyzed</th><th>Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes
(Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td><table>
<tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>9%</td><td>16%</td><td>13%</td><td>62%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sixth Grade</td><td>0%</td><td>7%</td><td>7%</td><td>86%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Academic Achievement – Writing</td><td>Model Curriculum</td><td>Model Curriculum Assessments, Published Writing Pieces</td></tr>
<tr><td>Academic Achievement - Mathematics</td><td>Model Curriculum</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Family and Community Engagement</td><td>PARCC Readiness
Parent Grade Level Meetings
Parent University
Poison Awareness
School Safety Procedures
Computer classes
Bullying Awareness
Immigration, Parent Nutrition Classes,
SIOP,
Breast Cancer Awareness
UPO,
State Testing Workshop,
Passaic Gifted and Talented</td><td>Parent Surveys</td></tr>
<tr><td>Professional Development</td><td>Achieve3000, SIOP,</td><td>Surveys, Walkthroughs and Observations,</td></tr>
<tr><td>Leadership</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

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)
School Climate and Culture		
School-Based Youth Services		
Students with Disabilities	Co-teaching model	Walkthroughs, Classroom Observations
Homeless Students		
Migrant Students		
English Language Learners	SIOP	Walkthroughs, Classroom Observations
Economically Disadvantaged		

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*

Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment? Reviewing data, asking community members for feedback and input, workshop evaluation
2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

   Model Curriculum, DRA, NJASK, Terranova,

   a. District and school assessment data was gathered and evaluated for patterns, growth/regression.
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)?

   a. Only data sets currently supported by the district and state were utilized.
4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

a. Despite interventions, students reading below grade level continue to remain below grade level, despite better than expected growth for the majority of students. Students are entering the school significantly below grade level and will multiple years of intervention to approach grade level by the 6th grade.

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

a. Incomplete collection of data hampered our ability to analyze the effectiveness of professional development

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

a. Students at risk of academic failure are referred to the I&RS for intervention planning and evaluation. While the process has existed in the past, we are investigating ways in which it can become a more effective manner of addressing student growth, specifically in gathering quantifiable data at regular intervals, rather than beginning and end of year assessment cycles.

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

a. Intervention was provided by the classroom teacher.

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

a. NA

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

a. NA

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?

a. District level assessments are assigned periodically and uploaded to Schoolnet. Discussions on this issue will need district input and approval.

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

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

a. Orientation sessions are provided for 6th graders to prepare them for the middle school experience. Program information for Special Needs students is disseminated with orientation sessions for CST at the middle school, as well, to ensure that students are placed in the correct programs at the middle school.

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

a. Multiple measures that included formative and summative assessments, staff and parent input, as well as the needs assessment were analyzed to identify the priority problems for this 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	Closing the achievement gap in literacy	Closing the achievement gap in mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Special Education and ELL students are typically performing below the 50% mean NCE on the TerraNova/Supera, and do not meet the proficiency level of 200 on the NJ ASK. Teachers need continued assistance in addressing the various needs of their students performing below grade level in ELA.	Special Education and ELL students are typically performing below the 50% mean NCE on the TerraNova/Supera, and do not meet the proficiency level of 200 on the NJ ASK. Teachers need continued assistance in addressing the various needs of their students performing below grade level in Mathematics.
Describe the root causes of the problem	• Test scores revealed that our SPED population has difficulty meeting standardized test goals. The present testing situation contradicts the definition of Special Education. SPED students should be assessed at their grade level, rather than at their grade level. Fewer children are being seen by the Child Study Team for suspected classification. As a result, these children are in general education settings and are frustrated because they are unable to function on or close to grade level, impacting their self-esteem and ability to learn. • The ELL population has additional needs that extend beyond those of the general population. This is due to the acclimation into the American culture and language. The driving force for improvement within the ELL population is parental involvement and support given by the	• Test scores revealed that our SPED population has difficulty meeting standardized test goals. The present testing situation contradicts the definition of Special Education. SPED students should be assessed at their grade level, rather than at their grade level. Fewer children are being seen by the Child Study Team for suspected classification. As a result, these children are in general education settings and are frustrated because they are unable to function on or close to grade level, impacting their self-esteem and ability to learn. • The ELL population has additional needs that extend beyond those of the general population. This is due to the acclimation into the American culture and language. The driving force for improvement within the ELL population is parental involvement and support given by the

