NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I

2016-2017 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: TRENTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	School: CARROLL ROBBINS ELEMENTARY
Chief School Administrator: LUCY FERIA	Address: 283 TYLER STREET TRENTON NJ
Chief School Administrator's E-mail:lferia@trenton.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: K-5
Title I Contact: EVERENE DOWNING	Principal: BIENVENIDA GARDINET
Title I Contact E-mail: edowning@trenton.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: bgardinet@trenton.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: (609) 656-4900	Principal's Phone Number: 609-957-7171

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.

X 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 _____5_ (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were $ ___170,778, which comprised 100 % of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- State/local funds to support the school will be $__190,328, which will comprise 100 % of the school's budget in 2016-2017.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2016 -2017 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Literacy Leader	**#2 -51 % of students in k-5 are reading below grade level.** **#3 Data from benchmarks and PARCC shows a need of improvement in demonstrating mastery**	Intervention (PD, Assessment	Salary	$139,000
Parental Involvement Activities	**#2 -51 % of students in k-5 are reading below grade level.**			$6,500

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
Maria Lissette Rodriguez	**Resource Room**	YES	YES	YES	
Brian L'Ouiseau	**School Counselor**	YES	YES	YES	
Karen Delgado	**3rd grade teacher**	YES	YES	YES	
Karen Ryan	**4th grade Bilingual teacher**	YES	YES	YES	
Jennifer Ayling	**2nd grade teacher**	YES	YES	YES	
Pauline Kothare	**5th grade teacher**	YES	YES	YES	
Bienvenida Gardinet	**Principal**	YES	YES	YES	
Damaris Passerella	**Parent Liaison**	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
April 13, 2016	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
April 28, 2016	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
May 5, 2016	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
May 19, 2016	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		X	
June 16,2015	ROBBINS SCHOOL	Program Evaluation (SIP ONLY)	X		X	

***Add rows as necessary**.

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

School's Mission

What is the school's mission statement?	Carroll Robbins Elementary School in partnership with our children, families, staff and community seeks the best education through daily rigorous, engaging and differentiated learning experiences. All stakeholders will be accountable and motivated to attain this vision through a nurturing, safe and respectful environment.

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

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

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

   Yes.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

   As we reviewed the plan, we found out that most of the strategies we planned were implemented.

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

   We included some initiatives (i.e. Scholastic Reading Inventory and Scholastic Math Inventory) that we that the district does not support any more. Lack of technology hardware made it difficult for some programs (Lexia, Reflex Math, Pebblego and Go Noddle) to be used efficiently.

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

   One of our strengths includes the reflection process that takes place during School Leadership Team (SLT) meetings.

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

Another strength is how we discuss, review, and disseminate student, school, and district wide data to guide our instructional decisions.

There was a challenge in our ability to schedule SLT meetings that best accommodated the schedules of all team members.

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

   Buy-in was obtained through parent meetings and workshops; seeking feedback from stakeholders through parent, student, and staff surveys (which provided data used to develop school wide goals); and formal informal conversations during faculty meetings and professional learning community (PLC) meetings.

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

   We used a school climate and culture survey to measure staff perceptions. We also gave each teacher a budget survey.

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

   We used a school climate and culture survey to measure parents' perceptions.

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

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

Lexia Program: All students were provided with a license to access and use the Lexia program. Each classroom is equipped with at least 3 pieces of technology, which may include desktop computers, laptops, and tablets. The administration used reports to monitor and assist teachers with classroom usage. 2 professional development sessions were provided to staff on how to incorporate Lexia lessons to provide literacy interventions to students.

Reflex Math: All students were provided with a license to access and use the Reflex Math program. Each classroom is equipped with at least 3 pieces of technology, which may include desktop computers, laptops, and tablets. The administration used reports to monitor and assist teachers with classroom usage. The School Growth reports were used to inform staff and students about usage and progress.

Close Reading: This is a district initiative. The staff received a professional development session in the fall of 2015. Teachers in K-5 implemented at least two close readings per unit of study (ELA).

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

Before and Afterschool Intervention: Forty students received intervention services in ELA and Math. These students were identified as tier 2 and tier 3 students.

Guided Reading: This is a component of the Reader's Workshop model. Teachers work with small groups of students monitoring their reading behaviors, strengths and weaknesses in order to use the data to plan future lessons. In order differentiate instruction, teacher group students by instructional reading levels.

Intervention Teacher: During the year 2015-16 she serviced students in three cycles using the Systematic Sequential Teaching Approach. 79 students in grades 1-4 received services, 21 students exited the program.

ESL Program- twenty- five students received after school intervention from January through May.

Lexia levels improved by two levels in second grade.

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

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Interventions were structured before, during, and after school hours. Before and after school academic intervention and support were provided to students. Academic support was provided by specialists during the school day. Students used Lexia during school hours and had access to the program within their homes.

Intervention Teacher: During the year 2015-16 she serviced students in three cycles using the Systematic Sequential Teaching Approach. 79 students in grades 1-4 received services, 21 students exited the program.

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Student received instructional interventions daily through Guided Reading, Lexia, Reflex Math and Literacy Intervention Services. Students received intervention for at least one hour and half three times a week.

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

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

The school used the following technology to support the program: Laptops, projectors, iPads, and desktop computers. We just got confirmation of 60 laptops for next school year.

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

The technology contributed to the success of the program by individualizing the instructional needs of students. Lexia and Reflex Math instruct students at their respective literacy and math levels. An annex was added to the school two years ago. As a result, there is disparity of technology needed to successfully implement instructional strategies.

Provide a separate response for each question. Note: The school was a focus school during the school year 2015-2016. These questions do not apply.

