

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	School: #16
Chief School Administrator: MR. PABLO MUÑOZ	Address: 657 MAIN AVENUE
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: pmuñoz@passaicschools.org	Grade Levels: PRE-K AND KINDERGARTEN
Title I Contact: DR. CHRISTINE KRENICKI	Principal: EMMANUEL MORALES
Title I Contact E-mail: ckrenicki@passaic-city.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: emmorales@passaicschools.org
Title I Contact Phone Number: 973-470-5224	Principal's Phone Number: 973-815-8516

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 _____9_____ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ _____2,605,360_____, which comprised _____98_____ % of the school’s budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$ _____3,194,373_____, which will comprise _____98_____ % 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
Contribution to whole school reform	1, 2, 3	Student Achievement	15-120-100-730	\$20,000.00
Equipment-Smart boards IPads Laptops			15-190-100-610	\$68,541.57
General Supplies				
Stipends for teachers to conduct workshops, meetings, and classes for parents	1, 2, 3	Student Achievement Improve parent and community engagement	20-231-100-100-45-2000	\$3744.00
Supplies and Materials for parent training	1, 2, 3	Student Achievement	20-231-200-600-45-0000	\$1,482.00

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

		Improve parent and community engagement		
Reading Intervention/ELA Coach	2	ELA	20-231-200-100	\$136,637

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
Emmanuel Morales	School Staff Administrator	YES	YES	YES	
Anissa Richard-Jones	School Staff Administrator	YES	YES	YES	
Mary Ramirez	Kindergarten Teacher (Transitional)	YES	YES	YES	
Danielle D'Amico	Kindergarten Teacher	YES	YES	YES	
William Davidson	Parent Liaison	YES	YES	YES	
Giovanna Lopez	Parent	YES	YES	YES	

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
10/2/14 10/4/14 02/04/15	School #16 Principal’s Office	Needs Assessment	X		X	
05/29/2015 06/01/2015 06/02/2015 06/03/2015 06/04/2015 06/05/2015	School #16 Principal’s Office	Plan Development	X		X	
Ongoing throughout next year’s plan development	School #16 Principal’s Office	Program Evaluation	X		X	

****Add rows as necessary.***

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

School's Mission

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

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

What is the school's mission statement?	School #16 will build the foundation for future success that will prepare our students for college and to earn high paying jobs.
--	--

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

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

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *

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

1. Did the school implement the program as planned? Yes, our school implemented the program as planned.
2. What were the strengths of the implementation process? The strengths of the implementation process included: teachers implemented the program and administrators held grade level meetings and faculty meetings to provide professional development and data analysis. The implementation of best practices and developmentally appropriate intervention strategies helped to guide and develop effective instruction. New programs were implemented that contributed to overall student growth. The National Institute for Early Education Research implemented a pilot program that aimed to foster Kindergarten instruction through Project Based Learning. The Parent Liaison facilitated the communication between home and school through parental workshops and parent meetings.
3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter? Some implementation challenges and barriers included:
 - a. Classroom teachers were on leaves of absence. Substitute teachers were hired as replacements
 - b. Literacy and Math Coach positions have been eliminated.
 - c. There was no Data Coach, ELL Coordinator, Department Chair, ESL Push – in person assigned to our school.
 - d. We no longer have Spanish instruction in Kindergarten.