	school. Roosevelt School #10 has a sizable population of students identified as ELL. Large class sizes adversely affect academic achievement for these ELL students. There is a low literacy rate among non-English speaking parents. There are limited or non-existent sources of literacy materials in these children's' homes. Students also have limited schema of what the outside world has to offer. The ELL students do not receive enough BSI support in their native language since there is only one bilingual/BSI teacher to support the large population of non-English speaking students. • Large class sizes negatively impact instructional time, making it difficult for teachers to manage and address individual needs. The lack of ELA and ELL Department Chairs has had an adverse impact on professional development. Teachers have not been sufficiently prepared to address the needs of our students in conjugation with the Common Core State Standards. This remains an area of concern for the teachers. The CCSS are continuously updated and require students to demonstrate more independence, build strong content knowledge, respond to various demands, critique, and value evidence, utilize digital media, and understand other perspectives and cultures which will be measured by the upcoming PARCC assessment.	school. Roosevelt School #10 has a sizable population of students identified as ELL. Large class sizes adversely affect academic achievement for these ELL students. There is a low literacy rate among non-English speaking parents. There are limited or non-existent sources of math materials in these children's' homes. Students also have limited schema of what the outside world has to offer. The ELL students do not receive enough BSI support in their native language since there is only one bilingual/BSI teacher to support the large population of non-English speaking students. • Large class sizes negatively impact instructional time, making it difficult for teachers to manage and address individual needs. The lack of a Math Department Chairs has had an adverse impact on professional development. Teachers have not been sufficiently prepared to address the needs of our students in conjugation with the Common Core State Standards. This remains an area of concern for the teachers. The CCSS have evolved and require more quantitative and qualitative understanding and reasoning which will be measured by the upcoming PARCC assessment.
Subgroups or populations addressed	Special Education and ELL Students	Special Education and ELL Students
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	Literacy	Math
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address	Differentiated instruction, small group instruction, 3-Tier Model, Thematic instruction, guided reading, Writer's	Everyday Math, Connected Math, differentiated instruction, small group, hands on activities, FASTTMath,

priority problems	Workshop, SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) training, KidBiz, vertical and horizontal articulation, after school enrichment programs, and a remedial reading teacher	SIOP training, vertical and horizontal articulation, and after school enrichment programs
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The programs, curriculum, workshops, materials, workbooks/textbooks are board approved and aligned to the CCSS.	The programs, curriculum, workshops, materials, workbooks/textbooks are board approved and aligned to the CCSS.

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	Effective Classroom use of Technology in LAL/Math	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Technological advances are going to require everyone to have access to the internet for classroom materials and standardize testing.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Adequate level of mastery of technology is lacking. Lack of capacity of the staff to effectively implement technology and the programs that are available to the students and teachers in the district.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	Staff and students	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	All subject areas	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Wireless notebook laptops, technology center, SMARTboards, Pearson Technology components, BrainPOP, Reading A-Z, Kidbiz, Starfall, and Powerschool	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The College and Career Readiness standards that anchor the K-12 CCSS call for students to learn skills through technology and multi-media.	

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	Continue with the 88 minute literacy block with an in-depth concentration on improving guided reading instruction Differentiated Instruction Scaffold comprehension strategies to increase cognitive and metacognitive thinking skills Research methods and practices for exited ELL students in developing their English Acquisition Skills Improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary development	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of DRA/EDL Levels Model Curriculum Assessments	*Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making* (September 2009). See NCEE 2009-4067. Makes data a part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement, teaches students to examine their own data and set learning goals, establishes a clear vision for school wide data use, provides supports that foster a data-driven culture within the school, and recommends the maintenance of a district-wide data collection system. *Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Interventions (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* (February 2009). See NCEE 2009-4045. Recommends providing differentiated reading instruction for all students' based on assessments of students' current reading levels, progress monitoring, and small group

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)
		Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Administrators implement district initiatives.			instruction. *Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten through Third Grade* (September 2010). See NCEE 2010-4038. Recommends teaching students how to utilize reading comprehension strategies, identify text features, set a purpose for discussion, and establish motivation. *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in Elementary Grades.* (December 2007). NCEE 2007-4011. Recommends screening for reading problems and progress monitoring, providing intensive small group reading interventions, varying extensive vocabulary instruction, developing academic English, and scheduling regular pier assisted learning opportunities.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Scaffold instruction to increase number sense and problem solving skills	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of Model Curriculum	*Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools* (April 2009).