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	N/A	78%	Standard Solutions (Performance Based Assessments and Technology Enhanced Constructed Response) PARCC lessons, Lexia, Guided Reading through small group instruction, PARCC word of the day and PARCC test practice.	**This is the first time students take the PARCC test. PARCC lessons were effective only for students that were reading on or approaching grade level. PARCC lessons were not effective for students that were reading 2-3 years below grade level. Lexia provided additional support for students reading below grade level. Guided reading provided Tier 2 intervention for students (reading skills, reading fluency, vocabulary, etc.). PARCC word of the day gave students to opportunity to become more familiar with key domain specific vocabulary. The PARCC test practice allowed students the opportunity to practice using the accessibility features in this computer based test.**
Grade 5				We added 5th grade to our school in the year 2015-16. Data is not available at this time.

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

Grade 6				
Grade 7				
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

Mathematics	**2014-2015**	**2015-2016**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Grade 4		89%	Reflex Math, tiered work stations, Standard Solutions PARCC lessons,	Reflex math provided math fluency in math operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division). Our data shows that student fluency increased. Tiered work stations resulted in building students' math background
Grade 5				We added 5th grade to our school in the year 2015-16. Data is not available at this time .We did not have 5th grade school year 2014-2015.
Grade 6			N/A	
Grade 7			N/A	
Grade 8				
Grade 11				
Grade 12				

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

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

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

English Language Arts	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions ***did*** or ***did not*** result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Pre-Kindergarten			We do not have a pre-k program.	
Kindergarten	**14 Students (June 2015)**	**33 students (February 2016)**	• **Lexia** • **Guided Reading(anecdotal notes)**	Robbins School started with the Guided Reading initiative and collecting Anecdotal notes in 2013. Lack of technology and internet access at the Annex was one challenge faced this year. Some staff was transferred and were replaced by new staff .We received 8 new teachers this year. They need more training and PDs in these areas. ELA Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1 Unit 2 Percentage KG 28% 72% 44%

				1 38% 68% 30% 2 64% 62% 2% 3 20% 24% 4% 4 20% 28% 8% 5 20% 44% 24% Math Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1Unit 2 Percentage KG 75% 76% 1% 1 67% 66% 1% 2 27% 24% 3% 3 12% 17% 5% 4 0% 4% 4% 5 2% 3% 1%
Grade 1	**31 students**	**77 Students (DRA February 2016)**	• **Lexia** • **Guided Reading(anecdotal notes)**	Lack of technology, I&RS referrals and CST referrals, limited staffing resources due to new building opening, transferred/newcomer students lacking reading/writing foundational skills, lacking of effective instruction (new staff). Data from the DRA scores indicated that 35 % of the students were reading on or above grade level by February 2016. Data from the 2nd ELA District Benchmark indicated that 68% of the

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

				students were proficient.
Grade 2	**23 students**	**62 Students (DRA February 2016)**	• **Lexia** • **Guided Reading(anecdotal notes)**	Number of students with interrupted formal education (bilingual students/newcomers), lack of extended day program to provide intervention Data from the DRA scores indicated that 34% of the students were reading on or above grade level by February 2016. Data from the 2nd E LA District Benchmark indicated that 62% of the students were proficient.
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

Mathematics	**2014-15**	**2015 -2016**	**Interventions Provided**	**Describe why the interventions provided *did* or *did not* result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).**
Pre-Kindergarten				
Kindergarten	N/A	25 (Unit 2	• Reflex Math	Dual language program provided students the opportunity to learn math

		benchmark)		in two languages. Scores show improvement in math. Eighty four percent of the students were proficient in the math unit 2 assessment. The annex had limited technology resources. Students were not able to use the Reflex math program for the whole year. Data from the2nd Math District Benchmark indicated that 76% of the students were proficient.
Grade 1	N/A	40 (Unit 2 math benchmark)	• Reflex math	Lack of technology, Data from the 2nd Math District Benchmark indicated that 66% of the students were proficient.
Grade 2	N/A	72 (Unit 2 math benchmark)	• Math centers • Small group instruction • Reflex math • Identified math groups (guided practice) • Instructional rounds	Lack of technology, I&RS referrals and CST referrals, limited staffing resources due to new building opening. Data from the 2nd Math District Benchmark indicated that 24% of the students were proficient.
Grade 9				
Grade 10				

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

Evaluation of 2015-2016 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – **Implemented in 2015-2016**

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	• Lexia • Guided Reading (Anecdotal Notes)	YES	• Lexia Reports • Guided Reading Binders • Guided Reading(anecdotal notes)	Data from Lexia Reports indicated a growth of 17% in performance for students in the Resource Room. Teachers use anecdotal notes to plan instruction and interventions. ELA Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1 Unit 2 Percentage KG 28% 72% 44% 1 38% 68% 30% 2 64% 62% 2% 3 20% 24% 4% 4 20% 28% 8% 5 20% 44% 24%

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)

Students with Disabilities Scores

Grade	ELA Benchmark Unit 2	Math Benchmark Unit 2	DRA Level (Winter)	Lexia Level
4	86.7%	69.9%	30	11
3	58.3%	42.0%	18	13
2	66.7%	65.5%	3	7
4	46.7%	15.1%	28	11
2	50.0%	36.2%	8	7
3	41.7%	37.0%	12	10
4	73.3%	57.5%	30	10

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 Disabilities Scores
<table>
<tr><th>Grade</th><th>ELA Benchmark Unit 2</th><th>Math Benchmark Unit 2</th><th>DRA Level (Winter)</th><th>Lexia Level</th></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>63.3%</td><td>22.5%</td><td>40</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>27.3%</td><td>29.6%</td><td>38</td><td>12</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>45.5%</td><td>28.2%</td><td>34</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>36.4%</td><td>8.5%</td><td>38</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>58.3%</td><td>49.4%</td><td>14</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>54.5%</td><td>42.3%</td><td>40</td><td>14</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>27.3%</td><td>32.4%</td><td>34</td><td>13</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>60.0%</td><td>57.5%</td><td>30</td><td>13</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>• Resource Room
• Reflex Math</td><td>YES</td><td>• Reflex Math Reports</td><td>Data in June from Reflex Math indicated a growth of 60% improvement in Math Fluency</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA</td><td>Homeless</td><td>We do not have homeless</td><td>We do</td><td>We do not have homeless students.</td><td>We do not have homeless students.</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)
		students.	not have homeless students.		
Math	Homeless	We do not have homeless students.	We do not have homeless students.	We do not have homeless students.	We do not have homeless students.
ELA	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.
Math	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.
ELA	ELLs	• Lexia • Guided Reading	YES	• Pre-post tests • Guided Reading Binders	**Lexia reports indicate the following averages (growth)** 1st 10% growth

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)
		(Anecdotal			2nd 27% growth 3rd 14% growth 4th 0% PARCC 3rd 10% 4th 0% Benchmark unit 2 assessment (percentages in proficiency) K 70% 1st 66% 2nd 43% 3rd 4% 4th 27% DRA Scores (number of students on level students) Spring K- 81% 1st -50% 2nd- 40%

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)
					3rd -25% 4th- 19% 5-18%
Math	ELLs	• Reflex Math	Yes	Reflex Math Reports	Benchmark unit 2 assessment (percentages in proficiency) K 77% 1st 66% 2nd 26% 3rd 4% 4th 0%
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• Lexia • Guided Reading (Anecdotal Notes	Yes all interventions were effective.	• DRA scores • Lexia Reports • Anecdotal notes (guided reading	Lexia Skills Mastery Report as of June indicated a growth of 14% in performance school wide. February DRA percentage of students who are reading on grade level

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		• Intervention Teacher			Kindergarten 65% 1st grade 35% 2nd grade 35% 3rd grade 23% 4th grade 30% 5th grade 17% ELA Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1 Unit 2 Percentage KG 28% 72% 44% 1 38% 68% 30% 2 64% 62% 2% 3 20% 24% 4% 4 20% 28% 8% 5 20% 44% 24%
Math	Economically		Yes	• **Teacher data**	Reports indicate the following

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	• **Reflex Math**		• **ED connect Reports** • **District Benchmarks** • **Reflex Math Reports**	levels of proficiency in fluency from 2014- 2015: Reflex Math: Kindergarten- 1st grade- 5% 2nd grade- 59% 3rd grade-38% 4th grade- 54% 5th grade-45% Math Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1Unit 2 Percentage KG 75% 76% 1% 1 67% 66% 1% 2 27% 24% 3% 3 12% 17% 5% 4 0% 4% 4% 5 2% 3% 1%
ELA					
Math					

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

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

<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>ELA</td><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>• Lexia
• Guided Reading (Anecdotal Notes</td><td>Yes</td><td>• Lexia
• Guided Reading(an ecdotal notes)</td><td>I Data from Lexia Reports indicated a growth of 17% in performance for students in the Resource Room.

Teachers use anecdotal notes to plan instruction and interventions.

Students with Disabilities Scores
<table>
<tr><th>Grade</th><th>ELA Benchmark Unit 2</th><th>Math Benchmark Unit 2</th><th>DRA Level (Winter)</th><th>Lexia Level</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>86.7%</td><td>69.9%</td><td>30</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>58.3%</td><td>42.0%</td><td>18</td><td>13</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>66.7%</td><td>65.5%</td><td>3</td><td>7</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>46.7%</td><td>15.1%</td><td>28</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>50.0%</td><td>36.2%</td><td>8</td><td>7</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>41.7%</td><td>37.0%</td><td>12</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>73.3%</td><td>57.5%</td><td>30</td><td>10</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

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 Disabilities Scores

<table>
<tr><th>Grade</th><th>ELA Benchmark Unit 2</th><th>Math Benchmark Unit 2</th><th>DRA Level (Winter)</th><th>Lexia Level</th></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>63.3%</td><td>22.5%</td><td>40</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>27.3%</td><td>29.6%</td><td>38</td><td>12</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>45.5%</td><td>28.2%</td><td>34</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>36.4%</td><td>8.5%</td><td>38</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>58.3%</td><td>49.4%</td><td>14</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>54.5%</td><td>42.3%</td><td>40</td><td>14</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>27.3%</td><td>32.4%</td><td>34</td><td>13</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>60.0%</td><td>57.5%</td><td>30</td><td>13</td></tr>
</table>

.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>Students with Disabilities</td><td>Reflex Math</td><td>Yes</td><td>Reflex Math Reports</td><td>Data in June from Reflex Math indicated a growth of 60% improvement in Math Fluency</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	Homeless	We do not have homeless students.	We do not have homeless students.	We do not have homeless students.	We do not have homeless students.
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.
Math	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.	We do not have migrant students.
ELA	ELLs	ESL Afterschool Program, Reading and Writing for Newcomers	Yes	Pre and post scores (writing assessment)	Pre: 3 / Post: 4

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	4
					3	3
					3	3
					2	3
					3	4
					3	3
					2	3
					3	3
					3	4
					1	2
					3	3
					3	4
					2	3
					4	4
					3	3
					2	4
					3	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)
					3 4
Math	ELLs	No applicable			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Lexia computer program 2nd grade	YES	Lexia Reports 2nd grade	Lexia reports show 42% growth Lexia levels: K 0 student 1st 11 students 2nd 23 students 3rd 16 students 4th 8 students 5th 0 student
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Reflex Math to build fluency in four operations: addition, subtraction, division, and subtraction	Yes	Reflex Math report	Starting fluency in September 2015= 12% Current fluency in May 2016= 49% Students have a fluency gain of 41,943 facts Students have solved 2,380,492 facts as of May 2016

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					
Math					

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

Evaluation of 2015-2016 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	• Close Reading • Informational Writing K-2/ 3-5 • DRA refresher Running Records • Guided Reading Setting up the classroom • (Environment, Rituals and Routines) Writing Process	yes	• DRA • District Benchmarks • PARCC Tests Results • Walkthroughs • Formal observation • Genesis • GL meetings • PLEPS	Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level are: 0 students. Data from the second District Benchmark indicates the following (percentage represents proficiency) updated on 6/1 K- 67% 1st- N/A 2nd- N/A 3rd- 0% 4th- 67% 5-0%

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)
		• Looking at Student Writing • Looking at Data to Form Instructional Groups Using PARCC online resources and evidence tables to develop rigorous lessons • Using data protocol and the standard mastery report to identify student mastery of the			Lexia report shows the flowing Lexia levels : Special Needs 0 student at k and prek levels 2 students at first grade level 7 students at the second grade level 3 students at the third grade level 1 student at the fourth grade level

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		standards • Whole Brain PD • Easy IEP			
Math	Students with Disabilities	Using PARCC online resources and evidence tables to develop rigorous lessons Using data protocol and the standard mastery report to identify student mastery of the standards	yes	• Reflex Math • District Benchmarks • PARCC Tests Results-Pending • I-ready Reports	Data from the second District Benchmark indicates the following (percentage represents proficiency) updated on 6/1 K- 57% 1st- n/a 2nd- - n/a 3rd- 50% 4th- 57%
ELA	Homeless	**N/A**	N/A	**N/A**	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	**N/A**	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	
ELA	ELLs	Close Reading Informational Writing K-2/ 3-5 DRA refresher Running Records Guided Reading Setting up the classroom (Environment, Rituals and Routines) Writing Process Looking at Student Writing Looking at Data to Form Instructional Groups Using PARCC online resources and evidence tables to develop rigorous lessons Using data protocol and the standard mastery	yes	• **Walkthroughs** • **Formal observation** • **Professional Learning Community discussion** • **Report Cards**	Benchmark Unit 2 (Percentage proficient) K -70% 1- 66% 2- 43% 3- 4% 4 -27% PARCC percentage proficient 2015 3rd 10% 4th 0% DRA Proficiency levels as of February 2016 DRA Scores (number of students on level students) Spring K- 81% 1st -50% 2nd- 40%

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)	
		report to identify student mastery of the standards			3rd -25% 4th- 19% 5-18%	
Math	ELLs	Using PARCC online resources and evidence tables to develop rigorous lessons Using data protocol and the standard mastery report to identify student mastery of the standards Effective Strategies in Math instruction	yes	• **District Benchmarks** • **PARCC Tests Results-pending**	Benchmark Unit 2 (Percentage proficient) K 77% 1 66% 2 26% 3 4% 4 7% PARCC 2015 3 6% 4 0%	
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Close Reading Informational Writing K-2/ 3-5 DRA refresher Running Records Guided Reading Setting up the classroom	yes	• **Walkthroughs** • **Formal observation** • **Professional Learning Community discussion**	February DRA percentage of students who are reading on grade level Kindergarten 65% 1st grade 35% 2nd grade 35%	yes

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)	
		(Environment, Rituals and Routines) Writing Process Looking at Student Writing Looking at Data to Form Instructional Groups Using PARCC online resources and evidence tables to develop rigorous lessons Using data protocol and the standard mastery report to identify student mastery of the standards			3rd grade 23% 4th grade 30% 5th grade 17% ELA Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1 Unit 2 Percentage KG 28% 72% 44% 1 38% 68% 30% 2 64% 62% 2% 3 20% 24% 4% 4 20% 28% 8% 5 20% 44% 24%	
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Using PARCC online resources and evidence tables to develop rigorous lessons	yes	• **District Benchmarks** • **PARCC Tests Results**	Math Proficiency Growth	

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)
		Using data protocol and the standard mastery report to identify student mastery of the standards. Effective Strategies in Math instruction			Grade Unit 1Unit 2 Percentage KG 75% 76% 1% 1 67% 66% 1% 2 27% 24% 3% 3 12% 17% 5% 4 0% 4% 4% 5 2% 3% 1%
ELA					
Math					

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

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	**1. Back to School Night** **2. PARCC Workshop** **3. Walking In Your Child Foot Steps** **4. Climate and Culture Surveys** **5. Literacy Night** **6. Common Core Workshop For Parents** **7. Health Fair** **8. My Dad MY Hero** **9. Community Resources Workshop** **10. Grandparents Day,** **11. Coffee With Principal** **12. Muffins For Moms,** **13. Fruit And Vegetables,** **14. Career day,**	Yes	• Sign In Sheets • Survey Results • Donations • Class Dojo Data • Donorschoose Projects	**Consistent parent participation** **Donations have been used: technology, books, pencils, etc.**

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)
		15. Junior Achievement, 16. Young Audiences, 17. Mentors College Of New jersey, 18. Mercer Council, 19. Book Fair, 20. Stroke Prevention, 21. Mecha 22. Bike Safety 23. Parent teacher conferences 24. Award assemblies 25. School pictures 26. Dress down day 27. Family fun day 28. Pictures with Santa 29. Robo calls for attendance 30. School fundraisers 31. Soccer team 32. Tennis team 33. Chaperones for			

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)
		field trips 34. School clubs 35. Tea with mom 36. I&RS meetings 37. Book Fair 38. Developing literacy at home for K-1 parents 39. Open house for K parents 40. Annual reviews meetings 41. Fifth grade promotion exercise 42. Fifth grade dance 43. Talent show 44. Class projects presentations 45. Classroom Dojo 46. Book donations (Rider and NJ Department of Agriculture) 47. Donorschoose			

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)
		48. Thanksgivings food drive **49. Coats donated from Trenton Fire Department** **50. Hamilton Dental presentation and donation of toothbrushes, toothpaste and pencils**			
Math	Students with Disabilities		yes	• **Sign In Sheets** • **Surveys** • **Evaluation**	Data indicates that the lowest attendance was 5 parents and highest 125 for the activities of the year.
ELA	Homeless	N/A		N/A	
Math	Homeless	N/A		N/A	
ELA	Migrant	N/A		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)
Math	Migrant	N/A			
ELA	ELLs	**1. Back to School Night** **2. PARCC Workshop** **3. Walking In Your Child Foot Steps** **4. Climate and Culture Surveys** **5. Literacy Night** **6. Common Core Workshop For Parents** **7. Health Fair** **8. My Dad MY Hero** **9. Community Resources Workshop** **10. Grandparents Day,** **11. Coffee With Principal** **12. Muffins For Moms,** **13. Fruit And**		• Sign In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation	Data indicates that the lowest attendance was 5 parents and highest 125 for the activities of the year.

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)
		Vegetables, 14. Career day, 15. Junior Achievement, 16. Young Audiences, 17. Mentors College Of New jersey, 18. Mercer Council, 19. Book Fair, 20. Stroke Prevention, 21. Mecha 22. Bike Safety 23. Parent teacher conferences 24. Award assemblies 25. School pictures 26. Dress down day 27. Family fun day 28. Pictures with Santa 29. Robo calls for attendance 30. School fundraisers 31. Soccer team			

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)
		32. Tennis team 33. Chaperones for field trips 34. School clubs 35. Tea with mom 36. I&RS meetings 37. Book Fair 38. Developing literacy at home for K-1 parents 39. Open house for K parents 40. Annual reviews meetings 41. Fifth grade promotion exercise 42. Fifth grade dance 43. Talent show 44. Class projects presentations 45. Classroom Dojo 46. Book donations (Rider and NJ Department of			

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)
		Agriculture) **47. Donors choose** **48. Thanksgivings food drive** **49. Coats donated from Trenton Fire Department** **50. Hamilton Dental presentation and donation of toothbrushes, toothpaste and pencils**			
Math	ELLs			• Sign In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation	Data indicates that the lowest attendance was 5 parents and highest 125 for the activities of the year.
ELA	Economically Disadvant	1. Back to School Night 2. PARCC Workshop		• Sign In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation	Data indicates that the lowest attendance was 5 parents and highest 125 for

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)
	aged	3. Walking In Your Child Foot Steps 4. Climate and Culture Surveys 5. Literacy Night 6. Common Core Workshop For Parents 7. Health Fair 8. My Dad MY Hero 9. Community Resources Workshop 10. Grandparents Day, 11. Coffee With Principal 12. Muffins For Moms, 13. Fruit And Vegetables, 14. Career day, 15. Junior Achievement, 16. Young Audiences, 17. Mentors College Of			the activities of the year.

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)
		New jersey, 18. Mercer Council, 19. Book Fair, 20. Stroke Prevention, 21. Mecha 22. Bike Safety 23. Parent teacher conferences 24. Award assemblies 25. School pictures 26. Dress down day 27. Family fun day 28. Pictures with Santa 29. Robo calls for attendance 30. School fundraisers 31. Soccer team 32. Tennis team 33. Chaperones for field trips 34. School clubs 35. Tea with mom 36. I&RS meetings			

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)
		37. Book Fair 38. Developing literacy at home for K-1 parents 39. Open house for K parents 40. Annual reviews meetings 41. Fifth grade promotion exercise 42. Fifth grade dance 43. Talent show 44. Class projects presentations 45. Classroom Dojo 46. Book donations (Rider and NJ Department of Agriculture) 47. Donorschoose 48. Thanksgivings food drive 49. Coats donated from Trenton Fire Department			

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)
		50. Hamilton Dental presentation and donation of toothbrushes, toothpaste and pencils			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged			• Sig In Sheets • Surveys • Evaluation	Data indicates that the lowest attendance was 5 parents and highest 125 for the activities of the year.
ELA					
Math					

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

Principal's Certification

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

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

Bienvenida Gardinet _____ _____

_____

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 2015-2016

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	• DRA scores • District Benchmarks • NJASK (Science) • PARCC results • Report Cards • Assessments Connect	Data from the DRA scores indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were: DRA Scores (number of students on level students) Spring K- 81% 1st -50% 2nd- 40% 3rd -25% 4th- 19% 5-18%

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)
		Data from the fourth LA District Benchmark (grades k, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated number of the students were proficient. K- 81% 1st- 79% 2nd- 45 % 3rd- 18% 4th- 9 % NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grade 3 indicated 35 % of the students were proficient in LA 3rd grade. Students didn't meet the target of 51.8 %. PARCC scores pending
Academic Achievement - Writing	• Writing Portfolios • Open Ended Response-PARCC/ Benchmarks	Pending PARCC scores , writing portfolios
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	• Reflex Math • PARCC	NJ ASK Report for 2013-14 grades 3 indicated 35 % of the students were proficient in Math. Students met the target of 62.5%.

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)
	• NJASK(4th) • District Benchmarks	Data from the fourth Math District Benchmark (grades K, 1 and 2) and second Benchmark (grades 3 and 4) indicated the proficiency level of students. K- 82 % 1st- 95% 2nd- - 45 % 3rd- 41% 4th- 9% Pending PARCC scores
Family and Community Engagement	• Collection of Surveys • Donor Choose proposals • Sign In -Sheets	Data indicates that the lowest attendance was 5 parents and highest 125 for the activities of the year.
Professional Development	• DRA scores • District Benchmarks • PARCC Results • NJASK (science) • Report Cards	Data from the DRA scores (February) indicated that the average growth of the students reading on or above grade level were: DRA Scores (number of students on level students) Spring

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)
		K- 81% 1st -50% 2nd- 40% 3rd -25% 4th- 19% 5-18%
Leadership	• Parent, Staff , and Students Surveys	The parent Surveys indicated the following approval rating: Pending Results-
School Climate and Culture	• Parent, Staff , and Students Surveys	The parent Surveys indicated the following approval rating: Pending Results-
School-Based Youth Services	N/A	
Students with Disabilities		The climate and culture is anonymous. It cannot be desegregated.
Homeless Students	**N/A**	
Migrant Students	**N/A**	
English Language Learners		The climate and culture is anonymous. It cannot be desegregated.
Economically		Pending Results

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)
Disadvantaged		

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process*
Narrative

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

   Teachers at each grade GLM performed an analysis of the DRA and Benchmark Tests using our data protocols outlined in the District's "Data Analysis Guide." Strategies, interventions and Professional development were identified.

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

   Data from NJASK, DRA, PARCC, Lexia, Reflex Math, and District Benchmarks were used to identify each subgroup.

   We used ED Connect, Lexia, and Reflex Math as a main resource to collect Data.

3. **How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)**? The Data collected was a result of multiple measurements; it was aligned to identify the areas of needs and strengths.

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

   Data indicated that there is a need of professional development and students' interventions in the areas of reading and Math.

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

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

   The Data indicated that there is a need of professional development in the areas of Reading and Math.

   Teachers need more training with Lexia and how to collect anecdotal notes during guided reading to guide instruction.

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

   Students at risk are identified at the beginning and through the year by the I&RS team and teachers.

   DRAs levels, Benchmarks reports and attendance are taken into consideration.

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

   After the students are identified at the beginning of the school students are assigned to the Intervention Teacher and IRS team of the school. Actions plans are developed during IRS meetings. Lessons from Lexia and Reflex Math are implemented as a RTI.

   How does the school address the needs of migrant students?

   N/A

8. **How does the school address the needs of homeless students?**

   N/A

9. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

   Teachers, Principal, Literacy Leader meet weekly on their Grade Level to analyze Data and discuss the appropriate assessments to use. They guide instruction and practices after analyzing the Data.

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

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

Parents receive an informative letter on a timely matter, student in pre k shadowed the new the school at the end of the school year.

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

The priority problems and root causes were identified based on the data from the NJASK, DRA, PARCC, I READY, ACESS, Lexia , Reflex Math, IRS, District Benchmarks Test and school surveys.

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	**51 % of students in k-5 are reading one or more years below grade level.**	**Robbins School has 14.29% of enrolled students chronically absent.**
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	PARCC 2015-16--- LA Proficiency Levels Robbins-4th (segregated by sub-groups) District-13% school -23% Hispanic-23% Afroamerican-20% Spec. ED- 26% PARCC 2015-16 Proficiency Levels Robbins-3rd (segregated by sub-groups) School -15% Bilingual-6% Hispanic-29% Spec. ED- 16%	Attendance as of 6/21/16. • Kindergarten: 94% • First Grade: 94% • Second Grade: 95% • Third Grade: 97% • Fourth Grade: 95% • Fifth Grade: 94% School Average: 94.6% Chronic Absences: **14.29%** PARCC 2015-16--- LA Proficiency Levels Robbins-4th District-13% school -23% Hispanic-23%

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

	Proficiency Levels Robbins-3rd School -18% Bilingual-100% Hispanic-15% Afroamerican-27% Spec. ED- 18% PARCC 2015-16--- Math Proficiency Levels Robbins-4th Hispanic-14% Afroamerican-100 % Spec. ED- 15% DRA Scores (number of students on level students) Spring K- 81% 1st -50% 2nd- 40% 3rd -25% 4th- 19% 5-18%	Afroamerican-20% Spec. ED- 26% PARCC 2015-16 Proficiency Levels Robbins-3rd (segregated by sub-groups) School -15% Bilingual-6% Hispanic-29% Spec. ED- 16% Proficiency Levels Robbins-3rd (segregated by sub-groups) School -18% Bilingual-100% Hispanic-15% Afroamerican-27% Spec. ED- 18% PARCC 2015-16--- Math Proficiency Levels Robbins-4th (segregated by sub-groups) Hispanic-14% Afroamerican-100 % Spec. ED- 15%

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

		DRA Scores (number of students on level students) Spring K- 81% 1st -50% 2nd- 40% 3rd -25% 4th- 19% 5-18%
Describe the root causes of the problem	• Staff demonstrated a lack of consistency using • The Data Protocol to identify areas of need for intervention. • Lack of technology resources from previous years • Student attendance • Changes in the DRA scale • Staff attendance • Large number of newcomers (ELLs) • EDL is not taken into consideration to	Robbins has two buildings. We identified the following root causes: 1. transportation 2. weather changes 3. siblings in others schools 4. walkers The annex is where K-1 students are housed. The building is far for many of our families. It is around 1 mile from the main building. We only have one parent liaison for two buildings.

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

	measure reading data • New teaching members Fidelity in implementing guided reading (change in VP, etc.…)	
Subgroups or populations addressed	Economically Disadvantage and ELLs	Economically Disadvantage and ELLs
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	LA & Math	LA & Math
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Lexia lessons, guided reading, anecdotal notes, proficiency development in lexia, Data protocol implementation.	An attendance committee team will be created to monitor student attendance. This committee will conduct: • Rob Calls • Phone Calls –Parents • Recognize Perfect attendance/ Assemblies • Monitor Daily Attendance/Lateness • Monitor Medical Absences • Celebrate Students Attendance in AM (intercom) • PM announcements /Attendance/ Percentages • Develop Action Plans/Instruction
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Lexia lessons are aligned to CCSS LA standards. Anecdotal Notes –Collecting Data will provide Data to guide and plan instruction. Professional Development- Topics for PD will	The teacher will be teaching skills aligned to the CCSS but at the student instructional level.

	be selected and aligned to LA CCSS. (Reading, Guided Reading)	

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	**Data from benchmarks and PARCC shows a need of improvement in demonstrating mastery of the mathematical processes.**	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	PARCC 2015-16--- LA Proficiency Levels Robbins-4th District-13% school -23% Hispanic-23% Afroamerican-20% Spec. ED- 26% PARCC 2015-16 Proficiency Levels Robbins-3rd School -15% Bilingual-6% Hispanic-29% Spec. ED- 16% Proficiency Levels Robbins-3rd School -18% Bilingual-100% Hispanic-15% Afroamerican-27%	

	Spec. ED- 18% PARCC 2015-16--- Math Proficiency Levels Robbins-4th Hispanic-14% Afroamerican-1000% Spec. ED- 15% Math Proficiency Growth Grade Unit 1Unit 2 Percentage KG 75% 76% 1% 1 67% 66% 1% 2 27% 24% 3% 3 12% 17% 5% 4 0% 4% 4% 5 2% 3% 1%	
Describe the root causes of the problem	All Students demonstrated challenges with academic vocabulary in Parcc and Benchmarks in then constructed responses.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	ELLs and Economically disadvantage	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)		
Name of scientifically research based	Teachers will get training in Math Reasoning, creating rigorous math centers,	

intervention to address priority problems	number sense, Number Talk, higher order thinking questions and Reflex Math. PD will be provided to Teachers on how to response to constructed ended questions.	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Benchmarks are aligned to the district curriculum; NJDOE Model Curriculum.	

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	• Lexia Program • Guided Reading(anecdotal Notes)	Resource Room Teachers/ Classroom Teachers	10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC Lexia 17-27% improvement in performance.	Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountans and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read Psychology Lexia (2008-2011)
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Reflex Math Program	Resource Room Teachers/ Classroom Teachers	10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC Reflex Math Fluency Improve Benchmarks scores	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Computers in The School

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

ESEA §1114(b)(l)(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	We do not have homeless students.			
Math	Homeless	We do not have homeless students.			
ELA	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.			
Math	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.			
ELA	ELLs	• Lexia Program • Intervention Teacher • Data protocol Analysis • Close Reading Strategy	Teachers, Intervention teacher, ESL teachers, Literacy Leader	10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC Lexia 15-25% improvement in performance. Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, SGOs, PDPs	Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read Sicology Lexia (2008-2011)

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

ESEA §1114(b)(l)(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	• Reflex Math • CCSS training for teachers • Data Protocol	Literacy Leader, Principal, teachers	Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, SGOs, PDPs	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Reflex Math
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• Lexia Program • Guide Reading (anecdotal Notes)		10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC Lexia 17-27% improvement in performance. Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, SGOs, PDPs, intervention teacher data	Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read Sicology Lexia (2008-2011)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• Reflex Math	Literacy Leader, Principal Teachers	10 % achievement as measured on the PARCC	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy Association for

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

ESEA §1114(b)(l)(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)**
		• Professional Development		Reflex Math Fluency Benchmarks scores Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Supervision and Curriculum Development Reflex Math
ELA					
Math					

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

2016-20167 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(l)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;					
Content Area Focus	**Target Population(s)**	**Name of Intervention**	**Person Responsible**	**Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)**	**Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)**
ELA	Students with	N/A	N/A	**N/A**	Guided Reading: Good First

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

ESEA §1114(b)(l)(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)
	Disabilities	ESY(Extended School Year)			Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read P Lexia (2008-2011)
Math	Students with Disabilities	N/A ESY(Extended School Year)	N/A	**N/A**	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Reflex Math
ELA	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Homeless	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ELA	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Math	Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	ELLs	• ESL Afterschool Program, after school intervention • Lexia Program	ESL contact teacher, Principal, teachers, Literacy Leader, Paras	Pre and post tests, growth reports Lexia reports	Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read Sicology Lexia (2008-2011)
Math	ELLs	• PARCC afterschool Program • Reflex Math	Principals, Literacy Leader, Teachers	Pre and post tests	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Reflex Math
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• ESL Afterschool Program, after school intervention	ESL contact teacher, Principal, teachers, Literacy Leader, Paras	Pre and post tests, growth reports Lexia Reports	Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read Psychology Lexia (2008-2011) Guided Reading: Good

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

ESEA §1114(b)(l)(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)**
					First Teaching for All Children: By Fountans and Pinnell
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• PARCC afterschool Program	Principals, Literacy Leader, Teachers	Pre and post tests Reflex Math Reports	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Reflex Math
ELA					
Math					

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

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

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	• Close Reading/ELA • Best Practices to Teach Writing • Brain learning Strategies • Use of writing rubrics/creating rubrics • Easy IEP	Principal Vice principal Presenters Literacy Coach Teacher Teachers	• Workshop Evaluations • Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs • Annual Reviews	Guided reading Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read PSicology Lexia (2008-2011) Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Reflex Math	Principal Vice principal Presenters	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Danielson rubric Math Talks Bloom's Taxonomy

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)
			Teachers		
ELA	Homeless				
Math	Homeless				
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	• Close Reading/LA (Best Strategies to	Principal Vice principal	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell Bilingual Research

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 <u>ongoing professional development</u> 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)
		teach) k-5 • Writing Best strategiesk-5 • Brain learning Parent University k-5 • Dual Language BL/Coaching - K • Team teaching- k • Learning centers	Literacy Coach Teachers		Program Computers in The School Read Psychology Lexia (2008-2011) Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network
Math	ELLs	Number sense Principal K-5 Reasoning in	Principal Vice	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations,	Number Talks by Sherry Parrish Bloom's Taxonomy

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Math k-5 Learning Centers Number Talks	principal Teacher Teachers	walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Reflex Math
		(Best Strategies to			

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 <u>ongoing professional development</u> 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	Economically Disadvantaged	teach) k-5 • Writing Best strategiesk-5 • Brain learning Parent University k-5 • Dual Language BL/Coaching - K • Team teaching- k • Learning centers	Principal Vice principal Presenters Literacy Coach Teacher	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	<u>Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children: By Fountains and Pinnell</u> Bilingual Research Program Computers in The School Read Sicology Lexia (2008-2011) Bilingual Research Journal RTI Action Network

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 <u>ongoing professional development</u> 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)
			Teachers		
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• number sense Principal K-5 • Reasoning in Math k-5 • Learning Centers	Principal Vice principal Teachers	Workshop evaluations Classroom evaluations, walkthroughs, PDPs, SGOs	Danielson rubric Math Talks Bloom's Taxonomy
ELA					
Math					

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

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

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

plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*
(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

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

1. **Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?**
   The SLT team, Literacy Leader, Principal and Vice principal will evaluate the plan quarterly at the end of each marking period.

2. **What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?**
   Available funds, having two buildings, lack of technology and new staff will be some of the challenges expected next year.

3. **How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?**
   Meeting with the staff and parents at the beginning of the year to set expectations. Information will be shared during back to school night and meetings. Each student will receive a Parent Handbook in English or Spanish.
4. **What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?**
   Monkey Surveys, School Survey, Inventories etc.

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

5. **What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?**
   Climate and Culture survey, school surveys.
6. **How will the school structure interventions?**
   Robbins will buy licenses for Reflex Math and Lexia Computers Programs for each student.
7. **How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?**
   Interventions will be for at least one hour and a half weekly.
   Time for daily RTI will be added to the master schedule.
8. **What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide progra**m?
   IPads, laptops s desktops, Reflex Math and Lexia license, Lexia and Math lessons for RTI.
9. **What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided**?
   DRA Data Wall, RTI data, Intervention teacher data, Lexia, Reflex Math Reports, and Access Tests scores, PARCC and Benchmarks Assessments.
10. **How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups**?
    The school will create an attendance committee team that will monitor the student attendance and progress. The IRS Team, Principal, Vice Principal, Literacy Coach and teachers will meet to analyzed data, guide instruction and plan interventions.

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 does 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	• Reading/Writing Workshops Parents • PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Understanding Your Child Development • Annual Reviews/ID meetings • Parents Volunteers • Class Parents	Principal / Vice Principal Counselor Teachers Presenters Agencies CST members	Increase Of NJASK and PARCC test by 10% DRA level growth of at least 1 year Lexia Reports Performance PLEPS	Survey Monkey Colorin, Colorado National Education Association PARCConline.org FEA
Math	Students with Disabilities	• Reading/Writing Workshops Parents • PARCC Test Prep Workshop	Principal / Vice Principal Counselor	Increase Of NJASK and PARCC test by 10%	Survey Monkey Colorin, Colorado National Education Association

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)
		• Literacy Night • Understanding Your Child Development • Annual Reviews/ID meetings • Parents Volunteers • Class Parents	Teachers Presenters Agencies CST members	Math Fluency Mastery PLEPS	PARCConline.org FEA
ELA	Homeless	We do not have homeless students.			
Math	Homeless	We do not have homeless students.			
ELA	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.			
Math	Migrant	We do not have migrant students.			
ELA	ELLs	• PARCC Test Prep Workshop		Increase Of NJASK and Parcc tests by	Monkey Survey Colorin, Colorado

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)
		• Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development • CCSS Workshop for Parents		10% DRA level growth of at least 1 year	National Education Association PARCConline.org FEA
Math	ELLs	• PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development • CCSS Workshop for Parents		Increase Of NJASK and Parcc tests by 10%	Monkey Survey Colorin, Colorado National Education Association PARCConline.org FEA
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	• PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development			Monkey Survey Colorin, Colorado National Education Association PARCConline.org FEA

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)
		• CCSS Workshop for Parents			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	• PARCC Test Prep Workshop • Literacy Night • Parent University • Understanding Your Child Development • CCSS Workshop for Parents			Monkey Survey Colorin, Colorado National Education Association PARCConline.org FEA
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?**

   Activities, workshops and programs will be offered to parents on a monthly basis.

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

   The leadership will solicit Parents to involve in the development of the pla**n.**

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

   During Back to school night and via mail, school messenger

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

   The leadership will solicit Parents to involve in the development of the plan.

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

   The document will be reviewed during Back to school night and will be mailed to parents.

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

   Parents will received updates via mail and workshops, PTC,

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?**

   Parents will receive a letter indicating the district performance and student performance.

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

   Parents will received updates via mailed and workshops, PTC

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

   Parents of the SLT and PTO will be part of the Data review.

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

    Parents will receive interim reports every six weeks and marking period reports cards. They will be informed via school messenger and have access on line to student's grades (If available). ESL teachers and intervention teacher will create a progress report every six weeks. The report will be sent home to the families.

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

    They will be used on parent workshops and programs to improve students' achievement.

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	**38** **100**	Model lesson are required as part of the interview process Monitoring of PD hours Assign a mentor to new teachers Monitor PDPs
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)	**5** **100**	Make sure paras complete the pro-para tests.
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by *ESEA* (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*		

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

* 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
Provide professional development for new teachers, provide a mentor, coaching cycles with the Literacy Leader, conduct instructional rounds.	**Principal, VP, Literacy Leader**