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

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation? Strengths included that there was more parental involvement due to the efforts of our Parent Liaison. Teacher participation during grade level meetings and instruction was improved due to data analysis. Weaknesses included a decrease in instructional time due to the number of mandated assessments in Language Arts and Math.
5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs? Stakeholders participated in grade level meetings and faculty meetings which helped guide and implement the program.
6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions? Surveys showed the staff was motivated by information presented at professional development workshops and faculty meetings presented by administrators. Teachers also voiced opinions during informal conversations.
7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions? The community was motivated by the information presented during family workshops and school based activities. Sign-in sheets helped to keep track of attendance at workshops, school events, and other school based activities.
8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)? Methods of delivery for each program included small group instruction and/or 1-1 instruction as needed.
9. How did the school structure the interventions? Students were identified based on IEP's, 504 Plans, Baseline scores, as well as Teacher Recommendations. Teachers and paraprofessionals provided small flexible group intervention, and resource teachers

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

provided one-on-one and/ or small group intervention in the inclusion classrooms. Aspects of the Orton Gillingham approach was implemented as well as Rosetta Stone, SIOP strategies for students with limited English proficiency. Differentiated instruction was also provided in all areas.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions? The homeroom teacher and paraprofessional provided intervention daily both reading and math.

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program? Computers and SMART boards were used in all classrooms. iPads were used in the inclusion classrooms.

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how? Yes, technology contributed to the success of the program because learning was interactive and students were motivated and more engaged.

**Provide a separate response for each question.*

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4				
Grade 5				

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

Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4				
Grade 5				
Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

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

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

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten				Evaluation of Pre-K students is done through the use of the COR assessment. The data collected through child observation and anecdotal records is used to inform instruction and provide knowledge of students' developmental levels. Most of our Pre-K students

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

				move on to Kindergarten classrooms in other schools because of where they live. The district has no tracking system in place for these students. The COR is not consistent with the skills initially tested in Kindergarten.
Kindergarten				Our Kindergarteners transition to First Grade in other schools in the district.
Grade 1				
Grade 2				
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten				
Kindergarten			N/A	Same as English Language Arts
Grade 1				
Grade 2				
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	N/A			Students in Self Contained Special Education Kindergarten classes are no longer in School #16 Inclusion population included in numbers below
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	In Class Support Orton Gillingham Rosetta Stone District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP Intervention	YES	Terranova Diagnostic Reading Assessment	Average Terranova score – 41.5 Average Supera score 38.0 36.4% percent increase in students at Grade Level in the Diagnostic Reading Assessment from first administration to last end of year administration DRA Average Scores increased from Level A to 2.3.

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	ELLs	Everyday Math In Class Support District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP	yes	Terranova Supera District Mid-Year Assessment District End of Year Assessment average	Average score – 46.8 Average score 32.7 District Mid-Year Assessment average is 75.7% proficiency District End of Year Assessment average is 92.6% proficiency This is an increase of 18.25%
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	In Class Support Orton Gillingham Rosetta Stone District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP	yes	Terranova Diagnostic Reading Assessment	Average score – 48.8 36.4% percent increase in students at Grade Level in the Diagnostic Reading Assessment from first administration to last end of year administration DRA Average Scores increased from Level A to 2.3.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Everyday Math In Class Support District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction	yes	Terranova District Mid-Year Assessment District End of Year Assessment	Average Terranova score – 54.3 District Mid-Year Assessment average is 75.7% proficiency District End of Year Assessment average is 92.6% proficiency

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)
		SIOP			This is an increase of 18.25%
ELA		In Class Support Orton Gillingham Rosetta Stone District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP	yes	Terranova Diagnostic Reading Assessment	Average score – 48.8 36.4% percent increase in students at Grade Level in the Diagnostic Reading Assessment from first administration to last end of year administration DRA Average Scores increased from Level A to 2.3.
Math		Everyday Math In Class Support District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP	yes	Terranova District Mid-Year Assessment District End of Year Assessment	Average Terranova score – 54.3 District Mid-Year Assessment average is 75.7% proficiency District End of Year Assessment average is 92.6% proficiency This is an increase of 18.25%

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	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	District sponsored and facilitated After School Program Before School Homework Assistance Program	YES	Terranova Diagnostic Reading Assessment	Average Terranova score – 41.5 Average Supera score 38.0 36.4% percent increase in students at Grade Level in the Diagnostic Reading Assessment from first administration to last end of year administration DRA Average Scores increased from Level A to 2.3.
Math	ELLs	District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction	yes	Terranova Supera District Mid-Year Assessment	Average score – 46.8 Average score 32.7 District Mid-Year Assessment average is 75.7% proficiency