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)
		Focus on mathematical terminology to strengthen vocabulary Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Data Coach facilitates collegial discussions and provides data analysis during grade level meetings, and Administrators implement district initiatives.			NCEE 2009-4060. Recommends screening to identify at risk students and provide intervention strategies, explicit and systematic instruction by providing models, visual representations, word problems, verbalizing of thought processes, guided practice, retrieval of basic facts, and corrective feedback and review. *Improving Mathematical Problem Solving Grades 4 through 8* (May 2012). NCEE 2012-4055. Recommends ensuring students will understand word problems by addressing issues with context, and/or language during whole group/class instruction, assisting students in monitoring and reflecting on the problem-solving process, teach students how to use visual representations and convert them into mathematical notation, expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, and help students make sense of and articulate mathematical concepts.

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)
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	Continue with the 88 minute literacy block with an in-depth concentration on improving guided reading instruction Differentiated Instruction Scaffold comprehension strategies to increase cognitive and metacognitive thinking skills Research methods and practices for exited ELL students in developing their English Acquisition Skills	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of DRA/EDL Levels Model Curriculum Assessments	*Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making* (September 2009). See NCEE 2009-4067. Makes data a part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement, teaches students to examine their own data and set learning goals, establishes a clear vision for school wide data use, provides supports that foster a data-driven culture within the school, and recommends the maintenance of a district-wide data collection system. *Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Interventions (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* (February 2009). See NCEE 2009-4045. Recommends providing differentiated reading instruction

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)
		Improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary development Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Administrators implement district initiatives.			for all students' based on assessments of students' current reading levels, progress monitoring, and small group instruction. *Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten through Third Grade* (September 2010). See NCEE 2010-4038. Recommends teaching students how to utilize reading comprehension strategies, identify text features, set a purpose for discussion, and establish motivation. *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in Elementary Grades.* (December 2007). NCEE 2007-4011. Recommends screening for reading problems and progress monitoring, providing intensive small group reading interventions, varying extensive vocabulary instruction, developing academic English, and scheduling regular pier assisted learning opportunities.

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)
Math	ELLs	Scaffold instruction to increase number sense and problem solving skills Focus on mathematical terminology to strengthen vocabulary Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Data Coach facilitates collegial discussions and provides data analysis during grade level meetings, and Administrators implement district initiatives.	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of Model Curriculum	*Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools* (April 2009). NCEE 2009-4060. Recommends screening to identify at risk students and provide intervention strategies, explicit and systematic instruction by providing models, visual representations, word problems, verbalizing of thought processes, guided practice, retrieval of basic facts, and corrective feedback and review. *Improving Mathematical Problem Solving Grades 4 through 8* (May 2012). NCEE 2012-4055. Recommends ensuring students will understand word problems by addressing issues with context, and/or language during whole group/class instruction, assisting students in monitoring and reflecting on the problem-solving process, teach students how to use visual representations and convert them into mathematical notation, expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, and help students

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)
					make sense of and articulate mathematical concepts.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Continue with the 88 minute literacy block with an in-depth concentration on improving guided reading instruction Differentiated Instruction Scaffold comprehension strategies to increase cognitive and metacognitive thinking skills Research methods and practices for exited ELL students in developing their English Acquisition Skills Improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary development	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of DRA/EDL Levels Model Curriculum Assessments	*Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools* (April 2009). NCEE 2009-4060. Recommends screening to identify at risk students and provide intervention strategies, explicit and systematic instruction by providing models, visual representations, word problems, verbalizing of thought processes, guided practice, retrieval of basic facts, and corrective feedback and review. *Improving Mathematical Problem Solving Grades 4 through 8* (May 2012). NCEE 2012-4055. Recommends ensuring students will understand word problems by addressing issues with context, and/or language during whole group/class instruction, assisting students in monitoring and reflecting on the problem-solving process, teach students how to use visual representations and convert them into mathematical