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)
		SIOP		District End of Year Assessment average	District End of Year Assessment average is 92.6% proficiency This is an increase of 18.25%
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	District sponsored and facilitated After School Program Before School Homework Assistance Program	YES	Terranova Diagnostic Reading Assessment	Average Terranova score – 41.5 Average Supera score 38.0 36.4% percent increase in students at Grade Level in the Diagnostic Reading Assessment from first administration to last end of year administration DRA Average Scores increased from Level A to 2.3.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Everyday Math District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP	yes	Terranova District Mid-Year Assessment District End of Year Assessment	Average Terranova score – 54.3 District Mid-Year Assessment average is 75.7% proficiency District End of Year Assessment average is 92.6% proficiency This is an increase of 18.25%
ELA		In Class Support Orton Gillingham	yes	Terranova	Average score – 48.8

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)
		District Sponsored and facilitated After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP		Diagnostic Reading Assessment	36.4% percent increase in students at Grade Level in the Diagnostic Reading Assessment from first administration to last end of year administration DRA Average Scores increased from Level A to 2.3.
Math		Everyday Math District Sponsored After School Program Morning homework assistance program Differentiated Instruction SIOP	yes	Terranova District Mid-Year Assessment District End of Year Assessment	Average Terranova score – 54.3 District Mid-Year Assessment average is 75.7% proficiency District End of Year Assessment average is 92.6% proficiency This is an increase of 18.25%

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

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	Rosetta Stone SIOP Dyslexia Training Guided Reading Writer’s Workshop Instructional Rounds Project Based Learning (National Institute for Early Education Research) Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO’s in Literacy > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric.
Math	ELLs	SIOP	yes	Walkthroughs	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned

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)
		Dyslexia Training Instructional Rounds Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training		Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Math > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Rosetta Stone SIOP Dyslexia Training Guided Reading Writer's Workshop Instructional Rounds Project Based Learning (National Institute for Early Education Research) Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Literacy > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	SIOP Dyslexia Training Instructional Rounds Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Math > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored

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)
					based on Danielson Model of observation rubric
ELA		Rosetta Stone SIOP Dyslexia Training Guided Reading Writer’s Workshop Instructional Rounds Project Based Learning (National Institute for Early Education Research) Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO’s in Literacy > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric.
Math		SIOP Dyslexia Training Instructional Rounds Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO’s in Math > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric

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

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	Rosetta Stone SIOP Dyslexia Training Guided Reading Writer's Workshop Instructional Rounds Project Based Learning (National Institute for Early Education Research) Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Literacy > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric.
Math	ELLs	SIOP	yes	Walkthroughs	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned

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)
		Dyslexia Training Instructional Rounds Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training		Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Math > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Rosetta Stone SIOP Dyslexia Training Guided Reading Writer's Workshop Instructional Rounds Project Based Learning (National Institute for Early Education Research) Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Literacy > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	SIOP Dyslexia Training Instructional Rounds Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO's in Math > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored

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)
					based on Danielson Model of observation rubric
ELA		Rosetta Stone SIOP Dyslexia Training Guided Reading Writer’s Workshop Instructional Rounds Project Based Learning (National Institute for Early Education Research) Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO’s in Literacy > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric.
Math		SIOP Dyslexia Training Instructional Rounds Danielson Training SGO, TEACHSCAPE Training	yes	Walkthroughs Observations and Evaluations Lesson Plans	100% teachers delivered instruction aligned to common core state standards. 100% of teachers met their SGO’s in Math > 75 % of teachers who received a rating of 2 or below on the Danielson FFT increased by at least one point. Evidence was scored based on Danielson Model of observation rubric

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, Unit Assessments, TERRANOVA/SUPERA.	Although many students have demonstrated an increase in DRA scores throughout the year, many students would continue to benefit from targeted literacy interventions. Mean NCE 48.8
Academic Achievement - Writing	Writer’s Workshop Model Curriculum	SGO Scores in writing increased from an average score of 1 to an average score of 2.4 based on a rubric score of 1-4 from the District Writing Rubric
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	District mid-year and end of year assessments. Terranova	27.8% increase from District Mid-Year- test to (District End of Year benchmark) scores. TerraNova Scores: Mean NCE 54.3
Family and Community Engagement	Sign-in sheets to monitor attendance at workshops and school events Evaluation forms/surveys.	Approximately 10 % of parents attended workshops conducted by the parent liaison and school events. 15% of parents attended content area related workshops conducted by teachers.
Professional Development	Sign-in sheets	100% teachers attended grade level meetings, faculty meeting PD and other district provided workshops.
Leadership	Observations/evaluations through use of Danielson Model Formal and informal class	90 formal observations were completed Approximately 100 Walkthroughs were completed

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)
	visitations Grade Level Meetings	
School Climate and Culture	Surveys Grade Level Meetings Faculty Meetings ILT Meetings School wide Activities Pre-K and Kindergarten Transition	100% of staff attended grade level and faculty meetings. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) met 8 times. The School wide Activities Committee met 8 times. Monthly school wide activities were implemented. 26 Pre-K classes visited 11 Kindergarten classes to assist with Kindergarten transition.
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	
Students with Disabilities	N/A	Students included with general population
Homeless Students	N/A	
Migrant Students	N/A	
English Language Learners	DRA Model Curriculum unit assessments SUPERA	ELL students were included in the above.
Economically Disadvantaged	Breakfast and Lunch Program	100% of students receive free breakfast and lunch

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

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*

Narrative

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

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment was developed based on weekly Grade Level discussions between administrators and teachers. Assessing district assessments, data, community surveys, classroom walkthroughs, and observations assisted with the improving instruction based on the needs. This plan guided job-embedded professional development throughout the year and created our school wide plan.

- What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups? We use writing, reading, and math baseline and benchmark assessments, Model Curriculum unit tests, and DRA scores to compile data. Terra Nova/SUPERA scores are analyzed and used to drive instruction.
- 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)? Model Curriculum Unit writing assessments, DRA's , and district math Benchmark Assessments are identified using Schoolnet Data Base. Teachers and administration determine appropriate intervention strategies for improvement based on the data results. Standardized test and benchmark results will be used as measurable goals. Grade level meetings are held in which these scores will be discussed and analyzed for identification of strengths and weaknesses.
- What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction? Based on the data analysis of the observations performed using the Danielson rubric, we discovered that there was a need for improvement in the area of Domain 3: Instruction. The data revealed the need for strategies to improve in:

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

3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Strategies

- High levels of student participation in discussions
- Designing questions that cause students to think, reflect and deepen understanding
- Creating environments where students feel free to take academic risks in shaping their own learning

3c: Engaging Students in Learning

- Student full participation in lessons
- Cognitive engagement rather than rote routines
- Appropriate selection of materials for the grade level, and use of manipulatives

3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

- Teaching students ways to set learning goals, implement, self-assess and reflect
- Effective ways teacher to provide feedback to students
- Strategies to scaffold student learning, while differentiating instruction for the class (ELL)

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

Data revealed that teachers' instructional practices improved throughout the year after receiving Danielson training, Writers Workshop training, and pedagogical discussions during Faculty and Grade level meetings. Continued professional development is needed in the areas of language development English acquisition for our students enrolled in the Bilingual Program(transitional classroom), inclusion, differentiated instruction, ELL instruction, using data to inform instruction, technology, specific content area instruction, and Orton Gillingham training for all teachers.

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

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

Early on the school year approximately 39% of at-risk students were identified based Reading and Math baseline assessments . Grade level meetings are held in which assessments (benchmarks, Model Curriculum unit tests, DRA) are analyzed for identification of students in need of intervention. Teacher recommendation is also taken into consideration based on students' classroom performance.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students? Teachers and paraprofessionals provide daily intervention and reinforce differentiated instruction in small flexible groups. Teachers and paraprofessionals provide small group math instruction to students that required intervention based on baseline and benchmark scores and teacher recommendation. Our school I&RS Team provides strategies to teachers to assist students with academic deficiencies. Follow up meetings are held to determine the effectiveness of implemented strategies.
8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students? N/A
9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students? N/A
10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program? During Grade Level Meetings Teachers analyze data to identify student strengths and weaknesses. In turn, the results of these meetings were used to analyze teaching strategies to increase skills.
11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school? Pre-K students visit Kindergarten classes to participate in the Kindergarten Language Arts block. The Pre-K Transition to Kindergarten Summer Program is available and will begin on July, 2015.
12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 school wide plan?

School #16 staff analyzed data from Literacy and Math benchmark assessments to identify students in need of additional intervention. We recognized that we have a large bilingual population with a variety of language abilities. The majority of our ELL

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

Kindergarten students scored partially proficient on baselines and required academic intervention. In addition, specific subgroups of the school's population met to discuss areas where greater support was needed.

**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	Math	ELA
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	District created Math Benchmarks Terranova/ Supera	Model Curriculum Unit Assessments DRA Terranova/ Supera
Describe the root causes of the problem	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approximately 80% of our student population is English Language Learners. These students, as well as our at-risk and inclusion populations typically have difficulty in the areas of Number Sense, Geometry, and Number Operations and Base Ten 2. Lack of a Math coach 3. There were no department chairs provided for our school 4. A data coach was not provided for our school 5. Limited professional development was provided to our staff in math as it pertains to English Language Learners 6. Lack of SMART boards in the workshop locations including multi-purpose room and cafeteria 7. Our students do not have access to iPads and apps 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Approximately 80% of our student population is English Language Learners. These students, as well as our at-risk and inclusion populations typically have difficulty in the areas of vocabulary, phonics, comprehension, writing, and expressive language 9. Literacy coach was removed from our program 10. There were no department chairs provided for our school 11. A data coach was not provided for our school 12. Limited professional development was provided to our staff in ELA as it pertains to English Language Learners 13. Lack of SMART boards in the workshop locations including multi-purpose room and cafeteria 14. Our students do not have access to iPads and apps
Subgroups or populations addressed	At-risk and Inclusion students (students that scored below 60% on baseline) LEP students (Bilingual and Transitional students)	At-risk and Inclusion students (students that scored below 60% on baseline) LEP students (Transitional students)
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	All content areas would benefit from implementing sheltered instruction and explicitly teaching academic language.	Social Studies and Science
Name of scientifically research		

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

based intervention to address priority problems		Aspects of Orton Gillingham Writer's Workshop Reading Streets Curriculum
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?		All interventions and curriculum are fully aligned with 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	ELL proficiency on standardized assessments.	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	There is a persistent academic achievement gap between ELL and mainstream students as reflected on DRA's and standardized ELA assessments.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Need for continued teacher training and development in SIOP. Teachers should be considering the academic language used in all the content areas and actively plan to explicitly teach it.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All ELL's in Kindergarten.	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	All content areas would benefit from implementing sheltered instruction and explicitly teaching academic language.	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (California State University at Long Beach), Jane Echevarria and Mary Ellen Vogt. At the Center for Applied Linguistics, Deborah J. Short.	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The CCSS emphasize not just proficiency in the content areas but proficiency in utilizing the academic language of the content areas. By explicitly teaching the language of the content areas along with the content, teachers will be aligning their lessons to the CCSS.	

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs			INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL POPULATION	
Math	ELLs			INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL POPULATION	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided Reading Intervention • Writer’s Workshop • Orton Gillingham Multisensory Approach • Technology: SMART boards, 	Classroom Teachers and Paraprofessionals	DRA Model Curriculum Unit Assessments, Baseline Assessments, Anecdotes, Reading and Writing Portfolios, Standardized Assessments	Reciprocal Teaching , Orton Gillingham Mosaic of Thought- Reading Comprehension Strategies, Keene and Zimmerman (1997) Strategies that Work, Garvey and Goudvis (2007) Units of Study for Teaching Writing, Lucy Calkins (2003)

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
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)
		computers, iPads, Rosetta Stone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIOP 			<p>The SIOP is a research-based observation instrument that has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of sheltered instruction (Guarino, Echevarria, Short, Schick, Forbes, & Rueda, 2001).</p> <p>-Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. "Emerging Results from the Nation's First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads." Michael Cohen Group & USDOE [US Department of Education]. 2011. "Young Children, Apps & iPad." New York: Michael Cohen Group.</p> <p>NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children's Media. 2012. "Technology and Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8.</p>

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
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					
ELA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guided Reading Intervention • Writer’s Workshop • Orton Gillingham Multisensory Approach • Technology: SMART boards, computers, iPads, Rosetta Stone • SIOP 	Classroom Teachers and Paraprofessionals	DRA Model Curriculum Unit Assessments, Baseline Assessments, Anecdotes, Reading and Writing Portfolios, Standardized Assessments	Reciprocal Teaching , Orton Gillingham Mosaic of Thought- Reading Comprehension Strategies, Keene and Zimmerman (1997) Strategies that Work, Garvey and Goudvis (2007) Units of Study for Teaching Writing, Lucy Calkins (2003) The SIOP is a research-based observation instrument that has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of sheltered instruction (Guarino, Echevarria, Short, Schick, Forbes, & Rueda, 2001). -Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. “Emerging Results from the Nation’s First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads.” Michael Cohen Group & USDOE [US Department of Education]. 2011. “Young Children, Apps & iPad.” New York: Michael

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
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)
					<p>Cohen Group.</p> <p>NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children’s Media. 2012. “Technology and Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8.</p>
Math	All Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyday Math: Hands on approach to address 3 stages of learning • Technology: SMART boards, computers, iPads 	Classroom Teacher Paraprofessional Inclusion Teacher	Baseline, Mid-Year, and End-of-the-Year Assessments, Model Curriculum, Portfolios, Anecdotes Standardized Assessments	<p>Everyday Mathematics, Bell(et. al), (2006)</p> <p>Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. “Emerging Results from the Nation’s First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads.” Michael Cohen Group & USDOE [US Department of Education]. 2011. “Young Children, Apps & iPad.” New York: Michael Cohen Group.</p> <p>NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children’s Media. 2012. “Technology and</p>

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
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)
					Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(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;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs			INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL POPULATION	

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(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)
Math	ELLs			INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL POPULATION	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged			INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL POPULATION	
Math	Economically Disadvantaged			INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL POPULATION	
ELA	Students identified based on Model Curriculum Unit 1 Assessment	District Facilitated After School Program Morning / Before School Homework Assistance Program	Selected Classroom Teachers	DRA Scores Model Curriculum Assessments Terranova Scores	Reciprocal Teaching , Orton Gillingham Mosaic of Thought- Reading Comprehension Strategies, Keene and Zimmerman (1997) Strategies that Work, Garvey and Goudvis (2007) Units of Study for Teaching Writing, Lucy Calkins (2003) The SIOP is a research-based observation instrument that has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of sheltered instruction (Guarino, Echevarria, Short, Schick, Forbes, & Rueda, 2001). -Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. "Emerging Results from the Nation's First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads."

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(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)
					<p>Michael Cohen Group & USDOE [US Department of Education]. 2011. "Young Children, Apps & iPad." New York: Michael Cohen Group.</p> <p>NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children's Media. 2012. "Technology and Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8."</p>
Math	Students identified based District Baseline Assessment				<p>Everyday Mathematics, Bell(et. al), (2006)</p> <p>Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. "Emerging Results from the Nation's First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads."</p> <p>Michael Cohen Group & USDOE [US Department of Education]. 2011. "Young Children, Apps & iPad." New York: Michael Cohen Group.</p> <p>NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children's Media. 2012. "Technology and Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8."</p>

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

**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	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs			INCLUDED WITH THE GENERAL POPULATION	
Math	ELLs			INCLUDED WITH THE GENERAL POPULATION	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged			INCLUDED WITH THE GENERAL POPULATION	
Math	Economically Disadvantaged			INCLUDED WITH THE GENERAL POPULATION	
ELA	All Kindergarten	Job embedded PD in the	Classroom	DRA	Orton Gillingham

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)
	Students	following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model Curriculum • Common Core • Danielson FFT • Technology • Multisensory approaches to learning • Differentiated Instruction • SIOP • Data analysis to Drive Instruction 	Teacher Classroom Paraprofessional	Model Curriculum Unit Assessments, Baseline, Anecdotes, Reading and Language Arts, Writing, and Standardized Assessments	Reciprocal Teaching Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. "Emerging Results from the Nation's First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads." Michael Cohen Group & USDOE [US Department of Education]. 2011. "Young Children, Apps & iPad." New York: Michael Cohen Group. NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children's Media. 2012. "Technology and Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood
Math	All Kindergarten Students	Job embedded PD in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model Curriculum • Common Core • Danielson • Technology • Multisensory 	Classroom Teacher Classroom Paraprofessional	Baseline, Mid-Year, and End-of-the-Year Assessments, Model Curriculum, Portfolios, Anecdotes, Standardized Assessments	Everyday Math Bebell, D., S. Dorris, & M. Muir. 2012. "Emerging Results from the Nation's First Kindergarten Implementation of iPads." Michael Cohen Group & USDOE

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)
		approaches to learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiated Instruction • ESL Strategies • Comprehension Strategies • Using Data to inform Instruction 			[US Department of Education]. 2011. "Young Children, Apps & iPad." New York: Michael Cohen Group. NAEYC & Fred Rogers Center for Early Learning and Children's Media. 2012. "Technology and Interactive Media as Tools in Early Childhood

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

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

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

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

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place? School #16 administrators and school wide committee will be responsible for evaluating the school wide program.
2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process? The barriers or challenges will include district approval and funding for new technology (SMART boards, computers) professional development, and the hiring of an Instructional Chairperson, Language Acquisition Instructional Chairperson, ESL Push-In teacher, Technology Coordinator and Computer Technician.
3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)? The stakeholders will be included throughout the implementation process through meetings, discussions, and written correspondence.
4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff? A survey will be distributed to gauge the perceptions of the staff.
5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community? A survey will be distributed to gauge the perceptions of the community.
6. How will the school structure interventions? Teachers and paraprofessionals will provide small flexible group intervention, and resource teachers will provide one-on-one or small group intervention in English Language Arts, and Math. Teachers and paraprofessionals will provide small group math instruction to students that required intervention based on baseline and benchmark scores and/or teacher recommendation.
7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions? Homeroom teachers and paraprofessionals provided intervention daily in Reading and Math.
8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program? Smart boards, and computers are the technologies that will be used to support the program.

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

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided? Student assessments such as: baseline and benchmark assessments, teacher assessments, anecdotal notes, DRA, Model Curriculum unit tests, and standardized assessments will be used to measure effectiveness of interventions.
10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups? Results will be analyzed by teachers in grade level meetings. Results are compiled and posted in Schoolnet. Report cards and standardized assessment reports will be sent home to families.

**Provide a separate response for each question.*

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

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

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A			
ELA	Homeless	N/A			
Math	Homeless	N/A			
ELA	Migrant	N/A			
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs			Included with the general population.	
Math	ELLs			Included with the general population.	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged			Included with the general population.	
Math	Economically Disadvantaged			Included with the general population.	
ELA	All	Maintain a Parent Liaison Continue Monthly Parent	Parent Liaison/	Increase in student work habits and parent involvement	Pearson Common Core State Standards

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)
		Involvement Activity Monthly Parent Workshops	Teachers	Increase parent understanding of common core standards, curriculum, and child development	Initiative
Math	All	Maintain a Parent Liaison Continue Monthly Parent Involvement Activity Monthly Parent Workshops	Parent Liaison/ Teachers	Increase in student work habits and parent involvement Increase parent understanding of common core standards, curriculum, and child development	Everyday Math Common Core State Standards Initiative

**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? The school's family and community engagement program will help address the priority problems by giving parents the tools to work with their children at home. By providing workshops, parents will be equipped to help with homework, testing strategies, and will learn tips for using math and literacy at home. Our aim is to encourage parents to take more responsibility and accountability for their child's academic achievement. By incorporating administrators, teachers, and parent liaisons, we will conduct monthly parent workshops on topics directly related to their children's developmental stages. In addition, teachers will develop monthly projects to be at home and sent back to the school. Our school's objective is to encourage parents to devote more time towards their child's academic development. We also plan to educate parents on the common core state standards, which will help develop their awareness of student expectations and requirements for achievement.
2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy? The School Parent Team will meet on a monthly basis with the Parent Liaison to develop the school's parent involvement policy, which will directly correspond with the district's parental involvement policy. The purpose of this policy will be to assist and increase parental involvement in the academic achievements of their children.

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

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? Once a comprehensive document is completed by the School Parent Team, and approved by the building administrator, the written policy will be distributed to parents by sending it home with the students in folders and backpacks. In addition, the policy will be uploaded to the school's webpage to which parents have access.
4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact? Although the school-parent compact is developed at the district level, each school can modify the Parental Concerns to more accurately fit the needs of their parents and students. We will meet with the School Parent Team to pinpoint and prioritize concerns for our school-parent compact.
5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact? The school-parent compact will be distributed to parents by sending it home with the students in folders and backpacks. The compact will be distributed in English and Spanish. Parents are required to acknowledge receipt by signing and returning the compact to the school.
6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community? Student achievement data will be reported to the public through school progress reports. In addition, parents will receive letters from the principal and central administration, district newsletters and websites, and other public correspondences.
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? The school will notify families by sending district reports to the home; in addition this information will be available on the school's webpage.

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

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results? The procedures by which the school will inform families and the community of the disaggregated assessment results will include but are not limited to; hosting Back to School Nights, parent teacher conferences, parent meetings (Title I) and workshops, district newsletters and web postings, report cards, calendars, letters and notices, and communications from the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan? The school will involve the families and the community in the development of the Title I plan by, providing a workshop which focuses on the objectives of Title I. Parents will be afforded an opportunity to express ideas for programs, and changes within the school. In addition, information gathered from the needs assessment survey will be used to develop goals for the Title I Schoolwide Plan.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children? The school will inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children through progress reports, parent-teacher conferences, I&RS meetings, and parent reports from the Terranova/SUPERA.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds? Parent involvement funds will be used for future parent workshops to increase the understanding of the following topics: curriculum, skills and strategies, student work habits, common core state standards, and child development. Moreover, informational workshops will be implemented as needs arise. Parent involvement funds will also be used to provide stipends for teachers conducting the parent workshops. Finally, maintaining the position of our parent liaison is an utmost concern.

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

**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	41	* 2 – Not required to be Highly Qualified – PreK Teachers.
	100% - of required teachers	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A		
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	33	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*		
	4 – Pre K Para	

* 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
N/A	Human Resources