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)
		Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Administrators implement district initiatives.			notation, expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, and help students make sense of and articulate mathematical concepts.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Scaffold instruction to increase number sense and problem solving skills Focus on mathematical terminology to strengthen vocabulary Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Data Coach facilitates collegial discussions and provides data analysis during grade level meetings, and Administrators implement district	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of Model Curriculum	*Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools* (April 2009). NCEE 2009-4060. Recommends screening to identify at risk students and provide intervention strategies, explicit and systematic instruction by providing models, visual representations, word problems, verbalizing of thought processes, guided practice, retrieval of basic facts, and corrective feedback and review. *Improving Mathematical Problem Solving Grades 4 through 8* (May 2012). NCEE 2012-4055. Recommends ensuring students will understand word problems by addressing issues with context, and/or language during whole

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)
		initiatives.			group/class instruction, assisting students in monitoring and reflecting on the problem-solving process, teach students how to use visual representations and convert them into mathematical notation, expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, and help students make sense of and articulate mathematical concepts.
ELA		Continue with the 88 minute literacy block with an in-depth concentration on improving guided reading instruction Differentiated Instruction Scaffold comprehension strategies to increase cognitive and metacognitive thinking skills Research methods	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of DRA/EDL Levels Model Curriculum Assessments	*Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools* (April 2009). NCEE 2009-4060. Recommends screening to identify at risk students and provide intervention strategies, explicit and systematic instruction by providing models, visual representations, word problems, verbalizing of thought processes, guided practice, retrieval of basic facts, and corrective feedback and review. *Improving Mathematical Problem Solving Grades 4 through 8* (May 2012). NCEE 2012-4055. Recommends ensuring students

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)
		and practices for exited ELL students in developing their English Acquisition Skills Improve Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary development Teachers implement lessons based on Common Core State Standards. Administrators implement district initiatives.			will understand word problems by addressing issues with context, and/or language during whole group/class instruction, assisting students in monitoring and reflecting on the problem-solving process, teach students how to use visual representations and convert them into mathematical notation, expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, and help students make sense of and articulate mathematical concepts.
Math		Scaffold instruction to increase number sense and problem solving skills Focus on mathematical terminology to strengthen vocabulary Teachers implement lessons based on	Administrators Teachers Paraprofessionals	Analysis of Model Curriculum	*Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools* (April 2009). NCEE 2009-4060. Recommends screening to identify at risk students and provide intervention strategies, explicit and systematic instruction by providing models, visual representations, word problems, verbalizing of thought processes, guided practice, retrieval of basic facts, and

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)
		Common Core State Standards. Data Coach facilitates collegial discussions and provides data analysis during grade level meetings, and Administrators implement district initiatives.			corrective feedback and review. *Improving Mathematical Problem Solving Grades 4 through 8* (May 2012). NCEE 2012-4055. Recommends ensuring students will understand word problems by addressing issues with context, and/or language during whole group/class instruction, assisting students in monitoring and reflecting on the problem-solving process, teach students how to use visual representations and convert them into mathematical notation, expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies, and help students make sense of and articulate mathematical concepts.

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

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

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	District-wide after school enrichment program District wide before school homework program	Administrators Teachers	DRA/EDL Scores Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly. *Assisted Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Interventions (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* (February 2009). See NCEE 2009-4045. Recommends providing differentiated reading instruction for all students based on assessments of students' current reading levels, progress monitoring, and small group instruction.
Math	Students with Disabilities	District-wide After School Enrichment	Administrators Teachers	Math Model Curriculum	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal*

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Program District wide Before School Homework Program			*Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly.
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	District-wide After School Enrichment Program District wide Before School Homework Program	Administrators Teachers	DRA/EDL Scores Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly. *Assisted Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Interventions (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* (February 2009). See NCEE 2009-4045. Recommends providing differentiated reading instruction

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

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					for all students based on assessments of students' current reading levels, progress monitoring, and small group instruction.
Math	ELLs	District-wide After School Enrichment Program District wide Before School Homework Program	Administrators Teachers	Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	District-wide After School Enrichment Program District wide Before School Homework Program	Administrators Teachers	DRA/EDL Scores Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly. *Assisted Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Interventions (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* (February 2009). See NCEE 2009-4045. Recommends providing differentiated reading instruction

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

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention** (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					for all students based on assessments of students' current reading levels, progress monitoring, and small group instruction.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	District-wide After School Enrichment Program District wide Before School Homework Program	Administrators Teachers	Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly.
ELA		District-wide After School Enrichment Program District wide Before School Homework Program	Administrators Teachers	DRA/EDL Scores Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly. *Assisted Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Interventions (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades* (February 2009). See NCEE 2009-4045. Recommends providing differentiated reading instruction

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)
					for all students based on assessments of students' current reading levels, progress monitoring, and small group instruction.
Math		District-wide After School Enrichment Program District wide Before School Homework Program	Administrators Teachers	DRA/EDL Scores Model Curriculum Assessments	*Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Finding from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs:* (October 2007). The study reported higher standardized test scores and better behavioral outcomes for students who attended regularly.

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

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Achieve 3000	Teachers adequately trained in the program that will	Analyze the reading lexile numbers, DRA/EDL scores, and Model Curriculum Assessments.	Achieve provides the only web-based, differentiated instruction solutions designed to reach a school's entire student population — mainstream, English

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)
			provide the professional development		Language Learners, special needs, and gifted.
		Orton-Gillingham	Teachers adequately trained in the program that will provide the professional development	Analyze the reading lexile numbers, DRA/EDL scores, and Model Curriculum Assessments.	The Institute for Multi-Sensory Education's (IMSE) Orton-Gillingham training program is a research based, multi-sensory, kinesthetic, phonics program for use in the general education classroom and special education. In addition to students with dyslexia and other learning disabilities, we believe that every child can benefit from IMSE's time tested Orton-Gillingham reading program. The Orton-Gillingham approach covers reading, spelling, writing, and reading comprehension.
		SIOP	Susan Kruck-	Walkthroughs and observations	

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)
			Matos		
		Guided Reading	Teachers adequately trained in the program that will provide the professional development	Analyze the reading lexile numbers, DRA/EDL scores, and Model Curriculum Assessments.	*Research Base for Guided Reading as an Instructional Approach* *Research Base for Guided Reading as an Instructional Approach* written by *Gay Su Pinnell & Irene C. Fountas* For the student, the guided reading lesson means reading and talking (and sometimes writing) about an interesting and engaging variety of fiction and nonfiction texts. For the teacher, guided reading means taking the opportunity for careful text selection and intentional and intensive teaching of systems of strategic activity for proficient reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996).
		Writer's Workshop	Teachers adequately trained in	The quality of work assessed by the district approved holistic rubric.	Calkins, L. & Harwayne, S. (1987) The writing workshop: A world of

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)
			the program that will provide the professional development		difference: A guide for staff development. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
		Pearson	Teachers adequately trained in the program that will provide the professional development	Walkthroughs, observations, teacher surveys, sample lesson plans	
		Use of technology	Teachers adequately trained in the program that will provide the professional development	Usage logs, student samples, teachers samples, walkthroughs, observations, and teachers surveys	Evaluating the Effectiveness of Technology in Our Schools ACT Policy Report Richard J. Noeth Boris B. Volkov
Math	Students with	Everyday Math and	Teachers		Carroll, W. M., & Issacs, A. C.

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)
	Disabilities	Connected Math	adequately trained in the program that will provide the professional development	Walkthroughs, observations, Model Curriculum Assessments	(2003). Achievement of students using the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project's Everyday Mathematics. In S. Senk & D. Thompson (Eds.), Standards-based school mathematics curricula: What are they? What do students learn? (pp. 9-22). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	Please see above			
Math	ELLs	Please see above			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Please see above			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Please see above			
ELA		Please see above			
Math		Please see above			

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

***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?
    a. School Improvement Team comprised of administrative team, staff and parent volunteers will assess the progress of the plan every 3 months with a data review. Monthly meetings will be held to gather and discuss data to better inform the team for the cycle evaluation sessions.
2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?
    a. Staffing, technology, availability, parental involvement, lack of adequate professional development (especially in math) faulty data sets and lack of staff for comprehension data gathering and analysis
3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?
    a. All staff will be given copies of the plan and set aside one grade level meeting a month to discuss and give input on the plan. Parents will be informed of the plan components in September and be asked bi-monthly to review data reports sent home with relevant data updates.
4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

   a. Staff will develop a survey that will give them appropriate levels of input and evaluation of the plan and progress of implementation with each cycle evaluation.

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?
   a. School Improvement Team will develop a survey that will give parents appropriate levels of input and evaluation of the plan and progress of implementation with each cycle evaluation.
6. How will the school structure interventions?
   a. During the instructional day and reorganizing the instructional cycle weekly to provide additional intervention sessions in ELA and Math.
7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?
   a. Interventions should be spaced no more than 2 weeks apart, with a focus in the first cycle on weekly interventions.
8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?
   a. Subscriptions to Achieve 3000, FASTTMath, and computer based instruction on Chromebook
9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?
   a. Student performance data/grades gathered by teacher each marking period, as well as running records and model curriculum assessments?
10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?
   a. Each cycle, the School Improvement Team will generate a summary report for the stakeholders to review and provide input after the cycle has completed.

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	Parents' Activities Computer Classes Workshops: Grade Level Meetings Nutrition and Fitness Reading Writing Testing	Elba Garcia-Parent Liaison	Surveys	**A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family and Community Connections on Student Achievement** According to this review of recent research published by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (2002), students with involved parents, no matter what their income or background, are more likely to: • Earn higher grades and test scores, and enroll in higher-level programs • Be promoted, pass their classes and earn credits • Attend school regularly • Have better social skills, show improved behavior and adapt well to school • Graduate and go on to post-secondary education Furthermore, studies show that families of all income and education

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)
					levels, and from all ethnic and cultural groups, are engaged in supporting their children's learning at home. White, middle-class families, however, tend to be more involved at school, and to be better informed about how to help their children. Supporting more involvement at school from all families may be an important strategy for addressing the achievement gap.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Parents' Activities Computer Classes Workshops: Grade Level Meetings Nutrition and Fitness Math	Elba Garcia	Surveys	**A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family and Community Connections on Student Achievement** According to this review of recent research published by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (2002), students with involved parents, no matter what their income or background, are more likely to: • Earn higher grades and test scores, and enroll in higher-level programs • Be promoted, pass their classes and earn credits • Attend school regularly

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)
					• Have better social skills, show improved behavior and adapt well to school • Graduate and go on to post-secondary education Furthermore, studies show that families of all income and education levels, and from all ethnic and cultural groups, are engaged in supporting their children's learning at home. White, middle-class families, however, tend to be more involved at school, and to be better informed about how to help their children. Supporting more involvement at school from all families may be an important strategy for addressing the achievement gap.
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs				
Math	ELLs				
ELA	Economically				

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)
	Disadvantaged				
Math	Economically Disadvantaged				
ELA					
Math					

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?

Regular parent meetings will keep the community informed of any problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment. Open communication between the administration, teachers/staff, parent liaison, and parents will also address these problems.

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

During Back to School Night, when most parents of this school community attend to meet their child(ren)'s teachers, is the time to engage parents to assist in the written parent involvement policy. This can be achieved by having a general meeting before the parents go to the classrooms.

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

The policy will be sent home with the students.

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

The school-parent compact is developed by the district and distributed to the schools.

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

Parents will sign a contract stating they received and reviewed the compact.

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

Student achievement data will be sent home with the students at various times during the year.

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

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?

Measurable objectives for Title III will be sent home with the students.

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

Results will be sent home with the students.

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

Parents will be invited to participate in the plan to share their ideas and thoughts with the school.

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

Reports will be sent home to the parents and conferences will be held throughout the school year.

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

Provide a separate response for each question.

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A		
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A		
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)		
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*		

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

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

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

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible