GRANTEE

# Form S-1

## NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
## TITLE PAGE - **SCHOOL APPLICATION**

**SECTION I:**

NGO#: 14-SG07-H03 Title: New Jersey School Improvement Grant (SIG) for Priority Schools – Cohort 3

**SECTION II, PART A:**
School No. 6

School Name
137 Carroll Street

School Address
Paterson, NJ 07501

School City, State, Zip
K - 8

Grade Span of School

Internal use only: 31 - 4010 - 0 - 100
School Code - Type - Region - Sequence

Shonda Davis (973) 321-0060
School Principal Name Phone #

Mrs. Marguerite Sullivan
School Program Director Name

(973) 321-2331
School Program Director Telephone

(973) 321-0652 / msullivan@paterson.k12.nj.us
School Program Director Fax/email

Total amount of funds requested for school application: Year 1 $1,990,800 Year 2 $1,977,157 Year 3 $1,996,756

Duration of the Year 1 project: 7/1/14 to 8/31/15

To the best of my knowledge and belief, the information contained in the application is true and correct. I further certify the school application information is complete.

Donn W. Evan
Certification of Chief School Administrator

3/31/14
Date

*SECTION II PART B*

The school application has been duly authorized by the governing body of the Paterson Public Schools district (County Code 31, District Code 4010, School Code 100).

Donn W. Evan
Signature of Chief School Administrator

State District Superintendent
Title

3/31/14
Date

Business Manager: Richard J. Kilpatrick, Business Administrator Phone: 973-321-0703 Fax: 973-321-0899

Richard J. Kilpatrick 3/31/2014

## Form S-2

# SCHOOL STATEMENT OF ASSURANCES

**On behalf of the LEA and the applicant School, the undersigned hereby assure the New Jersey Department of Education that under this School Improvement Grant program:**

- Each school's principal and appropriate staff agrees to participate in the Leadership Academy.
- A State Turnaround Coach is assigned to each school.
- Each school agrees to participate in an external evaluation and accountability process that includes rigorous objectives that measure the impact of the activities.
- Each school is fully committed to the implementation of all project activity plans as outlined in the approved grant application, to include fulfillment of all relevant SIG model requirements.

Paterson Public Schools
Applicant LEA

Signature: *Chief School Administrator*

School No. 6
Applicant School

3/31/14
Date

## Form S-3

## Documentation of Federal Compliance (DUNS/SAM) Form

Note: this form must be completed and returned by the applicant school prior to any award being made.

**Part I – Applicant Organization**

| | |
|---|---|
| Organizational Name of Applicant | *Paterson Public Schools* |
| Address (including zip + 4 code) | *90 Delaware Ave., Paterson, NJ 07503-1804* |
| DUNS number | *079305892* |
| Expiration Date of SAM registration | *07/05/2014* |
| Congressional District | U.S. D-09 |

**Part II – Primary Place of Performance under this award**

| | |
|---|---|
| City | Paterson |
| County | Passaic |

*I certify that this information is complete and correct. Furthermore, the applicant certifies that it has completed its registration on the System for Award Management (SAM) website, found at www.sam.gov and shall maintain a current registration throughout the grant period.*

*Signature of Chief School Administrator*

*Dr. Donnie Evans, State District Superintendent*
*Name and Title*

# Form S-4

**Date**: April 1, 2014



## PROJECT ABSTRACT

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | |
|---|---|
| **Mission** | To transform the climate, culture and operations of School 6 through staff development and stakeholder engagement resulting in significant student academic and personal growth. |
| **Vision** | Advancing student growth with continuous improvement and high standards. |
| **Project Implementation Summary** | **Activity 1 – Governance**<br>▪ Retain current Principal who has initiated a transformation model<br>▪ Embrace the eight turnaround principals<br>▪ Set a vision for high standards in instruction practice and student growth<br>**Activity 2 – Evaluation**<br>▪ Implement the Focal Point rubric-based Teacher and Principal/VP/AP Observation System combined with AchieveNJ requirements<br>▪ Support staff with a "Praise and Polish" approach<br>▪ Continuously monitor and improve effectiveness of the systems<br>**Activity 3 – Incentives**<br>▪ Convene stakeholder-facilitated decision-making process for creating incentives and corresponding milestones by staff<br>▪ Act swiftly and efficiently to improve teacher practice or dismiss staff through Corrective Action Plans<br>**Activity 4 – Professional Development**<br>▪ Provide job-embedded professional development through external providers<br>▪ Convene a peer-based professional development environment that supports on-the-job improvement and support (PLCs, VAMs, and GLMs, etc.)<br>**Activity 5 – Recruit and Retain Staff**<br>▪ Implement a rigorous screening process for new and current staff<br>▪ Through SIG funds, hire: Two Reading Specialists and Teacher Mentors of Climate/Culture and Data, respectively<br>▪ Encourage professional leadership and advancement<br>▪ Retain existing staff leadership positions beyond project term<br>**Activity 6 – Data- Driven Reform**<br>▪ Provide professional support for staff to effectively utilize Performance Matters and STAR assessments<br>▪ Create a collaborative professional climate for data- and trend-driven instructional practice though PLCs and other communities/meetings.<br>**Activity 7a – Extended Learning Opportunities**<br>▪ Implement 300 hours of extended learning time impeded into the regular school day<br>▪ Enrich student learning though a Middle School University, community-centered theme, and interventions that make use of an extended day<br>**Activity 7b – Community Engagement**<br>▪ Continuous convene stakeholder committee, School Action Team and other methods to actively engage parents and community-based organizations |

# PROJECT ABSTRACT

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | |
|---|---|
| | ▪ Facilitate staff coordination with community-based leaders and organizations with coordinated planning, professional development and mentorship<br>**Activity 8 – Operations**<br>▪ Provide flexibility and autonomy for staffing, scheduling and budgeting<br>▪ Maintain leader accountability through a summative school rating<br>**Activity 9 - Assessment**<br>▪ Use McREL to continuously collect and analyze evaluation data<br>▪ Monitor behavior and discipline with PBSIS<br>▪ Continue to collect and assess student data through STAR and Performance Matters |

# Form S-5

**Date:** April 1, 2014



## REPORTING METRICS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools
**Name of School:** School 6

<table>
<tr><th>Metric</th><th>2012-2013 Data</th></tr>
<tr><td>School Data</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Which intervention the school used (i.e., turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation )</td><td>Transformation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Number of minutes within the school year</td><td>70,320</td></tr>
<tr><td>Student Outcome/Academic Outcome Data</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup</td><td>See attachment</td></tr>
<tr><td>Student participation rate on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup</td><td>School #6 – Participation rates
<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Subgroup</th><th colspan="2">Math</th><th colspan="2">Language</th></tr>
<tr><th>ELEM</th><th>MIDDLE</th><th>ELEM</th><th>MIDDLE</th></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>95%</td><td>96%</td><td>96%</td><td>97%</td></tr>
<tr><td>WHITE</td><td>-</td><td>100%</td><td>-</td><td>100%</td></tr>
<tr><td>AFRICANAMERICAN</td><td>95%</td><td>96%</td><td>96%</td><td>97%</td></tr>
<tr><td>HISPANIC</td><td>96%</td><td>97%</td><td>96%</td><td>97%</td></tr>
<tr><td>ASIAN</td><td>-</td><td>100%</td><td>-</td><td>100%</td></tr>
<tr><td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td><td>75%</td><td>85%</td><td>81%</td><td>88%</td></tr>
<tr><td>LEP</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td><td>100%</td></tr>
<tr><td>ED</td><td>93%</td><td>96%</td><td>96%</td><td>95%</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Average scale scores on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the “all students” group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup</td><td>See attachment</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency</td><td>N/A – From NJDOE School Performance Report</td></tr>
</table>

# Form S-5

**Date:** April 1, 2014



**REPORTING METRICS**

| Metric | 2012-2013 Data |
|---|---|
| Graduation rate | N/A |
| Dropout rate | N/A |
| Student attendance rate | 89.8% (389 total students enrolled) |
| Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes | N/A |
| College enrollment rates | N/A |
| **Student Connection and School Climate** | |
| Discipline incidents | Total suspensions – 178 (525 total days on suspension)<br>Office conduct referrals – 661 |
| Truants | 6,801 total unexcused absences with/without parent notification |
| **Talent** | |
| Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system | Number of Tenured Teachers<br>Outstanding – 0<br>Commendable – 4<br>Satisfactory – 21<br>Needs Improvement – 1<br>Unsatisfactory – 0<br><br>Number of Non-Tenured Teachers<br>Outstanding – 0<br>Commendable – 2<br>Satisfactory – 14<br>Needs Improvement – 0<br>Unsatisfactory – 0 |
| Teacher attendance rate | 94.1% |

# School 6

| Grade 3 | 2013 Language Arts | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 31 | 74.2% | 25.8% | 0.0% | 25.8% |
| GENERAL ED. | 24 | 79.2% | 20.8% | 0.0% | 20.8% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| LMTD. ENG. PROF. | 4 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 4 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 14 | 71.4% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 28.6% |
| MALE | 17 | 76.5% | 23.5% | 0.0% | 23.5% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 22 | 72.7% | 27.3% | 0.0% | 27.3% |
| ASIAN | 1 | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 8 | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 29 | 75.9% | 24.1% | 0.0% | 24.1% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 31 | 74.2% | 25.8% | 0.0% | 25.8% |

| Grade 3 | 2013 Mathematics | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient |
| TOTAL | 31 | 61.3% | 25.8% | 12.9% |
| GENERAL ED. | 24 | 54.2% | 29.2% | 16.7% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% |
| LMTD. ENG. PROF. | 4 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 4 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 14 | 57.1% | 28.6% | 14.3% |
| MALE | 17 | 64.7% | 23.5% | 11.8% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 22 | 59.1% | 27.3% | 13.6% |
| ASIAN | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 8 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 29 | 62.1% | 27.6% | 10.3% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 31 | 61.3% | 25.8% | 12.9% |

# School 6

| Grade 4 | 2013 Language Arts | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 28 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| GENERAL ED. | 23 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 5 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LMTD. ENG. PROF. | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 14 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| MALE | 14 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 26 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 2 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 28 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 28 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

| Grade 4 | 2013 Mathematics | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient |
| TOTAL | 27 | 85.2% | 14.8% | 0.0% |
| GENERAL ED. | 23 | 82.6% | 17.4% | 0.0% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LMTD. ENG. PROF. | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 13 | 76.9% | 23.1% | 0.0% |
| MALE | 14 | 92.9% | 7.1% | 0.0% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 25 | 84.0% | 16.0% | 0.0% |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 2 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| AMERICAN INDIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 27 | 85.2% | 14.8% | 0.0% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 27 | 85.2% | 14.8% | 0.0% |

## School 6

| Grade 5 | 2013 Langauge Arts | | | | | Grade 5 | 2013 Mathematics | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above | SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient |
| TOTAL | 37 | 97.3% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 2.7% | TOTAL | 37 | 56.8% | 37.8% | 5.4% |
| GENERAL ED. | 31 | 96.8% | 3.2% | 0.0% | 3.2% | GENERAL ED. | 31 | 51.6% | 41.9% | 6.5% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 2 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 2 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | CURRENT LEP | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 19 | 94.7% | 5.3% | 0.0% | 5.3% | FEMALE | 19 | 63.2% | 36.8% | 0.0% |
| MALE | 18 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | MALE | 18 | 50.0% | 38.9% | 11.1% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 25 | 96.0% | 4.0% | 0.0% | 4.0% | BLACK | 25 | 68.0% | 28.0% | 4.0% |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 12 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | HISPANIC | 12 | 33.3% | 58.3% | 8.3% |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 37 | 97.3% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 2.7% | ECON. DISADV. | 37 | 56.8% | 37.8% | 5.4% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 37 | 97.3% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 2.7% | NON-MIGRANT | 37 | 56.8% | 37.8% | 5.4% |

## School 6

| Grade 6 | 2013 Language Arts | | | | | Grade 6 | 2013 Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above | SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 52 | 84.6% | 15.4% | 0.0% | 15.4% | TOTAL | 52 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% |
| GENERAL ED. | 37 | 78.4% | 21.6% | 0.0% | 21.6% | GENERAL ED. | 37 | 67.6% | 32.4% | 0.0% | 32.4% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 12 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | SPECIAL ED. | 12 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 33.3% |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | CURRENT LEP | 3 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 33.3% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 22 | 72.7% | 27.3% | 0.0% | 27.3% | FEMALE | 22 | 68.2% | 31.8% | 0.0% | 31.8% |
| MALE | 30 | 93.3% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 6.7% | MALE | 30 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 45 | 84.4% | 15.6% | 0.0% | 15.6% | BLACK | 45 | 73.3% | 26.7% | 0.0% | 26.7% |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 7 | 85.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% | HISPANIC | 7 | 85.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 51 | 84.3% | 15.7% | 0.0% | 15.7% | ECON. DISADV. | 51 | 74.5% | 25.5% | 0.0% | 25.5% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | NON-ECON. DISADV. | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 52 | 84.6% | 15.4% | 0.0% | 15.4% | NON-MIGRANT | 52 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% |

# School 6

| Grade 7 | 2013 Language Arts | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 56 | 89.3% | 10.7% | 0.0% | 10.7% |
| GENERAL ED. | 44 | 86.4% | 13.6% | 0.0% | 13.6% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 9 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 24 | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| MALE | 32 | 90.6% | 9.4% | 0.0% | 9.4% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 47 | 89.4% | 10.6% | 0.0% | 10.6% |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 9 | 88.9% | 11.1% | 0.0% | 11.1% |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 52 | 90.4% | 9.6% | 0.0% | 9.6% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 4 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 56 | 89.3% | 10.7% | 0.0% | 10.7% |

| Grade 7 | 2013 Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 56 | 85.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% |
| GENERAL ED. | 44 | 86.4% | 13.6% | 0.0% | 13.6% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 9 | 77.8% | 22.2% | 0.0% | 22.2% |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 24 | 83.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 16.7% |
| MALE | 32 | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 47 | 83.0% | 17.0% | 0.0% | 17.0% |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 9 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 52 | 86.5% | 13.5% | 0.0% | 13.5% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 4 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 56 | 85.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% |

## School 6

| Grade 8 | 2013 LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 58 | 62.1% | 37.9% | 0.0% | 37.9% |
| GENERAL ED. | 38 | 52.6% | 47.4% | 0.0% | 47.4% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 15 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 5 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 5 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 35 | 51.4% | 48.6% | 0.0% | 48.6% |
| MALE | 23 | 78.3% | 21.7% | 0.0% | 21.7% |
| WHITE | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 43 | 62.8% | 37.2% | 0.0% | 37.2% |
| ASIAN | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 13 | 53.8% | 46.2% | 0.0% | 46.2% |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 56 | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0.0% | 37.5% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 58 | 62.1% | 37.9% | 0.0% | 37.9% |

| Grade 8 | 2013 MATHEMATICS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUB-GROUP | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | % Proficient & Above |
| TOTAL | 57 | 75.4% | 24.6% | 0.0% | 24.6% |
| GENERAL ED. | 38 | 65.8% | 34.2% | 0.0% | 34.2% |
| SPECIAL ED. | 14 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 5 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| CURRENT LEP | 5 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FEMALE | 35 | 68.6% | 31.4% | 0.0% | 31.4% |
| MALE | 22 | 86.4% | 13.6% | 0.0% | 13.6% |
| WHITE | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| BLACK | 42 | 81.0% | 19.0% | 0.0% | 19.0% |
| ASIAN | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HISPANIC | 13 | 53.8% | 46.2% | 0.0% | 46.2% |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| ECON. DISADV. | 55 | 76.4% | 23.6% | 0.0% | 23.6% |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| NON-MIGRANT | 57 | 75.4% | 24.6% | 0.0% | 24.6% |

| School 6<br>Grade 3 | 2013 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 31 | 74.20% | 25.80% | 0.00% | 186.1 |
| GENERAL ED. | 24 | 79.20% | 20.80% | 0.00% | 185.8 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 181.3 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 4 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 189.8 |
| CURRENT LEP | 4 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 189.8 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 14 | 71.40% | 28.60% | 0.00% | 188.1 |
| MALE | 17 | 76.50% | 23.50% | 0.00% | 184.5 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 22 | 72.70% | 27.30% | 0.00% | 183.6 |
| ASIAN | 1 | 0.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% | 225 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 8 | 87.50% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 188.1 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 29 | 75.90% | 24.10% | 0.00% | 185.2 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 199 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 31 | 74.20% | 25.80% | 0.00% | 186.1 |

| School 6<br>Grade 3 | 2013<br>Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 31 | 61.30% | 25.80% | 12.90% | 183.2 |
| GENERAL ED. | 24 | 54.20% | 29.20% | 16.70% | 191.8 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 165.3 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 4 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 136.8 |
| CURRENT LEP | 4 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 136.8 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 14 | 57.10% | 28.60% | 14.30% | 188.2 |
| MALE | 17 | 64.70% | 23.50% | 11.80% | 179.1 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 22 | 59.10% | 27.30% | 13.60% | 184.8 |
| ASIAN | 1 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 269 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 8 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 168.3 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 29 | 62.10% | 27.60% | 10.30% | 182.9 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.00% | 0.00% | 50.00% | 187.5 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 31 | 61.30% | 25.80% | 12.90% | 183.2 |

| School 6<br>Grade 4 | 2013<br>LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 28 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167.7 |
| GENERAL ED. | 23 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 171.6 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 5 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 149.8 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| CURRENT LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 14 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 170.7 |
| MALE | 14 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 164.7 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 26 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167.8 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 2 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 166.5 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 28 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167.7 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 28 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167.7 |

| School 6<br>Grade 4 | 2013<br>Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 27 | 85.20% | 14.80% | 0.00% | 171.9 |
| GENERAL ED. | 23 | 82.60% | 17.40% | 0.00% | 173.2 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 164.3 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| CURRENT LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 13 | 76.90% | 23.10% | 0.00% | 169.8 |
| MALE | 14 | 92.90% | 7.10% | 0.00% | 173.7 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 25 | 84.00% | 16.00% | 0.00% | 173.6 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 2 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 150 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 27 | 85.20% | 14.80% | 0.00% | 171.9 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 27 | 85.20% | 14.80% | 0.00% | 171.9 |

| School 6<br>Grade 4 | 2013<br>Science | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 28 | 57.10% | 42.90% | 0.00% | 190.5 |
| GENERAL ED. | 23 | 52.20% | 47.80% | 0.00% | 195.2 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 5 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 169 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| CURRENT LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 14 | 71.40% | 28.60% | 0.00% | 185.3 |
| MALE | 14 | 42.90% | 57.10% | 0.00% | 195.7 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 26 | 53.80% | 46.20% | 0.00% | 192.1 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 2 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 170 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 28 | 57.10% | 42.90% | 0.00% | 190.5 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 28 | 57.10% | 42.90% | 0.00% | 190.5 |

| School 6<br>Grade 5 | 2013<br>LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 36 | 97.30% | 2.70% | 0.00% | 163.8 |
| GENERAL ED. | 30 | 96.80% | 3.20% | 0.00% | 163.2 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 166.5 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 2 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167.5 |
| CURRENT LEP | 2 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167.5 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 18 | 94.70% | 5.30% | 0.00% | 1655.4 |
| MALE | 18 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 162.1 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 24 | 96.00% | 4.00% | 0.00% | 161.3 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 12 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 169.1 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 36 | 97.30% | 2.70% | 0.00% | 163.8 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 36 | 97.30% | 2.70% | 0.00% | 163.8 |

| School 6<br>Grade 5 | 2013 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mathematics | | | | |
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 21 | 56.80% | 37.80% | 5.40% | 187.8 |
| GENERAL ED. | 16 | 51.60% | 41.90% | 6.50% | 191.5 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 4 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 162.8 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 1 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 181 |
| CURRENT LEP | 1 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 181 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 12 | 63.20% | 36.80% | 0.00% | 181.3 |
| MALE | 9 | 50.00% | 38.90% | 11.10% | 194.7 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 17 | 68.00% | 28.00% | 4.00% | 179.2 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 4 | 33.30% | 58.30% | 8.30% | 205.7 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 21 | 56.80% | 37.80% | 5.40% | 187.8 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 21 | 56.80% | 37.80% | 5.40% | 187.8 |

| School 6<br>Grade 6 | 2013<br>LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 44 | 84.60% | 15.40% | 0.00% | 174.6 |
| GENERAL ED. | 29 | 78.40% | 21.60% | 0.00% | 180.5 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 12 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 159.6 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 161.7 |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 161.7 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 16 | 72.70% | 27.30% | 0.00% | 175.6 |
| MALE | 28 | 93.30% | 6.70% | 0.00% | 173.9 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 38 | 84.40% | 15.60% | 0.00% | 175.8 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 6 | 85.70% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 167.3 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 43 | 84.30% | 15.70% | 0.00% | 174.9 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 162 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 44 | 84.60% | 15.40% | 0.00% | 174.6 |

| School 6<br>Grade 6 | 2013<br>Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 52 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 175.2 |
| GENERAL ED. | 37 | 67.60% | 32.40% | 0.00% | 181.6 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 12 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 160.5 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 66.70% | 33.30% | 0.00% | 154 |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 66.70% | 33.30% | 0.00% | 154 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 22 | 68.20% | 31.80% | 0.00% | 178.7 |
| MALE | 30 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 172.6 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 45 | 73.30% | 26.70% | 0.00% | 176.6 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 7 | 85.70% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 166.1 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 51 | 74.50% | 25.50% | 0.00% | 175.2 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 172 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 52 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 175.2 |

| School 6<br>Grade 7 | 2013<br>LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 56 | 89.30% | 10.70% | 0.00% | 169.4 |
| GENERAL ED. | 44 | 86.40% | 13.60% | 0.00% | 173.9 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 9 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 154.8 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 400.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 147 |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 147 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 24 | 87.50% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 175.6 |
| MALE | 32 | 90.60% | 9.40% | 0.00% | 164.8 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 47 | 89.40% | 10.60% | 0.00% | 168.9 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 9 | 88.90% | 11.10% | 0.00% | 172 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 52 | 90.40% | 9.60% | 0.00% | 169.6 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 4 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 167 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 56 | 89.30% | 10.70% | 0.00% | 169.4 |

| School 6<br>Grade 7 | 2013<br>Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 56 | 85.70% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 169.4 |
| GENERAL ED. | 44 | 86.40% | 13.60% | 0.00% | 170.4 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 9 | 77.80% | 22.20% | 0.00% | 172.6 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 3 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 144.3 |
| CURRENT LEP | 3 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 144.3 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 24 | 83.30% | 16.70% | 0.00% | 173 |
| MALE | 32 | 87.50% | 12.50% | 0.00% | 166.7 |
| WHITE | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| BLACK | 47 | 83.00% | 17.00% | 0.00% | 169.2 |
| ASIAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 9 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 170.3 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 52 | 86.50% | 13.50% | 0.00% | 168.9 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 4 | 75.00% | 25.00% | 0.00% | 175 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 56 | 85.70% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 169.4 |

| School 6<br>Grade 8 | 2013<br>LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 58 | 62.10% | 37.90% | 0.00% | 191.6 |
| GENERAL ED. | 38 | 52.60% | 47.40% | 0.00% | 198.6 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 15 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 178.2 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 5 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 180.6 |
| CURRENT LEP | 5 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 180.6 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 35 | 51.40% | 48.60% | 0.00% | 197.5 |
| MALE | 23 | 78.30% | 21.70% | 0.00% | 182.6 |
| WHITE | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 142 |
| BLACK | 43 | 62.80% | 37.20% | 0.00% | 191 |
| ASIAN | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 191 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 13 | 53.80% | 46.20% | 0.00% | 197.3 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 56 | 62.50% | 37.50% | 0.00% | 191.7 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 188 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 58 | 62.10% | 37.90% | 0.00% | 191.6 |

| School 6<br>Grade 8 | 2013<br>Mathematics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 57 | 75.40% | 24.60% | 0.00% | 168.9 |
| GENERAL ED. | 38 | 653.80% | 34.20% | 0.00% | 177.9 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 14 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 149.6 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 5 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 155 |
| CURRENT LEP | 5 | 80.00% | 20.00% | 0.00% | 155 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 35 | 68.60% | 31.40% | 0.00% | 178.9 |
| MALE | 22 | 86.40% | 13.60% | 0.00% | 153.1 |
| WHITE | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 140 |
| BLACK | 42 | 81.00% | 19.00% | 0.00% | 166 |
| ASIAN | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 167 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 13 | 53.80% | 46.20% | 0.00% | 180.9 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 55 | 76.40% | 23.60% | 0.00% | 169.1 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | 163 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 57 | 75.40% | 24.60% | 0.00% | 168.9 |

| School 6<br>Grade 8 | 2013<br>Science | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Valid Scale Scores | % Partially Proficient | % Proficient | % Advanced Proficient | Scale Score Mean |
| TOTAL | 51 | 87.90% | 10.30% | 0.00% | 177.4 |
| GENERAL ED. | 32 | 84.20% | 13.20% | 0.00% | 184.4 |
| SPECIAL ED. | 14 | 93.30% | 6.70% | 0.00% | 162.1 |
| LMT. ENGL. PROF. | 5 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 169.4 |
| CURRENT LEP | 5 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 169.4 |
| FORMER LEP | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| FEMALE | 29 | 82.90% | 14.30% | 0.00% | 182.8 |
| MALE | 22 | 95.70% | 4.30% | 0.00% | 169.1 |
| WHITE | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 125 |
| BLACK | 40 | 93.00% | 4.70% | 0.00% | 176.2 |
| ASIAN | 1 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 169 |
| PACIFIC ISLANDER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 9 | 69.20% | 30.80% | 0.00% | 185.8 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| OTHER | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| ECON. DISADV. | 49 | 87.50% | 10.70% | 0.00% | 177.5 |
| NON-ECON. DISADV. | 2 | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 173.5 |
| MIGRANT | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| NON-MIGRANT | 51 | 87.90% | 10.30% | 0.00% | 177.4 |

# Form S-6

**Date:** April 1, 2014



## STATEMENT OF NEED

**LEA:** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| Academic Achievement – Reading<br>- to include indicators of students 2 or more grade levels behind, and K-2 literacy (in elementary schools) | NJASK 3-8<br>Unit Assessments K-8<br>STAR Reading 2-8<br>STAR Early Literacy K-1 | **(1) Overall Results/Outcomes**<br>NJASK results from 2013 for School 6 indicate that the proficiency of third graders is at 25.8%, indicating the approximately 75% of students in School 6 are performing below proficiency. As the grade increase student proficiency in reading decreases, with not one student in fourth grade showing proficiency on the NJASK. By the time students get to seventh grade only 10.7% are proficient. Unit Assessments for the 2013-2014 school year show proficiency rates that appear to show growth from the NJASK scores of 2013, however still far below expectations for mastery. The average proficiency rates on the Unit 3 assessment for Language Arts is 48%, below half of the students in the school, and 32 percentage points below mastery. STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy results show approximately 61% of the students at School 6 falling below the 25th percentile in reading and/or early literacy skills.<br>**(2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement** Based on the data analyzed above it appears that students at School 6 lack the foundational skills necessary to be successful readers making it hard for them to complete work with higher level comprehension and critical thinking. As you look at the data across the grades you see the numbers of students at the bottom 25th percentile increase. It can be assumed based on this trend that as students get older the gaps in their reading ability grows making it nearly impossible for them to read and comprehend grade level text. |
| Academic Achievement – Writing | NJASK 3-8<br>Unit Assessments K-8<br>Learning Progression Rubrics K-2 | **(1) Overall Results/Outcomes.** NJASK results from 2013 show the majority of students in grades 3-8 performing below proficiency. This is further supported by Unit Assessment data, which shows 15% of students in grade 6 performing at a mastery level for writing. The highest proficiency was in grade 3 at 48% of students showing mastery in writing, still below half the students in grade 3. This school year the district began |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | a three year rollout of the Writing Workshop. Students in grades kindergarten through second grade have been participating in Units of Study focusing on both narrative and informational writing using mentor texts and following the Workshop Model. To assess writing teachers have been using Learning Progression Rubrics that allow them to isolate writing skills and assess writing both holistically and by skill. Students at School 6 are showing below average proficiency rates in writing as well, with approximately 53% of students performing below mastery in writing.<br><br>**(2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement.** Based on the data analyzed above it appears that students at School 6 are again impacted by a lack in foundational skills, making it difficult to apply ideas to writing and write with cohesion and structure. The difference with writing proficiency as compared to reading is that all grades from 1-8 maintain a similar range of proficiency. Unit Assessment and Learning Progression results for these grade show student proficiency rates in the range of 35-45% regardless of the grade. This indicates that student improvement in writing specifically is not noted and students' achievement remains nearly stagnant every year. |
| Academic Achievement – Math<br>- to include indicators of students 2 or more grade levels behind | • NJASK 2010 – 2013 (State Assessment)<br>• Unit Assessments (District Assessment)<br>• STAR Math (District | **(1) Overall Results/Outcomes.** Based on NJASK three year data, Grades 3 and 6 math percentages of proficiency increased for 2 years consecutively and then in 2013 decreased, with a significant decrease in the special education subgroup. Grade 4 had minimal change in the total population with a significant decrease in the special education subgroup in 2013. Grades 7 and 8 had some inconsistencies throughout the three year trend where the first year there was minimal growth followed with an overwhelming difference in 2012 and then an increase in 2013. |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | Assessment)<br><br>Teacher Certifications (Human Resources) | |

| School | Strand | Count | Met | % Met | Avg |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School No. 6/ A.P.A. | CCSS - Opera... | 91 | 38 | 42% | 48 |
| | CCSS - Numbe... | 85 | 24 | 28% | 37 |
| | CCSS - Numbe... | 90 | 26 | 29% | 39 |
| | CCSS - Measu... | 88 | 20 | 23% | 29 |
| | [illegible] | 91 | [illegible] | [illegible] | 40 |
| Paterson Public Schools | CCSS - Opera... | 5586 | 3255 | 58% | 59 |
| | CCSS - Numbe... | 5578 | 3165 | 57% | 53 |
| | CCSS - Numbe... | 5556 | 3201 | 58% | 56 |
| | CCSS - Measu... | 5587 | 3302 | 59% | 52 |
| | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | 55 |

Based on the cluster grades 3-5 shown above, only 34% of students at school 6 met proficiency where the district overall had 59% proficiency in this grade band.

o Based on the current Unit Assessment data, 28% of grade band 3-5 at the school level met proficiency where as 46% of the district met proficiency. For grade band 6-8, 3% of the students at school level met proficiency where as 28% of the district met proficiency.

o Star Math Data: Grade 1 – 32% At benchmark and 68% Below

Grade 2 – 9% At benchmark and 91% Below

Grade 3 – 39% At benchmark and 61% Below

Grade 4 – 68% At benchmark and 32% Below

Grade 5 – 40% At benchmark and 60% Below

Grade 6 – 38% At benchmark and 63% Below

Grade 7 – 40% At benchmark and 60% Below

Grade 8 – 40% At benchmark and 60% Below

o Three out of the four middle school math teachers are highly

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | qualified (2 of these teachers having a middle school math certification and the other being house matrix); the 5 special education teachers are not certified in mathematics but considered highly qualified in the house matrix<br><br>**(2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement**<br>o Administration/Leadership in the School; change in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014<br>o Academic Performances of students; student have not acquired the background knowledge they need to help them "make sense" of the "new" content<br>o Shifts in CCSS for mathematics<br>o Most students are at least 1 grade level behind<br>o Lack of mastery of basic number operations<br>o Low expectations |
| Subgroup:<br>Homeless | District Enrollment Information | Currently only 6 students at School 6 are classified as "homeless students." Paterson serves as a "sending" and "receiving" district, working with other local municipalities and school districts to provide homeless shelters that enroll homeless children to the appropriate schools. None of these shelter facilities are located near school 6. Therefore School 6 does not serve a significant number of homeless students from within or beyond the district. |
| Subgroup:<br>Students with Disabilities | • NJASK 2010 – 2013 (State Assessment) | **(1) Overall Results/Outcomes**<br>As with the majority of sub-groups at School 6, over the past several years large numbers of students with disabilities have not scored at the proficient |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

<table>
<tr><th>Areas</th><th>List Multiple Measures Analyzed</th><th>(1) Overall Results & Outcomes &<br>(2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>• Unit Assessments (District Assessment)<br><br>• QSR – June, 2012</td><td>level on the NJASK tests. In 2013, the following percentages of students with disabilities across grade levels by subject matter achieved NJASK proficiency.<br><br>
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>ELA</th><th>Math</th><th>Science</th></tr>
<tr><td>3rd Grade SWD proficiency rate</td><td>50%</td><td>25%</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>4th Grade SWD proficiency rate</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>20%</td></tr>
<tr><td>5th Grade SWD proficiency rate</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>6th Grade SWD proficiency rate</td><td>0%</td><td>0%</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>7th Grade SWD proficiency rate</td><td>0%</td><td>22%</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td>8th Grade SWD proficiency rate</td><td>20%</td><td>0%</td><td>6.7%</td></tr>
</table>
<br>(2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement<br>Significant administrative turnover over the course of the past 4 years has served as a significant detriment to student achievement for this and all other groups of children attending school 6. The most recent QSR (2012) corroborates this statement, including specific indication about administrative inefficiencies – especially in following up recommendations for more effective teaching – tying directly in to weak student performance across the spectrum of subjects and sub-groups.<br><br>Other commentary in this document more specific to special education included the following items as root causes for the lack of achievement:<br>• The referral of students with behavioral problems to special education<br>• Special Education Vacancies: Difficulty in finding qualified special education teachers to provide special education services to</td></tr>
</table>

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | identified students due to school environment at School 6<br>• Instructional strategies. Teachers are not experienced in developing and administering alternative strategies (Multisensory Reading; Accommodations and modifications to curriculum to address specific learning styles of individual students).<br>• Special education teachers at School 6 are not well-versed in addressing the learning styles of students whose first language is not English. |
| Subgroup:<br>English Language Learners | NJ ASK<br>ACCESS<br>W-APT<br>Stars ≥3.5 CPL<br>QSR – June, 2012 | **(1) Overall Results/Outcomes**<br>When a student arrives in the district and is identified as an ENGLISH Language learner, the WAPT is administered to gauge the student's language proficiency. Based on the results, the Bilingual Department customizes a program that is best for the individual student. The program may consist of pulling a student out of the classroom or some other form of supplemental assistance. Throughout the district schools offer what they can and students are sometimes bussed to other schools if the services they need are not available within the school.<br><br>In prior years English Language Learners had scored considerably higher than both general and special education students on the NJASK. This remained true in math, with 31% of ELL students in grades 3-8 tested proficient. However, only 8% of ELL students in grades 3-8 were proficient in Language Arts, and only 1 (of 12) ELL students in grades 6-8 tested proficient in any of the three subject areas.<br><br>**(2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement**<br>At the present time, there is no consistency at district level in terms of the services students receive, and there are limited resource to deliver services. |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | At School 6 only one ESL teacher is available for grades K-8, giving limited time to students who need a great deal of individualized attention. Further, native language instruction is not available, and it is often the case that ELL students come to the district with limited education in their native language. |
| Subgroup:<br>Economically Disadvantaged | • Student demographic data maintained by the district<br>• NJASK scores (grades 3-8)<br>• Community Meetings<br>• Teacher Focus Groups<br>• US Census 2010<br>• American Factfinder 2 | It is well documented that School 6 is located in one of the most challenging neighborhoods in the City of Paterson. The area has the highest rate of violent crime in the City and is constituted by the census tract with other troubling socio-economic indicators – including median income, adults with high school diplomas, adults with college degrees all ranking either last or second to last among all US Census Tracts in the City. Given the fact that only a handful of School 6 students do not classify as economically disadvantaged (about 97% qualify for FRL), this classification of students is not truly a sub-group. NJ ASK testing and all other factors contributing to the designation of focus school all thoroughly outline the current results and academic outcomes for the children of school 6.<br><br>The root causes of the poverty itself are difficult to nail down, as entrenched poverty and high unemployment plague the City of Paterson as a whole. While Current school leadership has made progress in developing relationships with local faith-based and community organizations, a broader effort is needed to reach families in order to overcome the true impediment to achievement that the students' economically disadvantaged status represents. |
| Parent Involvement | • Parent Surveys<br>• Teacher Focus | Parent involvement was analyzed using a variety of measures and from diverse perspectives; given the lack of quantitative data available to assess |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | Groups<br>• School Leadership Focus Groups<br>• QSR 2012<br>• Stakeholder Committee Meetings<br>• Student Surveys<br>• Staff Surveys<br>• School walk-throughs<br>• Data maintained by Paterson Public Schools Office of Family and Community Engagement<br>• Parent Coordinator Feedback | this factor, the majority of these measures utilized during the needs assessment process were qualitative.<br><br>The source with the most positive take on the matter was the district manager of parent coordinators, who indicated that PTO attendance has risen from 3-4 to over 30 per meeting in the past 2 years. However, this seems to be the sole bright spot among all parent involvement data sets analyzed during this process.<br><br>The most recent QSR indicates that parent involvement is limited because "There is no system in place that analyzes, plans, develops, and evaluates the parent needs and its impact on student learning." While the recent creation of the School Action Team (group of local stakeholders, including parents) to evaluate school strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities does cover some of this topic, the focus is the school as a whole, not the specific needs of the parent body. This lack of focus on the parents' needs is echoed by parents' sentiments evident in the following questions and responses from the parent focus groups:<br>1) Q: What is the first thing that comes to mind when you hear the term "parent involvement"?<br>A: "There is none"<br><br>2) Q: What do you think the school expects of you?<br>A: "Help with homework, but there is no understanding of what is expected of the parents to help with."<br><br>3) Q: Does the school expect you to be in contact with your child's teacher? To be involved in academic decision making?<br>A: "in contact with the teacher, not very much involved in decision |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | making"<br>The overall results of the parent surveys expressed the notion that there is an overall lack of respect among school leadership, staff, students and parents and that this has been caused by an inconsistency in disciplinary policies and perceived lack of empathy and support from school leadership. Specific parent focus group responses include the feeling that the district "doesn't want us to know what's really going on" and that many parents do not get more involved because they don't feel welcome or informed enough to do so. Other parent responses do, however, speak to the fact that some of them are admittedly too busy with work or other commitments to be more involved in the academic process, especially when it comes to special trips or events hosted at the school itself.<br><br>Teacher focus groups and administrator correspondence also reflect ineffectual parental involvement, with teachers citing that they receive no training or other guidance from administrators on how to involve parents in the academic process and pointing out that parents do come to the building frequently, but most often to deal with disciplinary issues. Interviews with administrators and the most recent QSR support the idea notion voiced by the teachers that parents come into the school "for the wrong reasons" and with negative attitudes: "they show up unannounced and barge into classrooms unheeded by the security guards or administration" (QSR, 2012).<br><br>By all accounts the level and quality of parental involvement and the disconnect in communication between all parties described has proven to be detrimental to the community's attitude toward the school, student morale, and the academic process as a whole. |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| Professional Development | • QSR 2012<br>• School 6 Professional Development Plan<br>• Paterson Public Schools District Professional Development Plan<br>• Teacher Focus Groups<br>• School Leadership Focus Groups | When the last QSR was completed in June of 2012, the following observations on job-imbedded PD driven by data analysis were noted:<br>"There is not a system in place at the school to collaboratively develop a research-based evaluation process that includes updated district/school formal evaluations and walkthrough tools inclusive of a data-driven cycle of teacher assessment and development that tie student learning to teacher learning.<br>There is no system in place at the school to define and prioritize sustained, job-embedded, research-based best practices to implement specific to the needs of the students, teachers and school"<br><br>While evaluation of District and School Professional Development and Title I plans clearly show the good intentions of administration for the development of teaching staff, the sentiments of current teachers polled in the 2014 teacher focus groups mirrored the statements of the QSR. In answer to the question of how school administration prioritizes professional development, teacher responses included "middle of the road" and "teachers seek out professional development on their own." Further, when asked to describe support received in implementing strategies learned from professional development, teachers responded that they "never had professional development per se but attended workshops," that PD should be "more constructed and strategy driven," that PD "should be paid for by the school not the teacher," that they "should have half day in-service training," and that "implementation is off."<br><br>There were a multitude of other responses, but both the QSR and the school 6 teachers corroborated the sentiment that at present, professional development seems to be inadequate to meet the needs of teachers and students. When polled, it seemed that lack of time and resources were the |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | root causes of ineffectual PD – both items that would be addressed by the SIG implementation proposed herein with individualized coaching and modeling and vertical and horizontal alignment of instruction and PD. |
| Extended Learning Opportunities | • ELO program attendance data<br>• Needs Assessment data:<br>o Parent Surveys<br>o Teacher Focus Groups<br>o School Leadership Focus Groups<br>o Community Meetings<br>o Student Surveys<br>o Staff Surveys<br>o QSR 2012 | For the majority of School 6 Administrators – including Principal Davis - the concept of Extended Learning Opportunities is nothing new, as extension of the school day was a major component of the SIG-funded programming that they implemented at Barringer High School in Newark, NJ. However, to the parents and outside community there has been a history of ineffectual support and skepticism when it comes to ELO.<br><br>School 6 began an extended learning program entitled the Academic Intervention After-School Program on October 16, 2013. This offering was made available to 220 School 6 students. The program is designed to provide them with individualized and differentiated instruction in order to increase student learning focused on engaging teachers in assessing and monitoring student mastery through remediation. The Language Arts curriculum, in grades 6 thru 8, utilizes Successful Reader, an authentic literature and reading strategy focused on improving reading comprehension skills. In Kindergarten a combination of phonemic awareness activities, oral language opportunities, and Big Books to foster reading comprehension is used. In grades 1 thru 5, I Explore, an interdisciplinary nonfiction comprehension program has been implemented. Additionally, part of the program incorporates six-week interactions with Kids Xpress to foster writing skills and provide opportunities for students to publish in the "Voices of Paterson" magazine that will go out later in the spring. The Mathematics curriculum utilizes Accelerated Mathematics, Successmaker and Unit Assessments to determine areas in need of remediation. Trained math educators will effectively use IFL instructional strategies, select CCSS aligned materials |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | and hands-on manipulatives to develop deep mathematics understanding from the concrete to abstract with high level thinking skills.<br><br>Despite the efforts of the District and school to offer comprehensive, differentiate instruction to students in need, the program has been lightly attended, to say the least. Over the course of the first 50 days of the program, the attendance rate has been just over 40%. Given this record, school and District administration view the attendance record as the most vital issue requiring attention, citing the fact that there can be no effective assessment of achievement data until the outstanding concern over the glaring attendance statistic is rectified.<br><br>Many point to the previously referenced contentious attitudes and communication issues between parents and the school as the root cause for the program's slow start. As noted by parents during the March, 2014 focus groups, some parents with children in before or after-school programs are "unaware of what's going on," while others "feel it is a babysitting program." Other parents cited a lack of proper supervision for their dissatisfaction with school-operated before or after the school day. When asked about their level of satisfaction with before/after school programs, they responded that "kids were not happy," "kids did not enjoy the program so they no longer attend," and "parents see no benefits." To the question of what kinds of programs parents would like to see implemented in a before or after-school setting, they only mentioned "music programs and sports programs," with no reference to supplemental academics.<br><br>To administrators, these attitudes speak loudly to the need to address school climate and culture, which will be a major focus of the School 6 |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | SIG efforts. |
| School Culture | • QSR – June 2012<br>• Building security personnel interviews (walkthrough)<br>• Discipline data maintained by the district for the 2013-2014 school year<br>• Attendance Data<br>• School 6 Student Handbook<br>• School 6 Faculty Handbook<br>• Parent Surveys<br>• Teacher Focus Groups<br>• School Leadership Focus Groups<br>• Stakeholder Meetings<br>• Student Surveys<br>• Staff Surveys<br>• School walk-throughs | In the 2012 QSR, the following items were observed, collected, and reported as indicative of school culture and climate:<br>• There is little evidence that school rules are clear, fair, consistently applied and routinely shared with families, adult caregivers, and the entire school community. The instructional environment is not always designed to support individual student needs. Attendance and discipline data are not disaggregated and analyzed. Several staff members interviewed thought that consistently enforcing discipline code of conduct, would improve the school culture.<br>• Surveys were completed by 23 staff members and five parents. Eighty five percent of the staff feel they are committed to student achievement. Sixty three percent of staff feel respected. Fifty nine percent of staff feel safe in the school; forty percent of parents feel his or her child is safe in the school. More than sixty percent of teachers feel the students are safe in the school. Twenty percent of the parents feel there is adequate playground and lunch supervision.<br>• The principal stated: "The school is disenfranchised from the district." He further stated, "There is a culture of blame and excuses that non-supportive homes and poverty, as opposed to weak instruction, are the causes of poor student achievement. The district lacks an interest, focus and sense of urgency to improve this school."<br>The conclusions drawn by the author of the QSR were that the school |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | "does not function as a learning community and that the root cause was "lack of experienced leadership"<br><br>Although many individuals who were unofficially polled during school walkthroughs or other informal interviews during the more recent needs assessment efforts all tended to concur that there has been a general positive trend in school administration, culture & climate, and therefore behavior and instruction in the current school year, the facts remain that there is not yet enough quantitative data to substantiate these claims, regular school day supplemental academic attendance records are woeful, and stakeholder feedback still reflects many of the problematic issues reported in the 2012 QSR.<br><br>During the 2014 needs assessment process, stakeholders (parents, students, teachers, district administrators, school leadership and security personnel) expressed the following concerns:<br><br>• All groups expressed a need for enhanced security within the building and concern for the unsafe surroundings (citing drugs and violence in the neighborhood. 31% of teachers reported they do not feel safe at school and that when the students themselves "are dangerous, the consequences are few to none."<br><br>• Responses to student surveys indicated that fighting and bullying are among their major concerns. Over 50% of the students surveyed indicated that the school is not a safe place, many citing that issues from outside (including both specific arguments and general criminal activity) maker their way into the school. Even though they were not prompted, a number of the students indicated that safety, or lack thereof, makes it difficult to get work done. A number of others spoke to the uneven discipline referenced by the teachers as a factor contributing to their feeling that the school is not safe. |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Parents in focus groups cited that progress reports and other communications from the school were not helpful in the academic process: "Progress report fails to reflect truth – Report says one thing and report card shows different thing," and "Progress report says doing well, satisfactory, 2-3 weeks later Report Card shows Failure." In response to whether they are contacted when their children are having academic challenges, parents responded with "Contact deals with what Administration wants you to know," "Suspensions, no telephone calls," and "only contacted when child is disrespectful to teachers and adults."<br>• Both Student and Teacher focus groups indicated that behavioral issues pose a significant disruption to the academic process.<br>While slight progress has been noted by some groups, it is clear that the new school leadership must create an environment that facilitates increased student achievement and displays orderly and productive small learning environments supported by families and the school community at large. |
| Leadership | • QSR 2012<br>• Parent Surveys<br>• Teacher Focus Groups<br>• School Leadership Focus Groups<br>• Student Surveys<br>• Staff Surveys<br>• School walk-throughs<br>• NJASK scores | In the leadership section of the 2012 QSR, the observer noted the leadership challenges of the principal and leadership team at School 6:<br>• There is limited evidence that the principal ensures a culture of learning and continuous improvement.<br>• There is limited evidence that the leaders function in the capacity of a leadership/data team.<br>The author listed the root causes as follows:<br>→Lack of knowledge and understanding of:<br>• how to facilitate an accountable process with staff<br>• how to create a learning culture with high performance expectations<br>• how to monitor the implementation of the CCSS, especially in grades |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | (grades 3-8)<br>• School 6 Professional Development Plan | K-3<br>• how to provide quality constructive feedback with follow through<br>• how to use data to drive instructional practices<br>There is a system to collaboratively develop a research-based evaluation process that includes updated district/school formal evaluations and walkthrough tools inclusive of a data-driven cycle of teacher assessment and development that ties student learning to teacher learning, but it is not implemented.<br><br>While the 2014 teacher focus groups did not express the lack of confidence in the current principal's leadership capacity that was prevalent in the 2012 observation, the 2014 teacher responses did indicate a need for the kind of effectual differentiated professional development, follow through and coaching that is currently being proposed for the coming SIG cohort.<br><br>And though the District administrators polled believe that much of the parent distrust of current school administration is carryover from the previous years of administrative turnover and general turmoil, building strong community foundation and parent support remains a leadership challenge for current School 6 administrators. |
| Highly Qualified Staff | | Upon review of the HQT Report for Public School No. 6, it was found that all 41 teachers in the school are highly qualified (certified) as per standard State certification, House Matrix, or a combination of State Cert plus Praxis or House Matrix plus Praxis. There are 7 teachers who are primary certified (P-3 Standard or Provisional) teaching Pre-school, Kindergarten, 1st Grade. There are 9 elementary certified (K-5 or K-8) teaching grades 2 |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| Areas | List Multiple Measures Analyzed | (1) Overall Results & Outcomes & (2) Root Cause of Lack of Achievement |
|---|---|---|
| | | – 5. There are 9 teachers teaching specific content at the middle school level. There is one Art Teacher and one Bilingual Teacher, both of whom possess standard certification. The Music Teacher holds Standard Elementary and Standard Music certifications. There are 5 Special Education Teachers who hold either Teacher of the Handicapped or K-5&Standard TOSD certifications. There is one teacher of Phys. Ed./Health who holds a Standard Health and Phys. Ed. certification and one Teacher of Phys. Ed. who holds a Standard Phys. Ed. certification. |
| Other: | | |

## Evaluation & Needs Assessment Summary

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Describe the process and techniques used in the needs assessment. | The needs assessment was performed by a third party professional to consult all stakeholders, collect and analyze data, and advise corresponding action plans. Outsourcing the needs assessment process ensured objectivity and that stakeholder contributions to the process would be taken into consideration for recommendations for future plans of action.<br>The needs assessment was conducted using both qualitative and quantitative data. Summative and formative data was collected for both the district for a period of at least three years (2011 through 2014). This information included the NJ State Report Card, NJASK scores, District benchmark assessments, attendance records, discipline records, and school demographic information. Additionally, parents, staff, and students completed individual surveys and participated in organized focus groups providing qualitative responses to questions regarding key topical areas of concern. Additional informal polls of school administrators, along with a walkthrough of School 6, were conducted to garner qualitative data.<br>Other support documentation was secured through the school and the District to provide clarity and context on the school's historical academic performance, current and future initiatives, professional development strategy, and school climate and culture. These |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | documents included past restructuring plans, School CAPA assessments, and corrective action plans that were designed to improve the school's performance. |
| 2. | Describe methods used to collect and compile data for student subgroups. | State standardized tests as well as local district assessments are used to compile data. The state standardized assessment used is the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJASK) which is given in grades 3 through 8, once a year. Once the results are received, the Assessment Department compiles, analyzes, and distributes the data. In addition to the state assessment, local assessments such as STAR Renaissance and Unit Assessments are utilized. The STAR Renaissance Assessment is an adaptive, computer-based assessment. Upon completion of this assessment, reports are generated through the online website. Unit assessments are paper based assessments. Students' scores are reported online and stored in our data warehouse called Performance Matters. Through Performance Matters, teachers as well as district offices can generate a variety of data reports used to drive instruction. |
| 3. | Explain how the data from the collection methods are valid and reliable. | The reliability and validity evidences for the NJ ASK tests are documented. A reliable test is one that produces scores that are expected to be relatively stable if the test is administered repeatedly under similar conditions for overall and across subgroups. For evidence that a test is performing similarly across subgroups, the reliability values for these subgroups can be compared to those for the total population. Note that the reliability measures are impacted by the population distribution and can be lower when the subgroup is homogenous in performance. However, one would expect the subgroup reliabilities to be adequately high for all groups. The test reliabilities are measured by Cronbach alpha for the NJASK test. The alphas for overall student responses range from 0.81 to 0.90 for LAL, 0.90 to 0.92 for math, and 0.82 to 0.90 for science indicating that the test is highly reliable. The reliability of the test for Spanish students only was lower than overall, ranging from 0.73 to 0.81 for LAL, 0.83 to 0.89 for math, and 0.69 to 0.70 for science which is still reasonable given the student population (<900). Reliability estimates for special education and limited English proficient are quite similar to the general population.<br>All standards and assessments were reviewed by specialists from NJ content as well as bias and sensitivity review committees to identify and eliminate elements that may favor one group (e.g., language, culture, ethnicity) over another. These items were developed under universal test design principle so that no student groups fall in disadvantage. |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | The test validity also reflects from the fact that the test is inclusive to all student groups. In order to minimize or eliminate factors that contribute to assessment ambiguity and inaccuracy such that assessment results accurately reflect student knowledge and ability various accommodations were also provided to the NJ LEP students based on the decision made from their IEP or 504 plans.<br>The test validity further ensures from the comparability and interpretation of scores and proficiency standards across different student groups. All item responses from regular and special population in the NJ ASK test in a given grade/content are combined for item analyses, calibration, and equating if the students have taken the same test in different versions, for example regular, Spanish, Braille, and large Print. If a test needed modification, for example some items could not be converted into Braille; a different scoring table was prepared. However, the items were put on the same scale as the regular tests so that the same interpretation of proficiency standards could apply to all. |
| 4. | What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction? | The data analysis revealed that classroom instruction at School 6 is generally inadequate and that a variety of factors impede the learning process on a consistent basis. Qualitative and quantitative data both reveal that behavioral issues serve as one such impediment, while insufficient and ineffective professional development constitutes another. Clearly school culture and climate must be addressed in order to effect meaningful improvement. Fortunately, there are enough positive indicators when it comes to current leadership potential to believe that the desired steps can be undertaken by this school administration. More specifically, the analysis revealed the following:<br>• Teachers need quality professional development focusing on math content knowledge aligned to CCSS and pedagogical knowledge<br>• Administrative team must be effectively trained on the new curriculum and new pedagogical approach<br>• Administration and curriculum leaders must address the shifts required by the CCSS by focusing strongly where the standards are and unpacking them, maintaining coherence both across and within grades(vertical and horizontal alignment), and providing rigor to pursue conceptual understanding and procedural skills in major |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | topics<br>Further, evaluation of historical quantitative data reveals that student achievement at School 6 does not often significantly improve or decrease. It seems that proficiency rates maintain a fairly consistent range, never surpassing 47%-48%. In other words, less than half the student population at any particular grade is performing at a mastery level. This would seem to indicate that the same students are testing proficient from year to year, while the other who do not fall further behind. This indicates that in addition to the consistency of instruction will come with vertical and horizontal articulation and differentiated PD, differentiated instruction must be a major focus of the proposed SIG program at School 6. |
| 5. | What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)? | The teacher focus group responses revealed a variety of differing opinions on this matter:<br>"Supervisors provide resources to the teachers"<br>"Need PD on things other than academics"<br>"Not Enough Time"<br>"Need to specify training"<br>"should host meetings to help the teachers who have students with behavioral problems"<br>Across the spectrum of answers and in the analysis of hard data, the consistent conclusions that can be gleaned are that the process of professional development must be intensified, sessions do not occur often enough, and the PD that is delivered does not result in the desired outcomes. |
| 6. | How are educationally at-risk students identified in a timely manner? | Star Renaissance and Performance matters are used to assist in identifying at-risk students. It is a web-based, performance-based assessment. Once a group of students has completed the online assessment, results are instantly available. The reports generated group students in the following groups: At/Above Benchmark students are meeting or exceeding the standard requirements), On Watch (students are close to meeting the standard requirements), Intervention (students are need of additional support because they are struggling in a specific area or areas), Urgent Intervention (students in this group may be in need of additional services.) The Instructional Planning Report provides a list of recommended skills either by class or individual student. |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Performance Matters is the district's data warehouse. All scores from NJASK, Unit Assessments, STAR Renaissance, and any other assessments utilized by the district are stored in Performance Matters. Teachers, administrators, and central office personnel view the data and make comparisons across test scores by year, per grade, across schools, etc. All scores are also color coded (blue: above benchmark, green: at benchmark, yellow: slightly below benchmark, red: below benchmark). There is also the ability to group students based on proficiency by skill. |
| 7. | How are educationally at-risk students provided with effective assistance? | At present, interventions are provided as soon as practicable after the need for an intervention has been identified. While there is room to improve in this area at School 6, certain methods have shown themselves effective in some cases. For example, the aforementioned Star Renaissance program highlights the areas that need to be addressed during differentiated instruction and five-week units of instruction are delivered along with a week of assessment and a week of remediation aimed at instructing students on concepts that were not mastered. In math, there is "Math Facts in a Flash," which is utilized for at risk students to gain fluency. SuccessMaker is another math intervention program that is set up as a lab and used daily by identified students. Additionally, the After-school Intervention Program enrolls at risk students for the comprehensive remediation of skill deficiencies. |
| 8. | How does the needs assessment address migrant student(s) needs? | The number of migrant student attending Paterson Public Schools in general, and this school in particular, is not statistically significant (none reported for the current school year) and was therefore not addressed through the needs assessment process. |
| 9. | How does the needs assessment address homeless student(s) needs? | The district provides transportation if a student is living out of district and attending a Paterson public school, and each student gets $250 for the purchase of uniforms through Title I funding. Homeless students were not surveyed as a separate sub-group because there are only six students at school 6 that are considered homeless. |
| 10 | How were teachers engaged in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improvement of the instructional program? | In some cases, teachers were given the opportunity to design pre-and post-assessments for evaluating Student Growth Objectives that will be informed by the SIG program. In other instances, a significant number of teachers provided extensive feedback during teacher focus groups and through staff surveys. The information gleaned through these measures was utilized to directly inform program development, particularly with regard to academic assessments and improvements to the instructional program. Follow-up meetings with the |

Date: April 1, 2014



## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Department of Assessment, Evaluation, and Planning were conducted to discuss teacher concerns and explore solutions. |
| 11 | Describe the transition plan for preschool to kindergarten, if applicable. | Transition is executed through a number of methods. Prior the end of the school year in June, preschool students visit the kindergarten and partake in an activity with the kindergarten students. Additionally, the District and school compile a transition file for each child attending a district preschool or a preschool operated by a community provider. This file includes information such as the child's preschool, the teacher, and the date he or she entered preschool. It also contains assessment data as well as areas of strengths and weaknesses. If the child speaks a language other than English the transition file will include an ELL Profile Sheet; if the child is receiving intervention services, the intervention team member's name and contact information is given; and if the child has an IEP, the file is given to the guidance counselor at the receiving school.<br>In September, Master Teachers and Preschool Intervention and Referral Team hand deliver the transition folders to the kindergarten teacher. The interaction includes reviewing the folders and discussing all relevant information. |
| 12 | Describe the process used to select the priority problems and root causes for this plan? | District officials met extensively to explore root causes and determine what priority problems School 6 would address with its SIG program. During this process, the QSR Standards Rubric was utilized as a foundation and school administrators were engaged to join in and analyze all of the measure cited above under "Multiple Measures Analyzed." This team analyzed both qualitative and quantitative data to isolate priority problems and root causes to drive the development of the SIG Program. In addition to Principals, other district personnel and RAC members joined to conduct instructional walkthroughs to gauge the school atmosphere and develop an understanding of the adequacy of the instructional process and the monitoring thereof.<br><br>In addition to these factors, this group also evaluated administrative capacities and cross referenced all data sets – especially previously established QSR observations and current observations and reports on day-to-day instructional capability and delivery of the academic program – to determine the steps for moving forward to finally establish the priority problems and root causes for this plan. |
| 13 | What did the data analysis reveal regarding the root causes of lower subgroup performance? | All in all, when considering quantitative data in all subjects, it is clear to see that from year to year dating back to 2011, the lower performing subgroups of special education and LEP |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | students either decreased in score across most assessed grade levels or had no change. Based on this data we can surmise that these students lack foundational skills necessary to not only to comprehend material, but also to decode it.<br>Their limited proficiency scores, the number of students in the bottom 25th percentile in many areas, and the lack of any kind of growth across the grades show that students are not making gains to overcome their gaps in learning and therefore the same students maintain their proficiency each year and those who are not proficient have gaps that grow larger with each passing school year.<br>As enumerated in previous sections, there is no consistency at district level in terms of the services students receive, and there are limited resource to deliver services. At School 6 only one ESL teacher is available for grades K-8, giving limited time to students who need a great deal of individualized attention. Furthermore, special education teachers are not well-versed in addressing the learning styles of students whose first language is not English. In general, the atmosphere at School 6 makes it difficult to bring in qualified teachers of special education, so those who are brought in do not always have the ideal experience with the Instructional strategies required to effectively teach these children. |
| 14 | How did the needs assessment results and evaluation of current programs lead to the selection of the SIG model (Transformation, Turnaround, Restart or Closure)? | Over the course of the needs assessment, it was determined through various sources that Principal Davis, not yet through a single year at School 6 had already made great strides as a turnaround leader in improving various components of school culture and has already seen slight gains in specific grade levels in student achievement on the STARS assessment.<br><br>65% of the teachers feel valued as a staff member at School 6<br>62% of the teachers feel supported by their administrators at school in terms of student concerns<br>69% of teachers feel supported by their administrators at school in terms of professional development<br>65% of teachers feel they receive appropriate feedback on observations and walk-throughs<br>85% of teachers feel there are high expectations set for students at School 6<br>Only 12% of students feel that there are <u>not</u> high expectations for them at school |

## STATEMENT OF NEED

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 67% of students feel comfortable going to school staff with a problem at school<br><br>Furthermore, numerous sources reflected the need for consistency in the academic program in order to effect impactful transformation. Principal Davis now serves as the fifth principal at School 6 since 2009. That was yet another key factor in the selection of the Transformation Model. |
| 15 | What is the process for removal of staff members deemed to be ineffective? | The newly adopted Teacher Evaluation System and Principal and VP/AP Evaluation System will utilize an end-of-year summative rating according to State legislation and AchieveNJ guidelines. This overall evaluation score combines the multiple measures of teacher practice and student growth. All New Jersey teachers earn one of four ratings: highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective. All teachers receive individual professional development plans based on their ratings. Teachers rated ineffective or partially effective work with their principals to create a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) with targeted professional development for the subsequent year. To maintain tenure, all teachers (regardless of hire date) have to continue to earn a rating of effective or highly effective. After the first year, teachers who receive an Ineffective or partially effective rating are required to have one additional observation, and multiple observers are required. If the teacher rating is not improved after two years of a CAP, a teacher will be dismissed from employment. |
| 16 | Describe the incentive for Nationally Board Certified Teachers and Principals. | An incentive for Nationally Board Certified Teachers and Principals does not currently exist. However, the District is developing a program for a 2014-2015 Cohort of teachers to begin the National Board Certification process within the District. The NBCT sessions will provided in Paterson. Teachers/administrators who participate will experience the benefit of completing the NBC process as a cohort rather than independently. |

# STATEMENT OF NEED

# Form S-7

**Date:** April 1, 2014



## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| **Transformation SIG Required Activity – 1**<br>Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Implementation Guidance**<br>Establish clear criteria that describe the leadership behaviors needed to implement reform. These criteria should guide recruiting, hiring, supporting, and evaluating leaders. LEAs have the flexibility of retaining recently hired principals who have the experience and skills to successfully implement the SIG model. | | |
| **Evidence of Implementation Indicators** | **Implementation Description** | **Timeline** |
| 1. The LEA identifies behaviors that leaders need to improve instruction and promote necessary school change. | Along with adopting a rubric-based framework for model leadership practice through its Principal and Vice Principal/Assistant Principal (VP/AP) Evaluation System, the district will expect its School 6 leadership team to adhere to the following NJDOE-accepted turnaround principles:<br><br>1. School Leadership – Ensuring that the principal has the ability to lead the turnaround effort<br><br>2. School Climate and Culture – Establishing a school environment with a climate conducive to learning and a culture of high expectations<br><br>3. Effective Instruction – Ensuring teachers utilize research-based effective instruction to meet the needs of all students<br><br>4. Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System – Ensuring teachers have the foundational documents and instructional materials needed to teach to the rigorous college and career ready standards that have been adopted | July 2014 – August 2017 |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 5. Effective Staffing Practices – Developing the skills to better recruit, retain and develop effective teachers<br><br>6. Enabling the Effective Use of Data – Ensuring school-wide use of data focused on improving teaching and learning, as well as climate and culture<br><br>7. Effective Use of Time – Redesigning time to better meet student needs and increase teacher collaboration focused on improving teaching and learning<br><br>8. Effective Family and Community Engagement – Increasing academically focused family and community engagement | |
| 2. The LEA selects and hires a principal with the necessary competencies to be a transformation leader. | Ms. Shonda Davis, Principal of School 6, was hired starting in the 2013-14 school year with a proven track record as a turnaround leader while at a SIG School in another district — Barringer High School in Newark, New Jersey. Ms. Davis has demonstrated significant success in improving academic performance of a low performing school in an urban setting. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree from Kean University in 2005 and her Masters from Saint Peter's College in 2007. As Principal of Newark's Barringer High School for the three previous school years, graduation rates jumped from 36 percent to 60 percent, while math scores improved by 19.7 percent. Language arts scores rose by 14.2 percent, and violence and discipline issues declined significantly.<br><br>Ms. Davis was hired specifically to transform School 6, and thus, the District expects high performance in an extremely challenging school environment. Ms. Davis has already demonstrated some of the needed leadership qualities through half of the academic year. Ms. Davis' performance is evaluated by the District's Office of the Assistant Superintendent for Unit 1, which also provides professional coaching. According to Ms. Davis' Coach and | July 2014 – August 2017 |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Supervisor, she has reframed a vision for the school and set a positive outlook for the school community. At the same time, she has set high expectations for staff instructional practice and has shown willingness to turn around teacher performance. She is highly visible in classrooms and provides detailed and lengthy evaluations for instructional staff. Her teachers' evaluations have been recently recognized by state officials as exceptional models for others. Multiple teachers have been provided corrective action plans during this school year as a result of the high expectations that are characteristic of Ms. Davis' leadership.<br><br>Ms. Davis and her administrative staff work together in a shared mission to improve student achievement while providing a safe, supportive and respectful environment that is constantly tested by the plight of a low-income and high-crime neighborhood. Two of the assistant principals followed Ms. Davis from Newark and have hit the ground running as a well-managed and effective team, along with an existing assistant principal who provides the institutional knowledge that is so important to success. Student achievement has shown slight improvements this year, and suspensions are down. However, the transformation expectations will come to fruition when instructional practice is enhanced through the type of accountability and support that would be afforded through a SIG grant.<br><br>Along with the climate and tone set by Ms. Davis, a school theme has been developed that is expected to align with a community-based vision for improvement. Curricula have been developed around a theme of Social Justice in order to empower and unite students, parents, staff and community stakeholders who frequently feel discouraged. This change in school focus is proposed for the start of the 2014-15 academic year, along with a change in the school name to the Frank R. Lautenberg School of Social Justice. The new theme will be reflective of the progressive spirit of local figures past and present from Paterson, including Lautenberg. The school will also focus on the rich history of Paterson and how it has fostered many key components of a progressive and democratic society. For example, Alexander Hamilton's vision of an industrial-based society will be highlighted along with | |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | innovations like the locomotive and workers' rights movements. Topics will be highlighted to align with existing social studies curriculum guides and according to grade level groupings: (1) Pre-K through 2nd – My community, (2) 3rd through 5th – Immigration and Industry, and (3) 6th through 8th – Civics and Human Rights. The school will adopt accepted elements of urban social justice education according to Picower (2012): (1) self-love and knowledge, (2) respect for others, (3) issues of social injustice, (4) social movements and social change, (5) awareness raising, and (6) social action. | |
| 3. The LEA establishes a pipeline of potential turnaround leaders. | The district and school already have the makings of a turnaround leader pipeline through existing actions at both the teacher and school administrator levels. Existing actions will be further developed and expanded upon during the SIG project implementation period. The following efforts to develop teacher leadership have either been recently implemented or are planned for the upcoming academic year:<br>o Grade-span leaders are designated<br>o Grade level team leaders at grade level meetings (GLMs)<br>o Content team leaders at vertical articulation meetings (VAMs)<br>o Professional learning community (PLC) leaders designated<br>o Participation on the School Leadership Team<br>o 2 teachers participating in Supervisor/Principal Certification program<br>The following recently implemented actions by the school district will continue to support school 6 administrators to develop into turnaround leaders:<br>o Coaching to principals by Executive Director of Principal Coaching<br>o Coaching to vice principals by principal regarding evaluation, feedback techniques, calibration of evaluation findings, data analysis | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 4. The LEA creates the expectation that the principal will develop staff instructional | The principal of School 6 will adopt recommended LEA practices for the purpose of developing staff instructional capacity. In particular, School 6 will run team meetings as described above to examine data and student work to inform future instruction. Vertical articulation meetings combined with other forms of team meetings will ensure an | July 2014 – August 2017<br><br>PD topics will |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| capacity and provide opportunities for sharing authority to guide the learning agenda. | instructional continuum of increasing rigor as students move into higher grades while supporting instructional planning for the current year.<br><br>Besides instilling a culture of teamwork, collaboration and shared responsibilities, building administrators will complete bi-weekly walk-through observations on staff in all content areas in all grade levels. Administrators will also model instruction and effective instructional strategies. Professional development will be delivered through the team meetings or through individual plans on the following topics:<br>1. Effective Objectives<br>2. Focused Instruction<br>3. Backwards Planning<br>4. Creating Formative Assessments<br>5. Utilizing Assessments to Guide Instruction<br>6. Assessing Student Learning<br>7. Engaging Instructional Strategies<br>8. Student Centered Learning<br>9. Providing Feedback to Students<br>10. Questioning and Discussion Strategies<br><br>Projected SIG-funded positions to augment instructional capacity and shared responsibility for guiding the learning agenda include 2 Reading Specialists, 1 Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis, and one Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture. As their titles indicate, the Reading Specialists will utilize knowledge of language development and the components of reading performance to guide reading instruction, the Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis will be given authority to provide training and support for program teachers and administrators in order to increase their capacity to analyze data that informs the improvement of instruction, and the Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture will have the authority to guide teachers and administrators in an effective system for increasing capacity to engage families | be adjusted by year as needed |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | constructively and foster a safe and supportive learning environment. | |

**Transformation SIG Required Activity – 2**

Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

**Implementation Guidance**

Although we expect an LEA that receives SIG funds and decides to implement the transformation model in a Priority School to implement that model beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, we recognize that certain components of the model may need to be implemented later in the process. For example, because an LEA must design and develop a rigorous, transparent, and equitable staff evaluation system with the involvement of teachers and principals, implement that system, and then provide staff with ample opportunities to improve their practices, the LEA may not be able to remove staff members who have not improved their professional practices until later in the implementation process.

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The SEA and/or LEA establish a transparent system of procedures and protocols for evaluating staff growth. | Paterson Public School District chose the Focal Point measurement rubric to be used by the multiple observers. Staff was notified of the protocols in advance through newsletters, memos, handbook distribution and training meetings. The Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) walkthrough observation tool is being used by the multiple observers for the calibration of observation data.<br><br>• Teaching staff hired after August 6, 2012 will follow a four year and one day schedule to | July 2014 – August 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | earn tenure status. The first year is designated as a mentoring year.<br><br>• The district is following the NJ State recommendation for the number of observations for non-tenured staff, for both years 1-2 and years 3-4. For tenured staff the district has chosen to move from 3 short observations to 1 long and 2 short observations.<br><br>• Announced vs. Unannounced Classroom Observations: All long observations should be announced; at least 1 short observation must be unannounced.<br><br>• Co-observers (double-scored observations): All tenured principals/building lead administrators must have a co-observer present during 2 of their teacher observations. All non-tenured principals/building lead administrators must have a co-observer present during 4 of their teacher observations (2 for language arts, 2 for mathematics). The purpose of these co-observations is to support administrator professional development. The teacher receives 1 observation as a result of a co-observation.<br><br>• For tenured staff, 1 of the 2 short observations will have a pre-conference; the long observation for tenured staff will have a pre– and post-conference.<br><br>• Faculty must maintain a "Proficient" rating to sustain tenure (required).<br><br>• This overall evaluation score combines the multiple measures of teacher practice and student growth. All New Jersey teachers earn one of four ratings: highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective. All teachers receive individual professional development plans based on their ratings.<br><br>• The Principal observes all teachers at least once per year. There are three evaluation cycles per year. Principal Davis rotates her observations between the three VPs. The | |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Principal may not evaluation all teacher practice rubric areas at one time, but will have completed a score for all by the required annual deadline to be included in the summative evaluation.<br><br>• Scheduling teacher evaluations at School 6—each Vice Principal is responsible for specific areas:<br>o Humanities (Soc Std and LAL) grades 3 – 8<br>o Math and Science grades 3 – 8<br>o All specialty subjects<br>o Pre K – 2 is split by both Vice Principals | |
| 2. The LEA evaluates teacher and administrator skills and knowledge, using a variety of valid and reliable tools that can be used to guide PD, teacher support, and personnel decisions. | A rubric-based Teacher and Principal/Vice Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation System have been adopted district-wide in accordance with the Statewide AchieveNJ Evaluation and Support system. The rubrics adopted by the district are as follows:<br><br>I. Teacher Evaluation System rubric domains (performance standards) for instructional practice:<br>A. Preparation for Instruction — Professional educators prepare for quality instruction using a comprehensive approach.<br>B. Use of Data to Inform Instruction — Professional educators use assessment data to inform instruction.<br>C. Instruction — Professional educators deliver quality instruction.<br>D. Interventions to Meet Diverse Needs — Professional educators increase the probability of advancing individual student achievement.<br>E. Classroom Environment--Professional educators establish a culture that is conducive to student well-being and learning.<br>F. Leadership — Professional educators are responsible for professional growth and positive leadership. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | G. Professionalism — Professional educators have a responsibility to parents, students, the district, the public and to the education profession.<br>II. Principal and Vice Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation System rubric domains (performance standards)<br>A. Leadership<br>B. The instructional program<br>C. Staff development<br>D. Effective management<br>E. Professional responsibilities<br><br>During the post-observation conference evaluators will discuss the focus areas and provide meaningful feedback (the District's Praise and Polish policy). Evaluators will provide *ratings (not scores)* for the applicable standards (1-7).<br><br>A walkthrough identifies and informs teacher practice in the areas of classroom environment, instruction, and student engagement. Trained administrators debrief with the teacher and provide meaningful feedback and recommendations to improve teaching and learning. Walkthroughs last up to approximately 10 minutes with a follow-up email, and walkthroughs must be evenly divided between the 1st and 2nd semesters. Six walkthroughs per year are required at a minimum.<br><br>School 6 created an additional walk-through tool that specifically identifies rubric areas and gives the building administration an opportunity to connect their praise/polish to the evaluation rubrics. | |
| 3. The SEA and LEA document and provide training regarding the | The Paterson Public school district maintains a Department of Accountability which has overseen the district-wide transition to the Teacher and Principal Performance Evaluation system over the last two years through its *AchieveNJ* pilot endeavors. The entire district is now operating under the new systems during the 2013-14 academic year. Plans are currently being | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| evaluation process. | developed to roll out similar evaluation systems for certificated non-instructional staff and non-certificated staff on a district-wide basis for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years, respectively.<br><br>A series of guidance documents and training events were provided to all applicable staff during both pilot and district-wide implementations to ensure transparency and understanding the district's goals that align with State-mandated AchieveNJ and the TEACHNJ Law. School administrators were trained on their own evaluation system and how it coincides with the responsibilities of evaluating instructional staff. Trainings for next year's implementation for non-instructional staff will be conducted during spring and summer 2014. The following goals have been the focus of training for principals and building administrators:<br><br>• Goal 1: Common Language /Clear Expectations<br>The district has centered its attention on instruction by developing high expectations, and a platform for a common language of instruction, observation, and evaluation. Training has been conducted for teachers/administrators in developing strong teaching and learning objectives. Discussion and planning sessions regarding increasing the level of rigor in lesson planning are ongoing at the school and district level through vertical articulation and grade level meetings. Curriculum is being examined and in many areas realigned to meet 21st century learning expectations.<br><br>• Goal 2: Accurate and Different Levels of Performance<br>A district-wide emphasis on daily Demonstrations of Learning (DOLs) helps teachers recognize "what students have learned". Staff development at the district and school level has been conducted to allow for this process to be embedded in faculty practices. Performance Matters data and Renaissance STAR assessment results are uploaded and analyzed; interventions and understanding of performance levels are as individualized as possible to ensure student success. | |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | • Goal 3: Timely, Actionable, Data-Driven Feedback<br>Walkthroughs are conducted regularly in classrooms for the purpose of acquiring an understanding of "what good teaching and learning looks like." This practice has helped to identify areas of noteworthy performance as well as identify the need for specific professional development connected to the indicators of the new teacher evaluation rubric. For the past two years, administrators and teachers have learned the value of feedback, and teachers have provided critical input regarding students' needs.<br><br>• Goal 4: Aligned and Targeted Professional Development<br>Professional development is at the heart of the new teacher/principal evaluation systems. Workshops for the new teacher evaluation tool have been conducted at the district level for teachers and principals, as well as in the schools during grade level or faculty meetings. New regulations call for schools to create School Improvement Panels (ScIP), and provide tailored professional development to teachers, and mentoring to first year novice teachers. Each school has identified its ScIP, and discussions about their school's professional development needs are in progress. School-wide plans and School Improvement Plans (SIP) have been updated to reflect the needs of our teachers. Professional development is ongoing based on walkthrough findings and data analysis of student assessment outcomes.<br><br>The school district has recently adopted a shift in how it trains building administrators by conducting small cohort trainings rather than large group sessions. This approach has proven effective to ensure meaningful discussion and understanding of the new evaluation systems. Using this approach, twenty-one trainings have been conducted during the 2013-14 academic year for cohorts of Principals, Vice Principals, and Supervisors. Topics included training on the new teacher evaluation system, teacher observation tool, and summative scoring. Cohorts were selected according to groupings of schools. Small cohorts will continue to be used for future professional development trainings. | |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | The McREL walkthrough observation tool is being used by the multiple observers for the calibration of observation data. A multiple-observer process allows for: (1) a content-based or some other special observer to ensure fairness in instruction practice observations and (2) continuous training of observers who learn from others. Observers calibrate their judgments against those of their colleagues to ensure consistency of observation feedback that is given to a teacher being observed. One observer might not focus on a particular element of instruction during a classroom observation or walkthrough, or co-observers might interpret classroom observation data differently. Calibration of observation data supports collaboration among the observers to ensure that feedback that is given to teachers is meaningful and consistent among the observers. | |
| 4. The SEA and LEA periodically assess the quality and usefulness of the evaluation process. | The Department of Accountability and the Offices of the Assistant Superintendents continue to provide general ongoing feedback and support to ensure ongoing understanding of the new system. An environment of open discussion among school administrators and district-level administrators has allowed evaluations to progress with minimal disruption or uncertainty. The Offices of the Assistant Superintendents in coordination the Department of Accountability ultimately assess the quality and usefulness of the evaluation systems on a periodic basis and will report back to building administrators through the open dialog to discuss any shortcomings, new developments or recognized trends. Principals are encouraged to email the Accountability Department with questions. Responses are then shared with all school administrators in order to maintain transparency and fairness. Surveys from building administrators have been collected from recent training events and follow-up surveys will be developed to solicit feedback about the systems in action. Model evaluation reports by the building administrators will be collected and provided to the State AchieveNJ program officers so that they may be shared with other educators. Any feedback from the State will be reported within the district as appropriate. This protocol was performed previously when the District participated in the pilot program for AchieveNJ. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5. The LEA monitors the evaluation process and reviews results. | The district monitors the evaluation systems to ensure timely evaluations, walkthroughs, meetings and support at the school building level. For example, the Assistant Superintendents and Department of Accountability will send reminders about deadlines for observations and walkthroughs to building administrators as needed. Evaluation and walkthrough narratives are monitored and representative examples are shared with all building administrators via correspondence or meetings.<br><br>As the years advance under the new systems and the learning curve is eliminated, the Assistant Superintendents and Department of Accountability envisions a long-term goal of continuous coordination with the Departments Professional Development and Assessments and Data to ensure that the systems facilitate student growth and staff support. Ultimately, the new evaluation systems are being utilized to develop effective practices in school building leadership and instruction. The recent changes in how the systems are administered reflect this thinking and drive the dialog between district and school. The web-based PD360 professional development program will be rolled-out district-wide in spring 2014. Training will be offered to building staff during 2014-15. In particular, PD360 will offer building administrators the ability to direct teachers to specific topics chosen from a vast database of videos and other resources housed on the website. PD360 will allow teachers to swiftly address needs for improvement identified during observations. An atmosphere of both evaluation and support of teacher and administrator practice is the overall goal of the district. All efforts related to professional development and evaluation systems are tied to this goal over the long-term. It will include a goal of raising proficient instructional practice to exemplary instructional practice. And struggling teachers will be offered flexible, prompt and domain-specific professional development. The Departments of Professional Development, Accountability and Assessment and Data will all work with building administrators as needed to achieve professional development goals for struggling teachers as needed.<br><br>The district has also set an expectation for schools to adhere to the following monitoring tasks | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | on an ongoing basis:<br>• Bi-weekly walk-through and observation data is updated weekly to show trends<br>• Principals promptly chart all observation data in order to calibrate amongst administrators<br>• Principals, Vice Principals and/or Supervisors identify strengths and weaknesses of staff and provide models, coaching, and opportunities for struggling teachers to observe exemplary lessons from teachers within building.<br>• McREL is used to document professional meetings with staff to discuss student growth objectives (SGOs) or instructional practice. | |

| **Transformation SIG Required Activity – 3**<br>Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates, and identify and remove those who have not improved their professional practice after having been afforded ample opportunity to do so. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Implementation Guidance**<br>The LEA may develop a performance-based incentive system. | | |
| **Evidence of Implementation Indicators** | **Implementation Description** | **Timeline** |
| 1. The SEA and/or LEA develop a valid, fair, and transparent method for deciding whether performance-based incentives have | Decisions about incentives will be spearheaded by a Leadership Team made up of both administrators and teachers to ensure fairness and transparency from the beginning. The team will use recommendations from stakeholder sessions to create a list of incentives such as mini-grants, supplies and stimulating professional opportunities. It will then determine the logistics of implementing incentives based on fair performance measures such as rubrics tied to student achievement, teacher attendance and participation. The District will provide a list of incentives | Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Sept 2015 – June 2016 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| been met. | and performance measures to the overseeing State-level coordinator and seek feedback as needed. Any feedback will be reported back to the Leadership Team for adjustment if needed. Results of the implementation program will be reported in all regular reports to the State of New Jersey.<br><br>The Leadership Team is school-based….made up of school administrators and 10 teachers. All rubrics and incentive awards will be determined by the Leadership Team. After the rubrics are established, the Leadership Team will share the rubrics with all staff at grade level meetings and the twice monthly PD sessions. The Leadership Team will identify the teachers and students who have earned incentives based on the rubrics with the associated dollar amount award. | Sept 2016 – June 2017 |
| 2. A performance-based incentive system is developed in partnership with teachers, teachers' unions, and other relevant stakeholders. | The Leadership Team will consist of school administrators and teachers as described above. Incentive proposals will be reviewed with stakeholders at SIG Implementation Committee (SIC) (formally the Internal District Committee) meetings. Representatives of the local teachers' union are expected to continue play an active role in all future meetings along with community-based external partners and internal representatives from the school and district administration. A strong working relationship with the union has already been developed over the course of the past 4 years, especially in connection with SIG-related negotiations. Similarly, the SIC has considerable experience in effective dealings with the teachers themselves on the matter of performance-based incentives and are confident that current efforts of teachers and administrators and the union working together to develop the proposed system will be fruitful. | Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Sept 2015 – June 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – June 2017 |
| 3. The SEA and LEA develop policies that facilitate performance-based dismissals. | The newly adopted Teacher Evaluation System and Principal and VP/AP Evaluation System will utilize an end-of-year summative rating according to State legislation and AchieveNJ guidelines. This overall evaluation score combines the multiple measures of teacher practice and student growth. All New Jersey teachers earn one of four ratings: highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective. All teachers receive individual professional development plans based on their ratings. Teachers rated ineffective or partially effective work with their principals to create a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) with targeted professional development for the subsequent year. To maintain tenure, all teachers (regardless of hire date) have to continue to | Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Sept 2015 – June 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – June 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | earn a rating of effective or highly effective. After the first year, teachers who receive an Ineffective or partially effective rating are required to have one additional observation, and multiple observers are required. If the teacher rating is not improved after two years of a CAP, a teacher will be dismissed from employment.<br><br>Principals and VPs/APs risk dismissal as well according to the summative rating process of the AchieveNJ-based evaluation system. This summative end-of-year evaluation score combines the multiple measures of principal practice and student growth. All New Jersey principals earn one of four ratings: highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective. To maintain tenure, all principals (regardless of hire date) have to continue to earn a rating of effective or highly effective. Any principal, assistant principal, or vice principal who is rated ineffective or partially effective on his or her evaluation will receive additional support through a CAP. The CAP will include timelines for corrective action and clearly delineate responsibilities of the principal versus the district in implementing the plan. After two years without improvement, the administrator will be dismissed. | |
| 4. LEA hiring procedures and budget timelines support the recruitment and hiring of high-quality teachers. | The district will adhere to the following procedures in order for recruiting and hiring high-quality teachers:<br>o Identify school need and available funding<br>o Post for position<br>o Interview certificated, as applicable, highly-qualified and high-quality teachers<br>o Narrow the interview pool<br>o Invite candidates to perform demonstration lessons to be evaluated by administrators and students<br>o Select best candidate for school<br>o Recommend candidate to Human Resources | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 5. LEAs and schools provide targeted assistance to | The CAP as describe above will lead to one or more of the following forms of targeted assistance to ensure teachers improve instructional practice:<br>• Outstanding instructional practice will be modeled | Sept 2014 – June 2015 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| underperforming teachers. | • Coaching<br>• Feedback on lesson planning<br>• Professional development training<br>• GLMs and VAMs<br>• Arrange for struggling teachers view exemplary teachers in action<br>• Site-based supervisors support content-specific instructional practice | Sept 2015 – June 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – June 2017 |

**Transformation SIG Required Activity – 4**

Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (PD) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.

**Implementation Guidance**

Effective PD: (1) occurs on a regular basis (e.g., daily or weekly); (2) is aligned with academic standards, school curricula, and school improvement goals; (3) involves educators working together collaboratively, and is often facilitated by school instructional leaders, school-based PD coaches, or mentors; (4) requires active engagement rather than passive learning by participants; and (5) focuses on understanding what and how students are learning, and how to address students' learning needs (e.g., reviewing student work and achievement data; collaboratively planning, testing, and adjusting instructional strategies, formative assessments, and materials based on such data).

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The LEA and school provide PD that is differentiated based on teacher experience and expertise, and student data. Professional development does not interfere with the | **Professional Development Model**<br><br>Teachers and administrators of School 6 expressed through focus groups, surveys and during the Needs Assessment process that there is currently a lack of job-embedded professional development that is relative to the specific needs of their school environment and instructional capacity. To address this need Principal Shonda Davis, in collaboration with the District Site- | **Twice Monthly PD**<br><br>Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Sept 2015 – |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| classroom schedule. | based Supervisors of English Language Arts, Mathematics, Bilingual and Special Education will provide research-based, job-embedded professional development to instructional staff. Research from the Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) states, "An effective professional development program provides opportunities for participants to learn about research-based best practices, use data on children and parents in designing instruction, witness effectiveness through models and examples, use and reflect on practice, design instruction and the management of instruction, share and form accountability networks with other personnel, and evaluate and be accountable for what happens in the classroom." | June 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – June 2017 |
| | **PBSIS**<br><br>Principal Davis will implement a twice monthly professional development session as an extended learning professional development experience for the teachers above and beyond the required 300 hour extended learning experience for the students. This will be accomplished by dismissing the students at 3:00PM every 2nd and 4th Friday of the month resulting in an additional 16 hours of professional development for teachers. School administrators will collaborate with an external consultant to assist in providing school-based professional development. Teachers will break out in to small groups and filter through various professional development sessions as identified through walk-through data and teacher feedback on professional development needs. Principal Davis has identified potential topics for the professional development sessions:<br><br>1. Backwards Planning<br>2. Formative Assessments<br>3. Utilizing Assessment Data to Guide Instruction<br>4. Focused and Effective Instruction<br>5. Objectives and Outcomes | Sept 2014 – June 2017<br><br>**Soc/Emot PD**<br><br>Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Evaluate for: Sept 2015 – June 2016 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 6. Assessing Student Learning<br>7. Engagement Strategies<br>8. Student Centered Learning<br>9. Providing Feedback to Students<br>10. Question and Discussion Strategies | Sept 2016 – June 2017 |
| | School 6 will continue to implement the NJDOE sponsored Positive Behavior Support in Schools (PBSIS) Model. School 6 has formed an Universal Team consisting of various administrators, instructional staff and support staff members throughout the building. Teacher and administrators are currently participating in a pull-out professional development model where the Universal Team attends professional development sessions on implementing specific strategies in the school that promote a positive school climate by teaching and reinforce a consistent set of behavioral expectation of oral students, staff and settings school-wide. | **Site-based Supervisors**<br>July 2014 – August 2017 |
| | The needs assessment results spoke to an overwhelming need from parents and teachers to provide additional emotional and social supports in the classroom environment. Principal Davis has recognized the need and proposes to implement additional professional development for teachers to 1) prevent classroom disturbances and disruptions that are avoidable from occurring and 2) equip instructional staff with strategies to handle behavioral problem efficiently and effectively. The goal is to reduce the amount of office referrals by keeping students in the classroom where the learning occurs. This can be accomplished by building the teachers' capacity to handle behavior disruptions with effective strategies that are resolved quickly and in a positive manner. | **State Turnaround Coach**<br>July 2014 – August 2017 |
| | Principal Davis will be seeking an external partnership with a provider for the above professional development services. To kick off this initiative, all teachers will participate in a ½ day professional development on managing difficult behavior in the classroom. The goal of this | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | professional development session is to provide teachers with the foundational positive behavior modification strategies that they can begin to implement immediately, whether they are a veteran teacher or a first year teacher. This professional development model will continue with one-on-one coaching with teachers in the classroom where behavioral disturbances occur and will provide additional support with the foundational positive behavior modification strategies that were taught to teachers are the ½ professional development session. A mid-year behavior planning workshop will occur and then will be followed by more one-on-one coaching. In addition to the professional development offered to teachers, Principal Davis has also identified a need to include parents and provide them with strategies to reinforce at home. This will occur by offering parents the opportunity to attend bi-monthly professional development sessions also provide by the external partner. This will ensure that students are receiving the same message at home and at school when it comes to positive behavior modification strategies.<br><br>Moving forward to Year 2 and Year 3 of SIG Implementation, the external provider partnership on the emotional/social classroom strategies will be evaluated for effectiveness and data will be analyzed in hopes of demonstrating a reduction of office referrals, suspensions and classroom discipline incidents. Based on the outcome of the evaluation, the external provider will identify specific teachers who are in need of additional professional development and begin to decrease services to those teachers who are demonstrating effective use of the behavior management strategies. This may have an impact on the amount of services that is needed from the external provider.<br><br>**Differentiated PD Based on Teacher Experience, Expertise, and Student Data that is Provided in the Classroom**<br><br>The Site-based Supervisors will provide content specific professional development, model lessons and conduct observations and walk-throughs. Observations and walk-throughs include providing "praise" and "polish" for the teachers where strengths are commended and actionable steps are provided for weaknesses. The Site-based Supervisor's role is to improve the instructional practices in the classroom by providing the teacher with resources, suggestions for | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | improvement, and co-teach/model expectations for instruction leading to an environment that is focused on delivering quality instruction and is aligned to the learning needs of each student.<br><br>Both research and teacher input from the needs assessment calls for a job-embedded professional development design; allowing the teacher to practice implementing evidence- and standards-based practices under the guidance of the Site-based Supervisor. Professional development provided in the classroom while the teacher is teaching provides the opportunity for relative feedback and reflective discussion. The Site-based Supervisor will leave the teachers with "next steps" and a skill or strategy to work on or reflect on for the next visit.<br><br>Additionally, the Site-based Supervisor will give guidance and model effective data analysis and application to differentiating targeted classroom instruction. Through analyzing student achievement data, the teacher in collaboration with the Site-based Supervisor, will build skills needed to differentiate instruction based on student need. The focus of the Site-based Supervisor will shift based upon the needs of the students and teachers.<br><br>**NJDOE State Turnaround Coach**<br><br>The NJDOE will assign a State Turnaround Coach (STC) based out of the Regional Achievement Centers (RAC). The STC *will provide additional support to SIG schools beyond that which is provided to non-SIG Priority schools. This additional support is designed to ensure effective and efficient implementation of all SIG components*. The STC will be included on the SIG Implementation Committee (SIC) (formally the Internal District Team). | |
| 2. The LEA and school provide PD that equips teachers with the competencies needed to apply evidence- and standards-based practices effectively. | **Equipping Teachers with the Competencies Needed to Apply Evidence- and Standards-based Practices Effectively**<br><br>Both research and teacher input from the needs assessment calls for a job-embedded professional development design; allowing the teacher to practice implementing evidence- and standards-based practices under the guidance of the master instructional coach. Research from IDRA states, "Teachers must be provided opportunities to adapt and practice newly-learned | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | skills in their context. Teachers also must be provided opportunities to reflect on the impact of new knowledge and skills on children's academic achievement and on the feedback that mentors and coaches provide them." Professional development provided in the classroom while the teacher is teaching provides the opportunity for relative feedback and reflective discussion. The Site-based Supervisor will leave the teachers with "next steps" and a skill or strategy to work on or reflect on for the next visit. | |
| 3. The LEA and school define high levels of implementation of practices and monitor changes in teacher practice and student outcomes. | **High Levels of Teacher Practice Implementation**<br><br>The District and the leadership of School 6 will define high levels of implementation of practices for effective teaching and learning that will ensure school reform. Based upon the Aligned Instructional System Strategic Plan, teachers are expected to accomplish the following: 1) develop lesson objectives that are tied to the curriculum guide, 2) teach objectives according to district pacing guidelines; 3) participate in Grade Level Meetings, teacher study groups and shared planning times; and 4) utilize the District's assessment database system, *Performance Matters*, to assist teachers and school leadership in the data mining process.<br><br>**Monitor Changes in Teacher Practice and Student Outcomes**<br><br>The implementation of these practices will be monitored by the principal of School 6, who will track the school's regularly scheduled program planning and curriculum design periods. The leadership of School 6 will also monitor teacher practices through classroom observations and walk-throughs, and will review student outcomes using the District assessment database, *Performance Matters*. *Performance Matters* will allow Principal Davis and her instructional coaching team to evaluate individual student outcomes using quarterly benchmarks. | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 4. The LEA and school promote professional learning communities and | **Grade Level Meetings, Vertical Articulation Meetings and Professional Learning Communities** | **GLMs, VAMs, PLCs** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a school culture of continuous learning. | The District and the leadership at School 6 will promote an environment professional learning communities and a school culture of continuous learning through the formation of grade level meetings, vertical articulation meetings and professional learning communities. According to research from the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), "Schools should be learning communities - not just for students, but for teachers, administrators, and staff members." Grade level meetings and vertical articulation meetings will include such topics as curriculum, student data analysis, professional development, classroom management strategies, and other instructional or management challenges. The meeting will also provide additional opportunities for the school to develop a pipeline of leadership by designating a teacher leader for the grade level meetings, vertical articulation meetings and professional learning communities. These meetings will provide an opportunity for the collaborative atmosphere that teachers expressed desire for through the needs assessment.<br><br>Principal Davis will also provide opportunities for teachers to participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). The PLCs will meet above and beyond the normal school hours and the findings of the PLCs will be shared with all staff at grade level meetings, vertical articulation meetings and the bi-weekly professional development sessions. Principal Davis has identified the following topics for the PLCs and may elect to add additional topics depending on the results of NJASK 2014.<br>• Student Engagement Strategies,<br>• Assessing Student Learning, Effective<br>• Pedagogical Teaching Practices<br><br>**SIG Summer Leadership Academy**<br>The NJDOE will facilitate a SIG Summer Leadership Academy in which the school administrators and the SIG Supervisor will attend. The purpose of the SIG Summer Leadership Academy is *to address the extensive change, commitment, and activities required to fully implement one of the SIG models*. SIG Leaders will exit the SIG Summer Leadership Academy | Sept 2014 – July 2015<br><br>Evaluate for: Sept 2015 – July 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – July 2017<br><br>**Leadership Academy**<br><br>July/August 2014<br><br>July/August 2015<br><br>July/August 2016<br><br>**NJDOE PLC** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | *with additional learning, development, and networking opportunities needed to fully support effective SIG model implementation.* The training will directly align SIG implementation to the 8 Turnaround Principles.<br><br>**NJDOE Professional Learning Communities**<br>The NJDOE Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be a continuation of the NJDOE support initiated during the SIG Summer Leadership Academy. Paterson SIG leaders will have the opportunity to maintain the networking relationships that began during the Leadership Academy and have conversations on what is working at their respective schools and how leaders were able to overcome challenges. Best practices will be highlighted and SIG partnerships will be reinforced. The PLC meetings may occur through *live and remote interactions.* | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 5. The LEA has a system to evaluate PD providers and select only those providers considered to be of high quality. The LEA provides approval oversight to PD providers selected by the school. | **Evaluation System for Professional Development Providers**<br><br>The District has developed a system to evaluate the PD providers and select only those considered to be of the highest quality. The District convenes the Curriculum Writing and Professional Development Evaluation Committee. The function of the evaluation committee in any procurement is to make recommendations regarding vendors to the District Superintendent. The decision is based upon an objective and independent analysis of the proposals received, which is based upon the evaluation criteria contained in each Request for Qualifications (RFQ). To begin the process, members of the committee are briefed on the overall evaluation process and are given a set of expectations regarding their participation on the committee. Next, a point score methodology is used to quantify numerically both objective and subjective factors relative to each evaluator's findings and conclusions. Bidders are evaluated on how well the met the criteria outlined in the RFQ, as well as their clear indication of past experience with positive outcomes. Once all proposals are screened, the District creates a list of qualified PD providers, from which each individual can select to meet their school's PD needs.<br>The District will issue an RFQ and embark on the evaluation process for a university partnership, or equivalent of, in providing job-embedded standards- and evidence-based | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | professional development for instructional staff and administrative staff. Included in the RFQ will be the above mentioned desired components such as the teacher and administrative study groups, two weekly hours of job-embedded professional development for every teacher, the establishment and guidance of grade level meetings, and the assignment of a team leader to each school to coordinate professional development with the principal and staff. The RFQ will also require that the professional development provider have extensive and successful experience in providing professional development to chronically low-performing schools. Various stakeholders will participate on the evaluation committee to select the university partnership, or equivalent of, to provide the professional development such as school leadership, instructional staff, district representatives, and community members.<br><br>The RFQ will also require that the university, or equivalent of, produce a variety of reports that will include formative and summative assessment data. The District SIG Supervisor will monitor the implementation of the professional development in collaboration with the school principal and NTO officer. Teachers will also complete surveys and professional development evaluations to provide feedback as to whether or not the professional development has been helpful in improving their instructional strategies.<br><br>Ultimately, summative and formative student achievement data will be the indicator as to whether the professional development had a positive impact. McREL research states, "Student performance data should be used to measure whether changes in teaching practice have improved student achievement". Teacher feedback about professional development providers will constitute a key factor in determining whether to continue/renew contracts with external providers. Student achievement data and teacher feedback through surveys will also guide the direction of professional development. | |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

# Form S-7

**Date:** April 1, 2014



## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| **Transformation SIG Required Activity – 5**<br>Implement strategies that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Implementation Guidance**<br>Strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff may include financial incentives or non-financial incentives, such as increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions. | | |
| **Evidence of Implementation Indicators** | **Implementation Description** | **Timeline** |
| 1. The SEA and LEA secure funding for long-term program sustainability. | SIG funds will be leveraged to provide resources and build the capacity of administrators and teachers. Long-term stability of the school at a high-quality level is a priority of the district. While some of the proposed project components are thought to jump-start transformation within the three-year project term, additional funding will be sought to continue certain project components that require sustained implementation.<br><br>Certain SIG components, such as extended instruction, will be complemented by existing academic and school community supplements – such as the Full Service Community Schools Program which provides activities with integrated focus on academics, health, social services, youth development, and community engagement. Whether funds are garnered through Federal grant or local support, this will be a lasting initiative at School 6. Other Federal funding, such as the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant, will also be pursued, in addition to local partnerships – in order to sustain significant elements of the proposed programming.<br><br>Another permanent resource that will sustain certain components of the proposed | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | transformation program is the locally funded supervisor of theme-based development. This position requires no SIG funding and will provide support for ongoing site-specific organization, evaluation, and implementation of theme-based learning in collaboration with the SIG supervisor, School 6 principal, parents, community, and service organizations.<br><br>Additional locally funded positions, such as the Supervisor and Director of NCLB, will work to facilitate and support school improvement efforts, especially as these efforts relate to stakeholders and additional networking resources – such as community groups, non-profit organizations, and institutions of higher learning – that would serve to sustain programmatic components. | |
| 2. The SEA and LEA ensure that students have equal access to high-quality teachers. | Teachers and other staff will undergo a screening process so that only the most qualified personnel are retained. Staff is expected to buy into the new mission and vision set for the school under the SIG designation. The screening process for new teachers - plus a high expectation set for all teachers to improve - will ensure students have equal and continued access to high-quality staff.<br><br>Either by certificate or House Matrix, District Human Resources personnel ensure that only Highly Qualified teachers are hired, and if teachers do not live up to the expected standards Corrective Action Plans are developed and outcomes are expected to improve or else other personnel who do meet the program expectation will be provided for the students. | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 3. The LEA has an intensive long-term investment in developing instructional leadership capacity at the school, as well as at the LEA | Teacher participation in group activities will ensure long-term involvement and success with regard to continuous improvement of instructional practice. Implementing collaborative teams is a primary engine of our school improvement efforts. Teachers will be granted time to collaborate through PLCs, GLMs, VAMs, | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| levels. | grade-span meetings and the Leadership Team. Their continued participation will become an investment that ensures continued instructional leadership over the long term. Rather than working in isolation, teachers will gain focus and parameters from collaborations, they will have an effective process that involves following guiding questions. The collaborative structure will also provide training, resources, and support for overcoming difficulties while developing common outcomes, writing common assessments, and analyzing student achievement data. The team structure will allow for praise, polishing and discouragement of poor work practices from peers and celebration as they progressed. They needed someone to confront those individuals or teams of teachers who failed to fulfill their responsibilities." | |
| 4. The LEA delegates leadership to principals, instructional program leaders, and administrators. | As an experienced turnaround leader, Principal Davis along with her administrative staff members, who are also proven turnaround leaders from Newark, will be provided the needed flexibility and autonomy required to transform the school. This will include autonomy over the school budget, scheduling, professional development staffing and supplemental curriculum. At the next rung, SIG funded instructional program leaders – Reading Specialists, Teacher Mentors of Climate/Culture and Data Analysis – other instructional personnel and the site supervisor will also share in leadership capacities. And further – through the work of the PLCs, teachers will have leadership opportunities to contribute to the instructional program. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5. The LEA provides leadership PD that is job-embedded and focused on evidence-based decision making. | The Executive Director for Principal Evaluation and Coaching will provide assistance to the Assistant Superintendent for Administration with evaluations and in performing supervisory responsibilities pertaining to the principal's leadership and management development. The function of this office is to provide coaching for the principal in order that she may build her capacity as the instructional leader of the school. This coaching supports both the principal and assistant principal in job-specific leadership components related to issues such as personnel decisions, staff evaluation, effective instructional practices, school climate, school safety, and the use of data-analysis to drive the instructional and administrative model.<br><br>Additionally, the Director of Professional development is charged with working cooperatively with District staff in the planning and organization of development activities for all relevant personnel – this will include all District teachers and administrators working intimately on the School 6 SIG program. | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 6. The LEA includes non-monetary incentives for performance. | In all stages of proposal development and program planning – various stakeholder groups have identified specific incentives that will facilitate effective teaching, administration and learning under the proposed initiative.<br><br>Planned incentives for teacher performance as it relates to goal setting, student achievement and attendance include the provision of special supplementary educational materials, tools, and resources for the classroom; opportunities to participate in special conferences, design and lead field trips, execute creative projects; and opportunities to garner greater leadership responsibilities both within the SIG program and beyond.<br><br>Student incentives - based on attendance, academic performance, behavior and | Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Sept 2015 – June 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – June 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | citizenship - are to include monthly breakfasts, quarterly luncheons, a theme-specific (Social Justice, Civics, Human Rights) field trip to Washington D.C which will include US Capitol Building, the Arlington National Cemetery, the White House, and a bevy of museums and memorials. Other more regional field experiences – also connected to the theme of Social Justice - will include mock trials at the Passaic Courthouse, and visits to destinations such as the Paterson Museum, United Nations, American Labor Museum, and Ellis Island. | |

**Transformation SIG Required Activity – 6**

Comprehensive instructional reform strategies. The LEA must (a) use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next, as well as aligned with state academic standards; and (b) promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, classroom, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

**Implementation Guidance**

If an LEA determines, based on a careful review of appropriate data, that the instructional program currently being implemented in a particular school is research-based and properly aligned, it may continue to implement that instructional program. However, it is expected that most LEAs with Priority Schools will need to make at least minor adjustments to the instructional programs in those schools to ensure that those programs are, in fact, research-based and properly aligned.

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| 1. SEA and LEA data systems facilitate the collection, interpretation, and use of data to drive instructional change. | With a dedicated Assessment Department and a SIG-funded mentor of data analysis assisting relevant program personnel with instruments of assessment and evaluation of student needs, the school and LEA are well equipped to effectively utilize the following data systems to implement systematic instructional change: | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | *Performance Matters*:<br>This organization provides best-in-class products and services for K-12 education. As with so many districts across the country, Paterson uses the *Performance Matters* ADMS platforms, which link student and educator data. These data are used to drive the decisions made by teachers, administrators, board members and parents to improve student learning and educator performance. The system provides interactive, easy to use, reporting and analytics. All data and charts are consistently color coded which makes analyzing the results intuitive. The reporting system is very comprehensive, offering nearly 100 unique reports "out of the box." All reports have advanced filtering and comparative information. Any relevant question regarding student, teacher, school or district performance can be answered quickly within the system.<br><br>*Performance Matters* correlates and analyzes performance data from multiple sources, and turns that data into actionable information to improve instruction and student learning. On one screen, educators can easily compare historical data such as state test scores with current data such as local assessments. With this information, educators can evaluate student progress toward grade-level standards and analyze student growth over time. During the 2012-13 school year, *Performance Matters* loaded New Jersey's model curriculum and unit assessments into the ADMS. In addition to viewing students' scores, the entire assessment or individual questions and the specific standards to which they are attached can also be viewed. Using the ADMS, Paterson teachers administer the six-week formative assessments. Using the online scoring option, *Performance Matters* immediately scores and grades the student tests, and makes the data available for use in the classroom and at the school and district levels. The process is fast and much more convenient for teachers because the data is immediately available for analysis. | |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | While it was found during the needs assessment of the District's 2011 SIG application for School 6 that *Performance Matters* was not being utilized as effectively as possible, over the course of the School 6 SIG program, the disconnect was thoroughly addressed, thanks in large part to the overall effective administration of the SIG and the expert support of the data analyst coach the Office of Assessment, Planning and Evaluation.<br><br>In addition, the instructional staff and school administrators also have access to STAR Assessment data systems. The Renaissance Learning STAR Assessments are utilized in grades K-12 for reading and grades 1-12 for math. There are three assessments, which are given three times a year (fall, winter, and spring), and provide important diagnostic information on students' strengths and weaknesses. The data informs district curriculum and program decisions as well as school, classroom, and intervention programs and lessons. Teachers can access personal learning plans for each student and individualize learning goals as well as lessons for all students. There are three STAR assessments. STAR Early Literacy is given in grades K-1 and assesses skills such as rhyming, letter sounds, blending, segmenting, and alphabetical order. STAR Reading is given in grades 2-12 and requires students to read passages and/or sentences and answer comprehension questions. STAR Math assesses questions in four areas; Numbers and Operations, Geometry and Measurement, Algebra, and Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability. All three tests are computer-based and take approximately fifteen minutes to administer. After administration, teachers have immediate access to scores. The data analysis system will allow the teachers to disaggregate the data and access reports tailored to drive their instruction. | |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. SEA, LEA, and school provide access to timely data that include disaggregated statewide assessment scores, and school performance and aggregated classroom observation data. | The previously described systems – especially *Performance Matters* – provide school leadership and instructional staff with a comprehensive assessment of each student's academic proficiency on both the summative and formative levels. Through this system data is disaggregated to identify problems and opportunities to improve instruction. It is further utilized by teachers to work with the mentor of data analysis and the District's Department of Assessment, Planning, and Evaluation to record student performance on the NJASK, quarterly benchmark assessment tests, school report cards, and other potential sources of performance information.<br><br>In addition to the teachers' and school leaders' ready and instantaneous access to these systems, data is provided to other vital groups through other useful formats.<br><br>NJASK- Individualized Student Report (ISR):<br>This is a two-sided report, produced in grade and alphabetical sequence for students within a school. An ISR is produced for every student record. Two ISRs are printed and shipped to the home/sending district for each student record: one for the student's permanent folder after the results are analyzed, and the other for the student's parent/guardian to be shared in a manner determined by the local district. If a student takes the Spanish version of the NJ ASK, four copies will be provided: two in English and two in Spanish. The ISR presents a student's performance in each content area, indicating the extent to which the student meets or does not meet the State proficiency standards. Scores are provided for each cluster to identify particular areas of strength or areas in which the student needs improvement. When applicable, the ISR will also indicate why a student does not receive a scale score for a content area. The report also indicates both the date of test administration and the date that report itself was printed. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | STAR Parent Letter - Parent Report:<br>This report provides teachers with an informational report to give to parents. This letter provides details about each student's progress. It also provides instructional suggestions that parents can do at home with their child to improve on their scores.<br><br>School performance will be conveyed by the District to school administrators in a timely manner through a rating system that incorporates the average school-wide SGO scores combined with the median SGPs received from the state reports. Aggregated classroom observation data will be made available at all times to school and district administrators through the McREL tool and summary reports generated by McREL sent to the schools by the District Department of Accountability. | |
| 3. LEA and school ensure that school aligns instruction with standards and benchmarks. | For the start of the 2010-2011 school year, the District developed and implemented an Aligned Instructional System for grades K-12 that includes: textbook alignment, instructional alignment, alignment between State standards and enacted curriculum, and curriculum alignment. This system was developed to ensure that the District adequately delivers the Common Core Standards in Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics.<br><br>Key indicators of success for the Aligned Instructional System are whether or not lesson objectives and instructional strategies demonstrate knowledge learned; and whether or not teachers in K-12 ensure instruction enables students to pace their learning to realize grade level/course expectations.<br><br>The District will work closely with school leadership in order to ensure that teachers receive appropriate professional development to meet the District's and school's expectations for comprehensive instructional programming. The District will review curriculum alignment concepts with school leadership and refine walk-through tools to include specific indicators and rubrics for curriculum implementation. The district | July 2014 -- August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | will also work with school leaders to develop a student progression plan that outlines what students should know and be able to do at each grade level.<br><br>The District will empower Principal Davis to provide staff development around instructional practices associated with Balanced Literacy, Managed Instruction and other models used in the school. Staff will receive training in curriculum and instructional alignment and will be coached on how to use the student progression plan to ensure student promotion. Site-based supervisors will work one on one with teachers on how to collaborate effectively with parents so that they will understand and support student progression planning, and they will provide individualized feedback to teachers after classroom visits and Learning Walks. For teachers requiring additional support aligning instruction with standards and benchmarks, Principal Davis will implement procedures for increased observation – on a weekly basis – in addition to extra feedback and coaching. | |
| 4. LEA and school dedicate structured time for PD and staff collaboration around data interpretation. | The collaborative nature of the horizontal and vertical articulation meetings will allow teachers to analyze data for trends and explore possible methods for how to address the trends. Building administrators will also present analyses and reports to the meetings for further consideration and discussions. If trends are positive, teachers will discuss the corresponding successes in instructional practice that may have led to the trends. Factors unrelated to instructional practice may also be discussed such as support services, family life, and other environmental factors. Twice monthly professional development sessions and PLC meetings will be dedicated to data interpretation and recognizing trends as needed. Specific students and groups of students will also be discussed at PLCs to ensure consistency or adaptations in instructional practice across content areas. Administrators will use the results and discussions about trends to inform calibrations for upcoming observations and identify professional development needs. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5. LEA and school demonstrate use of data to guide instructional change, and the school defines a process where teacher and administrator teams meet to review data and plan improvement. | Student achievement data garnered and benchmarked through the previously identified methods and through classroom observation will be the driving force for changes in instructional practice and day-to-day activities at the school. The collaborative teacher meetings as described previously will provide the needed venue. Guided by the Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis, teachers and administrators will meet to discuss data and use the findings from the data to drive instruction. They will also meet through horizontal and vertical articulation. It is beneficial for teachers and administrators to meet in both ways in that teachers need to be aware of the standards their students are to meet before being promoted to the next grade so that they are well prepared. Through these processes, teachers will derive both support and accountability from administrators and peers. Administrators will be continuously aware of changes in student achievement data so that they may provide support to assist the teachers if needed to allow students to reach the goals set for them. SGOs will be continuously monitored with tools like Renaissance Learning and other methods. Administrators will review classroom evidence during pre- and post-observation meetings and walk-through summaries along with student achievement data. Both will drive a plan for improvement in instructional practice. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

**Transformation SIG Required Activity – 7a**

Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools. The LEA must (a) establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all students

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

**Implementation Guidance**
"Increased learning time" means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for: (a) instruction in core academic subjects, including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in PD within and across grades and subjects. Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year.

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The SEA and LEA are familiar with evidence-based practices to provide increased learning time. | The project team responsible for SIG program design – including the school principal, assistant principals, and various administrators – has considerable experience in both the comprehensive study and successful implementation of evidence-based practices to provide increased learning time. In preparation for instituting increased learning time at Schools 4 and 10 the District utilized a multitude of sources – including the practice guide entitled "Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement." In the years that have followed the implementation of school days extended by75 minutes and school years extended by three weeks at Schools 4 and 10, District personnel guiding the SIG process have become intimately familiar with this practice and are well versed in the challenges that must be overcome, the logistics of curriculum design, and the comprehensives supports for teachers, students, administrators and families that must be put in place.<br><br>The School 6 program will build upon this success by presenting another true school day and school year extension that offers a wide variety of theme-based courses and field learning experiences, with a goal of motivating middle school students to attain the path to college and career readiness in high school. | July 2014 -- August 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. The LEA identifies community needs and partnership opportunities. | It is well documented that School 6 is located in one of the most challenging neighborhoods in the City of Paterson. The area has the highest rate of violent crime in the City and is constituted by the census tract with other troubling socio-economic indicators – including median income, adults with high school diplomas, adults with college degrees all ranking either last or second to last among all US Census Tracts in the City. Nearly 97% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch. Needless to say, these factors have contributed to consistently high mobility and truancy rates at School 6 over the years. Fortunately the latter statistics have already begun to decrease slightly with the arrival of Principal Davis and her vice principals. However, the challenges remain, and the comprehensive program proposed will be necessary in order to effect significant positive change for our students.<br><br>In preparation for the School 6 SIG program a wide array of focus group meetings, surveys, and stakeholder gatherings were orchestrated, along with the comprehensive needs assessment and Quality School Review attached to this document. All reflected the need for bringing the consistency and focus to learning and instruction that is impeded by the factors outlined above. Additionally, these groups – students, parents, teachers, administrators, consultants, local non-profits, and other community based organizations all made note of at least two or more of the following items - neighborhood and community environment, safety concerns, parental involvement, and lack of local resources for effective PD and/or supplemental programming – as factors detracting from effective education at School 6. Particularly poignant feedback was evident in the following specific student focus group and survey responses:<br>• To the question of what they don't have in their neighborhood but wished they did, some answered "peace," others answered "parks without junkies"; | July 2014 – August 2017 |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | • To the question of what groups they belong to, over half responded "none";<br>• To the question of whether or not School 6 is safe, nearly half responded in the negative, citing the surrounding neighborhood as the reason.<br><br>In recognition of community needs and partnership opportunities, the District initiated the Full Service Community Schools Initiative at School 6 for the 2013-2014 school year utilizing local funds. This initiative provides ELA and math tutoring, ballet, clothing donations, and holiday celebrations for 60 School 6 families. The effort is supported by two main partners – the New Destiny Family Success Center and the William Paterson University Center for Continuing & Professional Education.<br>As so many of the issues identified are traced back to school and community environment either directly or indirectly, the development team and stakeholders reached the logical conclusion of including a Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture in order to facilitate and coordinate the other efforts aimed at ensuring a safe and supportive school climate that are described herein. | |
| 3. The LEA allocates funding for extended-learning programs. | Through the SIG, funding would be allocated to fund 300 hours of extended learning, with stipends for administrators, teachers, instructional assistants, secretaries, security, custodial staff, and parent coordinators. 100% of school staff will be required to participate in the proposed extended-leaning program. Starting on the first day of school for students, the school day will be extended by one hour and fifteen minutes, resulting in the addition of approximately 225 hours to the students' learning experience. The school year will be extended by approximately 75 hours with the addition of three week of instruction. A Memorandum of Understanding is in process with the Paterson Education Association (the local teacher's union) that will set the extended learning timeframe that Principal Davis has developed. Paterson Public Schools has collaborated with the teacher's union on the design of the extended learning experience and have successfully executed a Memorandum of | September 2014 – July 2015<br><br>September 2015 – July 2016<br><br>September 2016 – July 2017 |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Understanding for our other SIG Schools from 2011 – 2014.<br><br>The following extended learning programs will be implemented by instructional staff with professional training and model curricula provided by external partners and vendors:<br>• The Middle School University (for teachers of grades 6-8 only) – A university partner will develop enrichment programs centered on pre-college curricula to inspire students and develop key skills for college readiness while improving student performance growth. The programs will be integrated into the school day during designated regular times to set an expectation for students. Teachers will implement the curriculum after receiving professional training from the partner and planning. The Middle School University is expected to be conducted 2 days per week with four unique courses per grade level (one per marking period). Occasional field trips will enhance student experiences and provide an incentive to students. The Middle School University initiative will provide a natural progression for those students transitioning to the pre-college offerings of both Eastside and International High Schools.<br>• Industry Enrichment Courses (for grades 1 – 5 only) developed by industry partners and community partners will provide theme-based enrichment classes 2 days per week in the following content areas:<br>o Art<br>o Music<br>o Equine therapy<br>o Cooking & nutrition<br>o Gardening<br>o Character Ed.<br>o Yoga | |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | ○ Karate<br>○ Dance<br>○ Technology (Web design, Scratch, movie-making, DJ)<br>• Struggling students will receive intervention classes in ELA and Math during the other 3 non-University days per week while on-grade level and high achieving students will be offered additional classes in technology.<br>• Additional partnership with theme-based high schools will be developed. Junior and senior HS students will come to the elementary school and provide peer mediation and team building activities. Students will primarily be recruited as mentors from student government associations and ROTCs in from District high schools.<br><br>In addition to SIG funds, the district would continue to allocate funding to operate the Full Service Community Schools Program. Beyond the FSCS, the district operates the 21st Century Community Learning Centers at various school locations. This program connects community-based organizations with local schools to provide academic enrichment opportunities for children – particularly students who attend high poverty and low-performing schools – in core academic subjects in order to meet State and local achievement standards. | |
| 4. The LEA supports school leadership in developing and sustaining community partnerships. | As previously indicated, the district utilizes partnerships to facilitate both the Full Service Community Schools and 21st Century Community Learning Center programs. The District charges school leaders and program administrators with the responsibility and leadership for developing and sustaining said relationships Current partnerships. Existing partnerships at School 6 for these programs and for general community support of school initiatives include William Paterson University, New Destiny Community Development Center, Paterson Public Library | July 2014 – August 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | and St. Luke Baptist Church. Other partnerships with schools across the district include Creative Cooks, Kula for Karma, Catholic Families and Community Services, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Boys & Girls Club of Paterson and Passaic.<br><br>Community partnerships are further supported by the revitalization of the previously defunct School Action Teams. At School 6 the action team is comprised of members from civic organizations, parents, administrators, teachers, business owners, and faith based organizations. This group of 23 individuals meets regularly to evaluate and provide feedback for SIG leaders and other administrators on the School's strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities. | |
| 5. The LEA provides PD to ensure that extended-learning programs are aligned with the school curriculum. | Principal Davis will have autonomy over scheduling and will be able to add leaning time throughout the school day. The additional time will provide for meaningful connections to the school theme of Social Justice. She will also build-in the necessary professional development into the schedule as much as needed to support the added instructional time. Professional development will be required to assist teachers with linking the enrichment activities to the existing school curricula. The enrichment must supplement the current curricula by adding inquiry-based lessons, culminating projects and other manipulatives so that all learning styles may be addressed to facilitate academic growth. Both introductory professional training and ongoing support and evaluation with teachers will be implemented by external partners in order to facilitate instruction around the extended learning activities (described in section #3 of Activity 7a above). | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 6. The LEA has a system of assessing the progress of the extended-learning program and using data to guide instructional changes. | Current data sets have already been compiled that will be used as baselines for comparison against data collected during year 1 of the School 6 SIG program. These include a wide array of assessment data, stakeholder survey responses, attendance and discipline information, and climate and culture data. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

# TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | The Teacher Mentors of Data Analysis and Climate and Culture, along with the Assessments department, will assist in the comparison of the established baseline data sets and the newly collected data as various sets become available. At the outset benchmarks will be set and progress will be assessed on a monthly basis for data such as attendance and discipline, while other sets (such as classroom assessments and standardized testing) will be evaluated less frequently).<br><br>Personnel charged with responsibility of program oversight will meet regularly with the goal of utilizing results of progress assessments to guide adjustments to delivered programming and professional development as they are deemed necessary. | |

**Transformation SIG Required Activity – 7b**

Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools. The LEA must (b) provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

**Implementation Guidance**

In general, family and community engagement means strategies to increase the involvement and contributions, in both school-based and home-based settings, of parents and community partners that are designed to support classroom instruction and increase student achievement. Examples of mechanisms that can encourage family and community engagement include the establishment of organized parent groups, holding public meetings involving parents and community members to review school performance and help develop school improvement plans, using surveys to gauge parent and community satisfaction and support for local public schools, implementing complaint procedures for families, coordinating with local social and health service providers to help meet family needs, and parent education classes (including GED, adult literacy, and ESL programs).

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The LEA ensures each school has a strong academic program, with all other services complementing the central academic mission. | The English Language Arts program utilizes a Workshop Model following the format of "I Do-We Do-You DO." Inquiry-based discussion in the form of Accountable Talk is encouraged for approximately 90 minutes a week. Additionally, all curriculum guides and resources for ELA have been updated to align with the Common Core State Standards and the NJDOE Model Curriculum. Resources have been realigned and/or newly purchased to provide students with the opportunity to engage with complex texts and allow teachers to provide students with text-dependent questions based on complex and engaging texts. The infusion of additional non-fiction materials have also been added to the curriculum in grades K-8 and allow students to get familiar with the strategies and skills necessary for navigating more rigorous instructional material. The ELA program in grades K-2 includes a newly implemented phonics program as well as Units of Study for Writing Workshop. Grades 3-8 have added and realigned novels to match the text complexity levels set forth by the CCCSS. All grades K-8 have incorporated reading units from the Institute for Learning, which allow students to work with high interest rigorous text and engage not only in tasks, but also discussions around the text to encourage critical thinking. The ELA program incorporates both interdisciplinary connections and technology experiences in the forms of digital resources and aligned non-fiction text to literary text to allow students to make connections between content areas as well as preparing them for college and career.<br><br>In addition to these recent developments, a change in school focus is proposed for the start of the 2014-2015 academic year. Under the new focus, curricula across all subjects have been developed around a theme of Social Justice in order to empower and unite students, parents, staff and community stakeholders who frequently feel discouraged. Along with this shift, the school will also be renamed to the Frank R. Lautenberg School of Social Justice. The new theme will be reflective of the progressive spirit of local figures past and present from Paterson, including the late | July 2014 – August 2017 |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Senator Lautenberg. The school will also focus on the rich history of Paterson and how it has fostered many key components of a progressive and democratic society. For example, Alexander Hamilton's vision of an industrial-based society will be highlighted along with innovations like the locomotive and workers' rights movements. Topics will be highlighted to align with existing social studies curriculum guides and according to grade level groupings: (1) Pre-K through 2nd – My community, (2) 3rd through 5th – Immigration and Industry, and (3) 6th through 8th – Civics and Human Rights. The school will adopt accepted elements of urban social justice education according to Picower (2012): (1) self-love and knowledge, (2) respect for others, (3) issues of social injustice, (4) social movements and social change, (5) awareness raising, and (6) social action.<br><br>For grades 6-8 supplementary offerings – such as trip to Washington D.C and other more regional theme-specific destinations will complement the academic mission, while enrichment offerings such as character education, music, art, yoga, and technology will serve this purpose for grades K-5. | |
| 2. The LEA supports sustainable and effective community partnerships (e.g., requires partnering organizations to designate an employee at school site to operate as a contact point for school, family, and community; and develops joint financing of facilities and programs with community and local government). | As previously elaborated, the Full Service Community School Initiative provides a platform for effective partnership in the community, with the New Destiny Community Development Center serving as the primary partner for School 6 – including in-school representation operating as contact point for those receiving services. New Destiny has years of experience in partnership with non-profit and government entities, assisting in delivering services in a broad range of areas including immigration, parenting mentorship, nutrition, healthcare, advocacy, financial literacy, and adult education.<br><br>St. Luke Baptist Church has a rich history of community involvement in the Carroll Street neighborhood of the 4th Ward of Paterson. It has been involved with civil rights causes of the 1960s and has produced multiple leaders who can be studied by | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | students under the new Social Justice Theme. The St. Luke Community Development Corporation (CDC) was established more recently to help support and revitalize the 4th ward and provide services to its families—a mission that aligns well with the transformation goals of School 6. School administrators will continue to identify key roles for the St. Luke CDC in the community that will, in turn, support the function and transformation of the school. These include providing food, safe spaces and supportive special events. In addition to this community role, the St. Luke CDC will have a direct role within the school by helping coordinate external vendors who provide support services to students and classroom assistance to teachers during the school day.<br><br>In addition to programming that will continue to be financed and developed for the School 6 community by St. Luke, William Paterson University may soon be providing significant resources to sustain the District's ongoing efforts, as the University is developing a 21st Century Community Learning Centers proposal that would support school 6 if funded. Regardless of the outcome of that proposal, William Paterson will continue to support School 6 and serves a prime example for sustainable and effective community partnership with the District.<br><br>Additionally, the School 6 Parent Coordinator is an ongoing district-supported position that will also play a key role as a contact point within the school for parents and community representatives. While parents may drop out of active school roles once their children graduate, the Parent Coordinator will also be responsible for maintaining lasting relationships with key parents, alumni and community stakeholders beyond graduation who may contribute time, money and effort to the school over the long-term. After identifying key figures, the parent coordinator will arrange for fundraisers, speaking engagements and other special events in an attempt to inspire the current student body and parents to be actively involved in the success | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | of the school.<br><br>The SIG-funded position of Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture will serve to strengthen community relationships as she works to increase teacher capacity to engage families in academically focused activities and build a strong and supportive school culture and climate. The work of the Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture will help build lasting relationships with community leaders, parents, alumni and other stakeholders to ensure that they have a vested interest in the success of the school beyond the termination of SIG grant funding. | |
| 3. Schools involve a broad representation of parents, community members, school staff, and other stakeholders in planning and implementing services offered at the school site. | In developing the proposed programming, the district engaged a Stakeholder Committee comprised of community members, teachers, district staff, teacher's union, administrators and additionally solicited feedback from student, parent, and teacher focus groups.<br><br>A number of stakeholder groups will provide continual feedback to facilitate project implementation. One of said groups is the previously referenced Action Team – a group comprised by representatives of civic organizations, parents, administrators, teachers, business owners, and faith based organizations that meet regularly to evaluate and provide feedback for SIG leaders and other administrators on the School's strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities.<br><br>Another key group is the SIG Implementation Committee (SIC). The SIC is the newly renamed Internal District Team (IDT) and has been renamed to emphasize the inclusion of all stakeholders. Comprised of school administrators, district administrators, and former Paterson SIG principals, the SIC will meet once per month and utilize all manner of feedback – including internal data analysis and external evaluations provided by the action team to steer the planning and | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | implementation of the program and create partnerships between School 6 and other district SIG schools.<br><br>As identified by all stakeholders throughout the planning and pre-planning stages of program development, effective parent engagement is integral to turnaround efforts at School 6. As such, parents will participate in monthly parent meetings promoted by the School Parent Coordinator and PTO and facilitated by school administration. The meetings will provide a forum for parents to receive updates on SIG progress from an administrative standpoint and for administrators to receive input from the family standpoint. Parents will also be invited to participate in SIG-funded workshops delivered by an external provider, focusing on the following areas:<br>• Parents and Leadership<br>• Managing Behavior<br>• Promoting Healthy Social Behaviors<br>• Calming and Stress-relieving Strategies<br>• Power Struggles with Teens<br><br>Employing these methods will ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved, informed, and invested in the transformation process, the academic achievement of our students and the overall viability of our school and surrounding community. | |
| 4. Schools provide PD to ensure that staff members work effectively with partnering organizations. | As elaborated throughout this document, the formation and effectiveness of various teams will be vital to the operation of all components of SIG programming including professional development. As with the many other facets of professional development, staff instruction on effective partnership will be addressed during Grade Level Meetings, Vertical Articulation Meetings, and separate bi-monthly dedicated professional development sessions. | Sept 2014 – June 2015<br><br>Sept 2015 – June 2016<br><br>Sept 2016 – |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | June 2017 |
| 5. LEA and school leaders periodically report to, and solicit input from, the school committee, staff, families, and community on school improvement | District and school leaders will be provided with numerous formats and opportunities through which they will report to and receive input from various committees and stakeholders on school improvement. These include the following:<br>• Monthly SIG Improvement Committee meetings<br>• Monthly Parent Meetings<br>• Periodic meetings with the School Action Team | July 2014 – August 2017 |

**Transformation SIG Required Activity - 8**

Providing operational flexibility and sustained support. The LEA must (a) give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/ time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and (b) ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

**Implementation Guidance** - N/A

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The LEA has systems and processes for anticipating and addressing school staffing and instructional and operational needs in timely, efficient, and effective ways. | Principal Davis will begin screening staff immediately upon notification of the grant award. The Human Resources Department will assist with the hiring process and secure all necessary documentation from the selected candidate. Additionally, personnel and union representatives will be briefed about the screening process in advance to ensure all questions and concerns are answered and to avoid negative repercussions during implementation. The logistics of operating special programs and extended learning time have also been considered in advance. The additional | **Rescreen Staff**<br><br>May 2014 – August 2014<br><br>**Other Described** |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | staffing and operational costs need have been anticipated and are ready to be implemented upon procurement of grant funds. A daily schedule and annual calendar specific to the school under SIG status has been developed so that the district and school may act quickly and effectively. These instruments have already been considered by the stakeholders involved to ensure that there is minimal negative feedback at the time of implementation. | **Activities**<br><br>July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 2. The LEA cultivates a pipeline of school transformation leaders, as well as external providers. | The District and school have the makings of a transformation leader pipeline through existing actions at both the teacher and school administrator levels. Existing actions will be further developed and expanded upon during the SIG project implementation period. The following efforts to designate teachers as Teacher Leaders are planned for the upcoming academic year:<br>o Designate grade span leaders<br>o Designate grade level team leaders at GLMs<br>o Content team leaders designated for VAMs<br>o Designate PLC leaders<br>o Participation on School Leadership Team<br>o 2 teachers will participate in a Supervisor/Principal Certification program and related higher education coursework<br><br>In addition to developing teachers into transformation leaders and empowering them to advance to administrative leaders, the following steps will be taken to further develop existing administrators into administrator leaders:<br>o Coaching is provided to principals by the District's Executive Director of Principal Coaching<br>o Coaching to Vice Principals is provided by Principal regarding evaluation, feedback techniques, calibration of evaluation findings, data analysis | July 2014 – August 2017 |

TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

LEA : Paterson Public Schools

Name of School: School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Part of being an effective transformation leader is understanding when institutional limitations require external providers to aid in the development of certain school programs. The school is prepared to implement the following offered by external providers:<br>o The Middle School University (for teachers of grades 6-8 only) – A university partner will develop enrichment programs centered on pre-college curricula to inspire students and develop key skills for college readiness while improving student performance growth. The programs will be integrated into the school day during designated regular times to set an expectation for students. Teachers will implement the curriculum after receiving professional training from the partner and planning. The Middle School University is expected to be conducted 2 days per week with four unique courses per grade level (one per marking period). Occasional field trips will enhance student experiences and provide an incentive to students. The Middle School University initiative will provide a natural progression for those students transitioning to the pre-college offerings of both Eastside and International High Schools.<br>o Twice monthly PD sessions will be conducted during GLMs and VAMs on topics determined by teachers within each group setting. Teachers will work with administrators to bring in external trainers that offer programs to address needs identified in each meeting and that are aligned with the improvement of student growth.<br>o Positive youth development and creating a supportive environment for learning every day is a current challenge for the school. Professional training in socio-emotional topics will ultimately lead to enhanced student growth. An external partner will develop training around these topics that have been identified through the needs assessment | |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | process and stakeholder input:<br>▪ Student relationships and Role Modeling<br>▪ Purposeful Expectations and Structured Environments<br>▪ Targeted Planning for Individual Children's Needs<br>▪ Intensive Interventions<br>o Industry Enrichment Courses for grades 1 -5 (as described previously in #3 of Activity 7a above)<br>o An adult literacy course offering will not only assist parents with needed skills; it will engage them in school and student growth and provide a venue for interaction with school personnel. | |
| 3. The LEA has established annual goals for student achievement. | The State sets annual measurable objectives (AMOs). This is the percentage of students in each school, and in each subgroup within the school (low income or African American, among others), that must reach the proficient level in order for the school to meet their set targets in a given year. These AMOs vary by state (as do, of course, the difficulty of the proficiency standards). AMOs streamline the federal and state accountability systems into one rigorous, cohesive system that increases standards and holds schools, districts, and the state accountable for the achievement of all students including those that are struggling the most. The AMOs together with the SGOs set each year by teachers and administrators are used to establish student achievement according to growth indicators each year. | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 4. The LEA has ongoing diagnostic programs in place to assess annual goals for student learning and effective practice. | The school begins with setting SGOs each year as a collaborative process between the teacher and building administrators. Student growth will be measured against the SGOs each year along with SGPs generated from NJASK assessments in math and ELA. SGPs from state assessments will be integrated into the districts database when they become available and pre-populated into evaluation forms delivered to building administrators. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Building administrators and instructors use the computer-based Renaissance Learning software to inform instruction and predict student growth. STARS Renaissance, the assessment from Renaissance Learning, provides assessments for students, collects the data, provides intervention tools and compares the progress of the intervention tools to the assessment data.<br><br>All scores from NJASK, Unit Assessments, STAR Renaissance, and any other assessments utilized by the District are stored in Performance Matters. | |
| 5. The LEA and school share student progress data with parents and students. | The Individual Student Report (ISR) of the NJASK assessment is a two-sided report, produced in grade and alphabetical sequence for students within a school. An ISR is produced for every student record. Two ISRs are printed and shipped to the home/sending District for each student record: one for the student's permanent folder after the results are analyzed, and the other for the student's parent/guardian to be shared in a manner determined by the local District. If a student takes the Spanish version of the NJ ASK, four copies will be provided: two in English and two in Spanish. The ISR presents a student's performance in each content area, indicating the extent to which the student meets or does not meet the State proficiency standards. Scores are provided for each cluster to identify particular areas of strength or areas in which the student needs improvement. When applicable, the ISR will also indicate why a student does not receive a scale score for a content area. At the top of the ISR, you will find the date of test administration as well as the date the report itself was printed. All ISRs are discussed with students during counselor meetings and during parent-teacher meetings.<br><br>The STAR Parent Report/Letter provides teachers with an informational report to give to parents. This letter provides details about each student's progress. It also provides instructional suggestions that parents can do at home with their child to improve on their scores. | July 2014 – August 2017 |

# Form S-7

**Date:** April 1, 2014



## TRANSFORMATION PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools

**Name of School:** School 6

**Transformation SIG Required Activity – 9**

Establish a system to collect data for the required leading indicators for schools receiving SIG funds.

**Implementation Guidance**

The nine metrics that constitute the leading indicators for the SIG program include (1) the number of minutes within the school year, (2) student participation rate on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics by student subgroup, (3) dropout rate, (4) student attendance rate, (5) number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB, early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes), (6) discipline incidents, (7) truants, (8) distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's evaluation system, and (9) teacher attendance rate.

| Evidence of Implementation Indicators | Implementation Description | Timeline |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The SEA has established a process to collect and analyze data, preferably at key points during the year so the SEA may provide support to help the LEA and school make needed corrections. | Performance Matters is the District's data warehouse. All scores from NJASK, Unit Assessments, STAR Renaissance, and any other assessments utilized by the District are stored in Performance Matters. Teachers, administrators, and central office personnel view the data and make comparisons across test scores by year, per grade, across schools, etc. All scores are also color coded (blue: above benchmark, green: at benchmark, yellow: slightly below benchmark, red: below benchmark). There is also the ability to group students based on proficiency by skill. | July 2014 – August 2017 |
| 2. The LEA and school have established a data system that can collect and report information on all nine leading indicators. | The District has several data systems that collect and report information on the nine leading indicators. Infinite Campus is a student data management system that will track student attendance, drop-out rates, truancy, marking period grades and teacher-created assignments and projects (including any advanced coursework or honors/gifted courses). Infinite Campus is an interactive communication tool between teachers and parents. Performance Matters collects all student assessment data relating to NJASK and Performance Matters. Paterson has an additional student assessment data system, STARS Renaissance, which provides assessments for students, collects the data, provides intervention tools and compares the progress of | July 2014 – August 2017 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | the intervention tools to the assessment data. The McREL Observation Data Management Tool collects all teacher observation data and walk-through data with the capability to group teachers according to summative performance ratings. The school administrator can use McREL to disaggregate the data to show trends and identify areas amongst administrator's that need calibration. The District participates in the Positive Behavior Support in Schools (PBSIS) initiative. As a participating district, schools collect all discipline data including out-of-school suspensions, in-school suspensions and office referrals. PBSIS provides school staff with training, database tools and technical assistance to create environments that encourage and support pro-social student behavior at the school-wide, classroom, and individual student levels using current, research validated practices in positive behavior support. The school maintains teacher attendance locally, and the data is reported to the district-level payroll offices at regular intervals where it is housed permanently.<br><br>There are 70,320 minutes in a school day. The after-school program is optional and the summer program is only mandatory if the student did not show a certain percentage of growth throughout the school year. Each school has the ability to track to total number of minutes at the end of the school year according to comparisons with the expected school calendar and the actual school calendar after any closings or delays. | |

# Form S-8

Date: April 1, 2014



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 25.8% | 32.0% | 38.2% | 44.4% | State Assessment | 43.8% | 48.9% | 48.9% | 54.0% |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 50.0% | 54.2% | 58.3% | 62.5% | State Assessment | 25.0% | 31.3% | 37.5% | 43.8% |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 25.0% | 31.3% | 37.5% | 43.8% | State Assessment | 100.0 % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| African-American | State Assessment | 27.3% | 33.4% | 39.4% | 45.5% | State Assessment | 40.9% | 45.8% | 50.8% | 55.7% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 100% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 100.0 % | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 12.5% | 19.8% | 27.1% | 34.4% | State Assessment | 25.0% | 31.3% | 37.5% | 43.8% |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 24.1% | 30.4% | 36.8% | 43.1% | State Assessment | 50.0% | 54.2% | 58.3% | 62.5% |

Date: April 1, 2014

# Form S-8



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 4 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 14.8% | 21.9% | 29.0% | 36.1% |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| African-American | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 16.0% | 23.0% | 30.0% | 37.0% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 14.8% | 21.9% | 29.0% | 36.1% |

Date: April 1, 2014

# Form S-8



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | Science | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 4 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 42.9% | 47.7% | 52.4% | 57.2% | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 20.0% | 26.7% | 33.3% | 40.0% | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| African-American | State Assessment | 46.2% | 50.7% | 55.2% | 59.7% | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | | | | | |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 42.9% | 47.7% | 52.4% | 57.2% | | | | | |

Date: April 1, 2014

# Form S-8



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 5 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 2.7% | 10.8% | 18.9% | 27.0% | State Assessment | 43.2% | 47.9% | 52.7% | 57.4% |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 50.0% | 54.2% | 58.3% | 62.5% |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| African-American | State Assessment | 4.0% | 12.0% | 20.0% | 28.0% | State Assessment | 32.0% | 37.7% | 43.3% | 49.0% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 66.6% | 69.4% | 72.2% | 75.0% |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 43.2% | 47.9% | 52.7% | 57.4% |

# Form S-8

Date: April 1, 2014



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 6 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 15.4% | 22.5% | 29.5% | 36.6% | State Assessment | 25.0% | 31.3% | 37.5% | 43.8% |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 33.3% | 38.9% | 44.4% | 50.0% |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| African-American | State Assessment | 15.6% | 22.6% | 29.7% | 36.7% | State Assessment | 26.7% | 32.8% | 38.9% | 45.0% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 14.3% | 21.4% | 28.6% | 35.7% | State Assessment | 14.3% | 21.4% | 28.6% | 35.7% |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 15.7% | 22.7% | 29.8% | 36.8% | State Assessment | 25.5% | 31.7% | 37.9% | 44.1% |

Date: April 1, 2014

# Form S-8



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 7 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 10.7% | 18.1% | 25.6% | 33.0% | State Assessment | 14.3% | 21.4% | 28.6% | 35.7% |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 22.2% | 28.7% | 35.2% | 41.7% |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| African-American | State Assessment | 10.6% | 18.1% | 22.5% | 33.0% | State Assessment | 17.0% | 23.9% | 30.8% | 37.8% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 11.1% | 18.5% | 25.9% | 33.3% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 9.6% | 17.1% | 24.7% | 32.2% | State Assessment | 13.5% | 20.7% | 27.9% | 35.1% |

Date: April 1, 2014

# Form S-8



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | LANGUAGE ARTS | | | | | MATH | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 8 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 37.9% | 43.1% | 48.3% | 53.4% | State Assessment | 24.6% | 30.9% | 37.2% | 43.5% |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 20.0% | 26.7% | 33.3% | 40.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 20.0% | 26.6% | 33.3% | 40.0% | State Assessment | 20.0% | 26.7% | 33.3% | 40.0% |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% |
| African-American | State Assessment | 37.2% | 42.4% | 47.7% | 52.9% | State Assessment | 19.0% | 25.8% | 32.5% | 39.3% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 46.2% | 50.7% | 55.2% | 59.7% | State Assessment | 46.2% | 50.7% | 55.2% | 59.7% |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 37.9% | 43.1% | 48.3% | 53.4% | State Assessment | 23.6% | 30.0% | 36.3% | 42.7% |

Date: April 1, 2014

# Form S-8



## ANNUAL STUDENT TARGETS

**LEA :** Paterson Public Schools **Name of School:** School 6

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 8 | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target | Name of Measurement | 2013 Baseline | 2014 Target | 2015 Target | 2016 Target |
| Total Students | State Assessment | 12.0% | 19.3% | 26.7% | 34.0% | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | State Assessment | 6.7% | 15.5% | 22.3% | 30.0% | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient Students | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | | | | | |
| White | State Assessment | 0.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | | | | | |
| African-American | State Assessment | 7.0% | 14..8% | 22.5% | 30.3% | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| American Indian/Native American | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| Hispanic | State Assessment | 30.8% | 36.6% | 42.3% | 48.1% | | | | | |
| Others | State Assessment | 0.0% | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | State Assessment | 12.5% | 19.8% | 27.1% | 34.4% | | | | | |

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

Regional
CHIEVEMENT
CENTERS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **School:** | 2 | **Number 6, Acad Perf Arts** |
| **Region:** | | 2 |
| **County:** | | Passaic |
| **District:** | | Paterson City |
| **CDS:** | | 314010100 |
| **RAC Classification:** | | Priority School |
| **Principal:** | 3 | **Ms. Shonda Davis** |

# School Goals - Number 6, Acad Perf Arts

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

**Our school will be held accountable for achieving the following goals:**

| Frequency of review | Metric | Goal |
|---|---|---|
| Every 6-8 weeks | Implementation progress & quality | • **At least 80%** of SIG - School Improvement Plan actions are accomplished for each 6-8 week period |
| | Attendance | • **At least 92%** school-wide attendance for students and teachers<br>• **Less than 5%** of targeted subgroup students are chronically absent (>10% of schools days missed) |
| | Discipline | • Fewer **than 5%** of students are suspended |
| | End-of-Unit Assessment Proficiency | • **At least 95%** participation of students on the end-of-unit assessment<br>• **At least 70%** of students demonstrate proficiency on each Subject Learning Objective on standards-aligned end-of-unit assessments |
| 2 times during school year | Survey / focus group responses | • **95%** of teachers and students participate in the survey<br>• **25%** of parents participate in the survey<br>• **At least 80%** of survey responders state that the school "meets expectations" |
| Annually | NJASK & HSPA proficiency | 4 • **17 percent of students proficient in ELA**[1]<br>4 • **25 percent of students proficient in Math**[1] |
| | NJASK growth | • **At least 35** on median School-wide Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for 2 out of the next 3 years |
| | High school graduation rate | • **At least 75%** graduation rate for each cohort year |

Click on link provided - 2013 School Profiles and Progress Targets. When prompted enter User ID: PT@2013 and Password: NJPTS@13

1 – Progress targets are calculated by taking a 25% decrease over 3 years (or 8.3% decrease per year) in number of students not proficient on 2011 state assessments.

# Quality School Review Details

5

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

**Use the link below to access the QSR rubric from the DOE website.**
**http://www.state.nj.us/education/rac/pres/QSRRubric.pdf**

**Based on QSR review, enter the summary of findings aligned to each indicator based on data and/or observations.**
**Click on the Indicator # for the description. Please use the drop-down menu for the Rating column.**

| Turnaround Principle | Indicator # | Rating | Overall Strengths Summary |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - School Leadership | 1.1 | Developing | As a newly assigned principal, a new leadership team was created to implement district and school initiatives. |
| | 1.2 | Developing | |
| | 1.3 | Developing | |
| | 1.4 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 1.5 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 1.6 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 1.7 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 1.8 | Developing | |
| | 1.9 | Developing | |
| | 1.10 | Developing | |
| 2- School Climate & Culture | 2.1 | Developing | The administrative team has created a clear and consistent policy for student behavior and this policy has been clearly communicated to instructional staff, parents, community and students. |
| | 2.2 | Developing | |
| | 2.3 | Underdeveloped | |
| 3 - Effective Instruction | 3.1 | Underdeveloped | Teachers participated in staff development that specifically addressed curriculum alignment with the Common Core and effectively using the 90 minute instructional block. |
| | 3.2 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 3.3 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 3.4 | Developing | |
| | 3.5 | Underdeveloped | |
| | 3.6 | Underdeveloped | |
| 4 - Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System | 4.1 | Developing | The administrative team conducted classroom walkthroughs to determine the extent to which classroom instruction was aligned to the Common Core Standards |
| | 4.2 | Developing | |
| | 4.3 | Developing | |
| | 4.4 | Developing | |
| | 4.5 | Underdeveloped | |
| 5- Effective Staffing Practices | 5.1 | Underdeveloped | The school has a clear professional development calendar and topics are aligned with district and school initiatives. |
| | 5.2 | Developing | |
| | 5.3 | Developing | |
| | 5.4 | Developing | |
| | 5.5 | Developing | |
| 6 - Enabling the Effective Use of Data | 6.1 | Developing | Formative and summative data is analyzed and shared with staff at vertical articulation meetings and this data is used to modify and adjust instruction. |
| | 6.2 | Developing | |
| | 6.3 | Developing | |
| 7- Effective Use of Time | 7.1 | Developing | A master schedule has been developed and all students are assigned to level appropriate classes. |
| | 7.2 | Developing | |
| | 7.3 | Developing | |
| 8- Family & Community Engagement | 8.1 | Proficient | To address climate, culture and community engagement, the principal is partnering with the local organizations and is in the process of implementing Jr. ROTC and PBSIS. |
| | 8.2 | Developing | |

# Description of Highest Priority Issues

6

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

**Enter additional detail on issue highlighted as a high priority need identified through the QSR process.**
(Rows will automatically be added when data is entered at the bottom of the chart)

| Highest Priority Issue | Evidence / Support and Data Sources | Root Cause | Sub-groups / populations affected |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention 4.5 An intervention plan for students two years behind in math is developed and monitored. Effective Staffing Practices 5.4 Staff assignment optimizes student learning.** | List of identified students, schedule for intervention teacher, administrative walkthrough data, formal and informal teacher observations, lesson plans, posted lesson objectives and DOLs. | The large number of students requiring intervention presents scheduling challenges. In class teacher require additional PD in the use of data to group students and develop intervention strategies | All |
| **Effective Instruction 3.5 Teachers use multiple measures of assessment data to differentiate instruction.** | Data binders maintained by instructional staff, lesson plans reflecting differentiated instruction targeting specific student instructional needs, flexible grouping indicated during administrative walkthroughs and objectives and DOLs directly aligned with student academic needs. | There isn't sufficient time to provide ongoing PD in the area of data analysis and the use of data to guide instruction. | All |
| **Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention 4.2 Teachers and school leaders collect classroom level data to verify that the adapted and aligned CCSS is aligned and is the current taught curriculum.** | Administrative review of classroom level assessment data indicates assessments aligned to the model curriculum as well as to the varying levels of student achievement | The large number of students requiring intervention present challenges in the delivery of instruction. Teacher require additional PD in the use of data to group students and develop intervention strategies | All |
| **4.3 The district provides formative assessments in literacy and math to gauge student progress. 6.2 Multiple forms of data are timely, friendly and drive improved student achievement. 6.3 A schedule and process for analyzing on-going formative assessment data tied to the CCSS.** | Data binders reflect that all teachers receive data results from all district formative assessment and vertical articulation meetings give evidence that these results are analyzed in a timely manner. | There isn't sufficient time to provide ongoing PD particularly to novice teachers in the area of data analysis and using data to plan for instruction. | All |
| | | | |

# Description of Highest Priority Issues

6

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

**Enter additional detail on Issue highlighted as a high priority need identified through the QSR process.**
(Rows will automatically be added when data is entered at the bottom of the chart)

| Highest Priority Issue | Evidence / Support and Data Sources | Root Cause | Sub-groups / populations affected |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.3-The district provides formative assessments in literacy and math to enable teachers to effectively gauge student progress and inform instructional decisions at the classroom and team levels. 6.3-A specific schedule and process for the analysis of on-going formative assessment data tied to the CCSS aligned curriculum that includes the specific goals for improvement, defined strategies, progress monitoring and evaluation. 4.5 An intervention plan designed to meet the learning needs of students who are two or more years behind in ELA and Mathematics is planned, monitored and evaluated for effectiveness based on defined student learning goals. | Data binders maintained by ELL and SPED instructional staff, lesson plans reflecting differentiated instruction targeting specific student instructional needs, flexible grouping indicated during administrative walkthroughs and objectives and DOLs directly aligned with student academic needs. | There is only one bilingual ESL teacher to service all grade levels K - 8. There is limited time to provide professional development to classroom teachers in the area of providing specific accommodations to the ELL population. | ELL and SPED student population |
| 6.3-A specific schedule and process for the analysis of on-going formative assessment data tied to the CCSS aligned curriculum that includes the specific goals for improvement, defined strategies, progress monitoring and evaluation. 4.3-The district provides formative assessments in literacy and math to enable teachers to effectively gauge student progress and inform instructional decisions at the classroom and team levels. | Agendas from vertical articulation and grade level meetings indicates ongoing data analysis and planning for instruction | There is a need for additional time specifically for novice teachers in the area of using data to drive instruction. | All |
| 2 .2 School Climate and Culture School community promotes academic and personal growth of students and staff. 5.5 Effective Staffing Staff assignments optimize student learning. | Master schedule reflects optimum use of all staff. | A culture and climate mentor teacher needs to be hired to lead the PBSIS program. Limited time is available for instructional staff to participate in social development projects for the students. | All |
| 7.1 To provide administrative and content area support for all teachers in order to increase student achievement | Administrative walkthrough and feedback data, agendas from vertical and grade level meetings indicating content area support and guidance. | Novice teachers and teachers who experience a grade change require addition instructional and content area support. Insufficient time is available to provide adequate PD. | All |
| | | | |

# Description of Highest Priority Issues

6

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

**Enter additional detail on issue highlighted as a high priority need identified through the QSR process.**
(Rows will automatically be added when data is entered at the bottom of the chart)

| Highest Priority Issue | Evidence / Support and Data Sources | Root Cause | Sub-groups / populations affected |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SIG Required Activity - 1 Transformation** | Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model. | | |
| **SMART goal** | During the course of the 2014-2015 school year, the school administrators will be 100% anchored in influencing all staff members to implement school improvement practices and strategies to make dramatic and substantial changes such as spending time in classrooms, monitoring teachers, modeling good teaching practices, and being highly visible throughout the school. | **Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When?** | |
| **Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable** | 1 The principal develops and promotes a coherent strategy and plan for implementing the school vision, which inclused clear measureable goals, aligned strategies and a plan for monitoring progress and driving countinuous improvement. | **Primary Turnaround Principle addressed** | 1 |
| **Measurable Effectiveness Data** | **School plan, School vision, belief statements, individual teacher observations and evaluations, performace on benchmarks, lesson plans, attendance,** | **Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed** | 3 |
| **Owner of strategy** | **School administrators; Principal and vice principals** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | 5 |
| **Target population** | **All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners.** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | 6 |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time

MUST USE DROP-DOWN ARROWS FOR THE FUNDING SECTION. DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Strategy Objectives / Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Owner | Funding amount required |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Retain Turnaround Principal Ms. Shonda Davis (in place for 1 year and has demonstrated turnaround capabilities) | 7/1/2014 | District Administration | $0.00 |
| 2 | School admininistrators will embrace the 8 Turnaround Principles | 7/1/2014 | School Administrators STC from RAC | $0.00 |
| 3 | School administrators and District administrators to attend SIG Summer Leadership Academy | 8/15/2014 | NJDOE, School Administrators District Administrators | $0.00 |
| 4 | NJDOE to provide State Turnarcund Coach (STC) to provide implementation coaching to Turnaround Principal | 9/1/2014 | NJDOE | $0.00 |
| 5 | Identify college and career readiness school theme - School of Social Justice | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 |
| 6 | Create grade span clusters aligned to school theme (K - 2: My Community; 3 - 5: Immigration and Industry; 6 - 8: Civics and Human Rights) and identify grade span teacher leaders | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 |
| 7 | Administrators to develop plan to increase staff instructional capacity by reviewing data analysis, identifying areas of professional development and developing walk-through/observation schedule | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 |
| 8 | Form SIG School Leadership Team comprised of school administrators and 10 teachers (10 hrs per staff member) (stipend + FICA) | 9/15/2014 | School Administrators | $4,952.00 |
| 9 | Form SIG Implementation Committee inclusive of school, district and community stakeholders to attend monthly meetings to address the successes and challenges of SIG implementation | 9/1/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 |
| 10 | School administrators and District administrators to attend NJDOE sponsored SIG Professional Learning Communities through Year 1 of SIG Implementation | 6/30/2015 | NJDOE, School Administrators District Administrators | $800.00 |
| 11 | | | | |
| 12 | | | | |
| 13 | | | | |
| 14 | | | | |
| 15 | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIG Required Activity - 2 Transformation | Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor, as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. | | |
| SMART goal | During the course of the 2014-2015 school year, 100% of the School Administrators, school onsite supervisors, and district administrators will have established teams to conduct State approved evaluations and walk throughs and collect student data to align with job-embedded professional development that will address student learning and effective instructional practices | Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When? | |
| Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable | 1.9 The principal effectively employs staffing practices in order to continuously improve instructional and meet student learning goals. | Primary Turnaround Principle addressed | 3 |
| Measurable Effectiveness Data | Individual Teacher observations and evaluations, performace on benchmarks, lesson plans, attendance, | Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed | 1 |
| Owner of strategy | School administrators; principal and vice principals | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 5 |
| Target population | All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners. | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 2 |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | School administrators to create observation and walk-through schedule | 5/1/2014 | School administrators | $0.00 | |
| 2 | School administrators and instructional staff will analyze achievement in preparation for writing Student Growth Objectives | 5/15/2014 | School administrators and Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Instructional staff will identify their Student Growth Objectives for the 2014-2015 school year | 10/15/2014 | School administrators, Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis and instructional staff | $0.00 | |
| 4 | Continue to implement the Focal Point Performance Rubrics for instructional staff and administrative staff | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 5 | Provide teachers with actionable and meaningful feedback on all walk-throughs and observations | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 6 | Assist struggling teachers by providing additional professional development through model lessons of effective strategies and opportunities to observe exelempary lessons | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators, Site-based Supervisors and Content Supervisors | $0.00 | |
| 7 | Utilize Site-based Supervisors for ELA, Math, BIL and SPED to provide job-embedded professional developmen to struggling teachers as identified by the teacher evaluation rubrics | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators, Site-based Supervisors | $0.00 | |
| 8 | Utilize PD306 as a means of professional development for staff in all areas relating to the performance components of the evaluation system | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 9 | District to provide professional development to struggling teachers in specific evalation domains | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators, Department of Accountability | $0.00 | |
| 10 | Executive Directors for Principal Coaching to continue to provide job-embedded coaching for principals | 9/1/2014 | Executive Directors for Principal Coaching | $0.00 | |
| 11 | School administrators will maintain evaluation data and utilize to identify trends and areas of need for calibration | 10/15/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 12 | District to provide calibration sessions to evaluating administrators | 9/1/2014 | Department of Accountability | $0.00 | |
| 13 | Teachers who have been rated as Ineffective or Partially Effective will be placed on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for the following school year which includes targeted professional development to address needs identified through observations | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators, Department of Accountability | $0.00 | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SIG Required Activity - 3 Transformation** | Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates, and identify and remove those who have not improved their professional practice after having been afforded ample opportunity to do so. | | |
| **SMART goal** | By November 1, 2014, 90% of instructional school staff will demonstrate implemention of research based rigorous instructional strategies as evidenced by growth in student achievement and is proven as stated on the teacher academic incentive and rewards rubrics. | **Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When?** | |
| **Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable** | **3.3 Teachers use multiple instructional strategies that activaely engage and meet student learning needs. 3.5 Teachers demonstrate the necessary skills to use multiple measures of data including the use of diagnostic, formative and summative assessment data to differenciate instruction to improve student achievement** | **Primary Turnaround Principle addressed** | **3** |
| **Measurable Effectiveness Data** | **Performace on benchmarks, lesson plans, attendance,** | **Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed** | **4** |
| **Owner of strategy** | **School administrators; Principal and vice principal and teachers** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | **6** |
| **Target population** | **All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners.** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | **7** |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time
8- Family & Community Engagement

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Establish valid, fair and transparent methods for allocating performance-based incentives | 9/15/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 2 | Utilize Leadership Team comprised of school administrators and teachers to identify teacher incentives, create rubrics tied to student achievement and other data points | 9/15/2014 | School Administrators | $20,000.00 | |
| 3 | Utilize Leadership Team comprised of school administrators and teachers to identify student incentives, create rubrics tied to student achievement and other data points | 9/15/2014 | School Administrators | $20,000.00 | |
| 4 | Share rubrics with all staff members during professional development sessions, grade level meetings and vertical articulation meetings | 9/15/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 5 | Identify teachers on a yearly basis for teacher incentive awards relating to student achievement | 4/30/2015 | Leadership Team | $0.00 | |
| 6 | Identify students on a yearly basis for student incentive awards relating to student achievement for culminating field trip aligned to school theme | 5/30/2015 | Leadership Team | $0.00 | |
| 7 | Identify students on quarterly basis for student incentive awards relating to Honor Roll achievement | 6/30/2015 | Leadership Team | $0.00 | |
| 8 | Identify students on a monthly basis for student incentive awards relating to attendance and uniforms | 6/30/2015 | Leadership Team | $0.00 | |
| 9 | Identify teachers on a monthly basis for teacher incentive awards relating to attendance and Teacher of the Month | 6/30/2015 | Leadership Team | $0.00 | |
| 10 | Facilitate performance-based dismissals through Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 11 | Provide targeted assistance to struggling teachers through modeling, coaching, feedback on lesson planning and job-embedded professional development facilitated through site-based supervisors and school administrators | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators and Site-based Supervisors | $0.00 | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIG Required Activity - 4 Transformation | Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (PD) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies. | | |
| SMART goal | During the course of the 2014-2015 school year, 100% of the teaching staff will participate in job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the Common Core State Standards to ensure the mission to prepare every student for success in postsecondary education and in his or her chosen career. | Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When? | |
| Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable | 5.3 Teachers are provided professional development that enables them to continuously reflect, revise, and evaluate their classroom practices to improve learning outcomes in both a structured collaborative setting and individually. | Primary Turnaround Principle addressed | 5 |
| Measurable Effectiveness Data | professional development plan, evaluation of the pd providers, pd topics linked to data from teacher observations | Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed | 3 |
| Owner of strategy | School Administrator; Principal, vice principals, and teachers | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 6 |
| Target population | All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners. | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 7 |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time
8- Family & Community Engagement

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Issue RFQ/P for services from external provider for job-embedded/one-on-one coaching professional development to instructional staff on effective strategies for social/emotional supports in classroom concentrating on positive behavior outcomes | 7/15/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 2 | Align PD on social/emotional supports in classroom concentrating on positive behavior outcomes to PBSIS to ensure both initiatives are working together seamlessly | 7/15/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Issue RFQ/P for services from external provider for trageted professional development during bi-weekly professional development sessions and grade-level meetings/vertical articulation meetings that occur on the day of the bi-weekly PD | 7/15/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 4 | Provide bi-weekly professional development sessions for teachers starting in September 2014 and finishing in June 2015 (stipend + FICA) | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator | $46,969.00 | |
| 5 | School administrator to partner with external provider for providing targeted professional development during bi-weekly professional development sessions and grade-level meetings/vertical articulation meetings that occur on the day of the bi-weekly PD | 9/15/2014 | School Administrator and SIG Supervisor | $10,000.00 | |
| 6 | External partner to provide job-embedded/one-on-one coaching professional development to instructional staff on effective strategies for social/emotional supports in classroom concentrating on positive behavior outcomes beginning in September 2014 and ending June 2015 | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator and SIG Supervisor | $27,950.00 | |
| 7 | Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities on topics such as Effective Pedagogical Teaching Practices, Student Engagement Strategies and Assessing Student Learning beginning in October 2014 and finishing in May 2015 (stipend + FICA) | 5/30/2015 | School Administrator and SIG Supervisor | $10,980.00 | |
| 8 | Provide PLC resources to guide topic and focus study | 5/30/2015 | School Administrator | $800.00 | |
| 9 | Utilize Site-based Supervisors in ELA, Math, BIL and SPED to provide job-embedded professional development to struggling teachers | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator | $0.00 | |
| 10 | Provide opportunities to attend professional development sessions outside of District provided PD and provide registration fees for administrators and instructional staff | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator | $500.00 | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIG Required Activity - 5 Transformation | Implement strategies that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model. | | |
| SMART goal | By September 1, 2014, the principal will have screened 100% existing staff and retained only the staff who have demonstrated effective teaching practices, a willingness to participate in SIG initiatives and who believe in the mission and vision of the school. | Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When? | |
| Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable | 5.2 School leadership uses teacher evaluation to provide feedback for improving classroom practices, informing professional development and increasing learning outcomes. | Primary Turnaround Principle addressed | 5 |
| Measurable Effectiveness Data | Observations, walk throughs, lesson plans, attendance, professional development plan | Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed | 3 |
| Owner of strategy | Teachers and School Administrators | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 1 |
| Target population | All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners. | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 7 |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time
8- Family & Community Engagement

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Screen all current staff and retain only those who believe in the mission and vision of School 6 and are willing to participate in SIG initiatives | 7/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 2 | Provide coaching to school administrators from Executive Director of Principal Coaching | 7/1/2014 | Excutive Director of Principal Coaching | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Hire one Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis (salary + benefits) | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $103,426.00 | |
| 4 | Hire one Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture (salary + benefits) | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $103,426.00 | |
| 5 | Hire two Reading Specialists for targeted diagnostic interventions in ELA (salary + benefits) | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $206,850.00 | |
| 6 | Develop instructional leadership capacity by utilizing teacher leaders for Leadership Team, PLCs, grade level meetings, vertical articulation meetings and grade spans | 9/15/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 7 | Provide non-monetary teacher incentives related to performance (please see 3.2 for resource information) | 9/15/2014 | Leadership Team | $0.00 | |
| 8 | Provide technology resources for 21st Century Learning and instruction including iPads, App Card and Smartboards | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators | $83,490.00 | |
| 9 | Instructional and office supplies to support Extended Learning Oppportunity | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators | $13,540.00 | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SIG Required Activity - 6 Transformation | Comprehensive instructional reform strategies. The LEA must (a) use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next, as well as aligned with state academic standards; and (b) promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, classroom, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students. | | |
| SMART goal | During the 2014-2015 school year, 85% of the students in grades Pre-K to 8th in School 6 will make one year's worth of growth measurable progress in every grade as measured by the state and district benchmarks in all subject areas. | Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When? | |
| Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable | 6.2 Multiple forms of data are presented in user-friendly formats in a timely manner to drive all decisions for improving student achievement. | Primary Turnaround Principle addressed | 6 |
| Measurable Effectiveness Data | District and State benchmarks, student artifacts, attendance data | Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed | 3 |
| Owner of strategy | School Administrators | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 4 |
| Target population | All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners. | Other Turnaround Principle addressed | 7 |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Hire one Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis (refer to 5.3 for resource information) | 5/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 2 | Structure schedule to include opportunities for data analysis by instructional staff such as grade level meetings, vertical articulation meetings, PLCs and bi-weekly professional development sessions | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Utilize Performance Matters to extract FLKRST, Unit Assessment and other data points | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Instructional Staff | $0.00 | |
| 4 | Utilize PBSIS to track student discipline and referral data | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Instructional Staff | $0.00 | |
| 5 | Utilize Infinite Campus to track student attendance and other student data points | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Instructional Staff | $0.00 | |
| 6 | Utilize Edumet to track teacher attendance | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 7 | Utilize McREL to track walk-through and evaluation data | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Instructional Staff | $0.00 | |
| 8 | Implement STAR Assessments to provide actionable student achievement data to teachers and intervention resources | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Instructional Staff | $0.00 | |
| 9 | Communicate student achievement data to parents and guardians via STAR Assessments and parent out-reach events | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Instructional Staff | $0.00 | |
| 10 | Ensure that school aligns instruction to the CCSS through monitoring implementation of curriculum mapping provided from | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators, Instructional Staff, Site-based Supervisors, District Administration | $0.00 | |
| 11 | As part of walk-through/evaluation process, schedule post-conference with instructional staff to review data and plan for improvements | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SIG Required Activity - 7a Transformation** | Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools. The LEA must (a) establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time for all students. | | |
| **SMART goal** | By September 1, 2014, 100% of student schedules will reflect an additional 300 hours of instructional time including the Middle School University for grades 6 - 8, Industry Enrichment Partnership for grades K-5 and additional intervention periods. | **Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When?** | |
| **Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable** | **7.2 The masters schedule is clearly designed to meet the intervention needs of all students who are two or more years behind in ELA or Mathmatics.** | **Primary Turnaround Principle addressed** | **7** |
| **Measurable Effectiveness Data** | **Master schedule,** | **Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed** | **4** |
| **Owner of strategy** | **School Administration** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | **3** |
| **Target population** | **All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners.** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | **6** |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Establish student schedules and extend learning experience for students by 300 hours and provide stipends to teachers, instructional assistants, administrators, secretaries, security, parent coordinator, custodian and lunch monitors (summer only) (stipend + FICA) | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $1,192,549.00 | |
| 2 | Issue RFQ/P for university partnership to provide the Middle School University | 7/15/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Issue RFQ/P for external partnership to provide the Lower Grades Industry Enrichment | 7/15/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 4 | Implement Middle School University for college prep classes aligned to school theme provided by university partner for students in grades 6 - 8 twice per week | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and SIG Supervisor | $40,000.00 | |
| 5 | Implement Lower Grades Industry Enrichment to provide enrichment classes to students in grades K - 5 that are connected to the school theme twice per week | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and SIG Supervisor | $20,000.00 | |
| 6 | Create natural pathway to one of the Paterson thema-based high schools connected with school theme of Social Justice | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator | $0.00 | |
| 7 | Implement a peer-to-peer program between students of School 6 and theme-based high schools including peer mediation, team building and mentoring | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator | $0.00 | |
| 8 | Provide opportunities for students to participate in field trips aligned to school theme (admissions) | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators | $4,650.00 | |
| 9 | Provide opportunities for students to travel to field trips aligned to school theme (transportation) | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators | $4,000.00 | |
| 10 | Assess impact and progress of extended learning opportunities included the ELO, Middle School University, Lower Grades Industry Enrichment and Peer-to-Peer Program | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators and SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SIG Required Activity - 7b Transformation** | Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools. The LEA must (b) provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement. | | |
| **SMART goal** | By June 30, 2015, School 6 will show a 50% increase in parental and community involvement as evidenced by participation in monthly parent meetings, parent workshops, Adult Literacy classes and other community events. | **Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?**<br>**Measurable - %, How?**<br>**Attainable - Reasonable?**<br>**Relevant - Why?**<br>**Timed - When?** | |
| **Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable** | 8- Family & Community groups and families of students who are struggling academically and/or socially are active partners in the educational process and work together to reduce barriers and accelerate the academic and personal growth of students. | **Primary Turnaround Principle addressed** | 8 |
| **Measurable Effectiveness Data** | Survey, focus groups, list of family and community engagement activities, student and parent handbooks, | **Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed** | 2 |
| **Owner of strategy** | School Administrators | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | 1 |
| **Target population** | Families, students, teachers, and community members | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | 7 |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time
8- Family & Community Engagement

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Include community partners on SIG Implementation Committee | 9/1/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 2 | Issue RFQ/P for external partnership to provide Adult Literacy Courses | 7/15/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Collaborate with the Full Service Community School to align initiatives and maximize resources to benefit the school | 9/1/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 4 | Hire one Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture (salary + benefits) (refer to 5.4 for resource information) | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 5 | Hire Parent Coordinator to participate in the Extended Learning Experience for students (refer to 7a.1 for resource information) | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 6 | Provide Adult Literacy Course for parents (2 Cohorts) through external provider | 10/1/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $10,000.00 | |
| 7 | Create Behavior Management Team to support professional development on effective social/emotional strategies in classrooms (refer to 4.6 for resource information | 10/15/2014 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 8 | Provide professional development to instructional staff to ensure staff members work effectively with partnering organizations during grade level meetings, vertical articulation meetings and bi-monthly PD sessions | 12/15/2014 | School Administrators, Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture | $0.00 | |
| 9 | Provide parent refreshments at school-sponsored events | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators and Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture | $7,500.00 | |
| 10 | Provide parent workshops facilitated through external provider on topics such as Parents and Leadership, Managing Behavior, Promoting Healthy Social Behaviors, Calming and Stress-relieving Strategies and Power Struggles with Teens (refer to 4.6 for resource information) | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators and SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 11 | Attend Full Service Community School meetings concerning School 6 | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators, Teacher Mentor of Climate and Culture and SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 12 | Develop school theme (Social Justice) by infusing throughout academic program | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators | $0.00 | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SIG Required Activity - 8 Transformation** | Providing operational flexibility and sustained support. The LEA must (a) give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/ time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and (b) ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO). | | |
| **SMART goal** | During the duration of the 2014-2015 school year, the school administrators will exercise 100% operational flexibiltly to staff, create master schedules and budgets. | **Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?<br>Measurable - %, How?<br>Attainable - Reasonable?<br>Relevant - Why?<br>Timed - When?** | |
| **Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, If applicable** | **1.8 The principal ensures that the schedule is intentionally aligned with the school improvement plan in order to meet the agreed upon school level learning goals. 7.1 The master schedule is clearly designed and structured to meet the needs of all students.** | **Primary Turnaround Principle addressed** | **1** |
| **Measurable Effectiveness Data** | **Master schedules, budgets,** | **Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed** | **7** |
| **Owner of strategy** | **School Administrators such as the Principal and Vice Principals** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | **5** |
| **Target population** | **All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners.** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | **2** |

**Turnaround Principles**
1- School Leadership
2- School Climate & Culture
3- Effective Instruction
4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System
5- Effective Staffing Practices
6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data
7- Effective Use of Time
8- Family & Community Engagement

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | SIG Supervisor hired in 2011 to oversee SIG implementation at School 4 and 10 | 7/1/2014 | District Administration | $58,418.00 | |
| 2 | Provide operational flexibility and autonomy over staffing, scheduling, budgets and professional development | 7/1/2014 | District Administration | $0.00 | |
| 3 | Form SIG Implementation Committee inclusive of school, district and community stakeholders to attend monthly meetings to address the successes and challenges of SIG implementation | 9/1/2014 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 4 | Human Resources Department to ensure expediated process when Principal screens existing staff and hires new staff | 9/1/2014 | Department of Human Resources | $0.00 | |
| 5 | Establish annual goals for student achievement and review quarterly | 9/1/2014 | School Administrators and Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis | $0.00 | |
| 6 | Cultivate pipeline of leaders include teachers leaders for GLMs, VAMs, PLCs and grade spans | 6/30/2015 | School Administrator | $0.00 | |
| 7 | Share students data through STARS Reports, NJASK and classroom assessments with parents at report card night and school sponsored events | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators, Instructional Staff and Teacher Mentor of Data Analysis | $0.00 | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

# Project Activity Plan - Transformation

RETURN TO INSTRUCTIONS

ENTER ALL INFORMATION FOR EACH STRATEGY. DO NOT COMBINE OBJECTIVES/ACTION STEPS IN ONE LINE. LIST EACH SEPARATELY

7

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SIG Required Activity - 9 Transformation** | Establish a system to collect data for the required leading indicators for schools receiving SIG funds. | | |
| **SMART goal** | By August 22, 2014, 100% of the student data will be accessible through Peformance Matters and Infinite Campus, which has the capability of tracking individual student progress from PK through 12 with the ability to personalize and improve instructional supports for every student will be fully implemented. | **Specific (and Strategic) - Who ? What?**<br>**Measurable - %, How?**<br>**Attainable - Reasonable?**<br>**Relevant - Why?**<br>**Timed - When?** | |
| **Highest Priority Issue Being Addressed, if applicable** | **6.2 Multiple forms of data are presented in user-friendly formats in a timely manner to dirive all decisions for improving student achievement.** | **Primary Turnaround Principle addressed** | 6 |
| **Measurable Effectiveness Data** | **Data analysis documentions and summary reports** | **Secondary Turnaround Principle addressed** | 3 |
| **Owner of strategy** | **School adminstrators such as Principals and vice principals** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | 7 |
| **Target population** | **All students; general ed., special ed, and english language learners.** | **Other Turnaround Principle addressed** | 1 |

**Turnaround Principles**
**1- School Leadership**
**2- School Climate & Culture**
**3- Effective Instruction**
**4- Curriculum, Assessment and Intervention System**
**5- Effective Staffing Practices**
**6- Enabling the Effective Use of Data**
**7- Effective Use of Time**

DO NOT CUT & PASTE!

| Objective/ step number | Action Steps (no more than 15 steps) | Deadline | Person Responsible | Resources | Date Completed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Collect data on the 9 leading indicators through the District data management systems including Performance Matters, STARS, Edumet, McREL, Infinite Campus and PBSIS | 6/30/2015 | School Administrators and SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 2 | Provide opportunities to analyze the effectiveness of external providers and SIG implementation activities through the SIG Implementation Committee monthly meetings | 6/30/2015 | SIG Supervisor | $0.00 | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |

| Item | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Total request |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(Year 1)** 2 Reading Specialist @ $75,000 = $150,000 **(Year 2)** 2 Reading Specialist @ $80,000 = $160,000 **(Year 3)** 2 Reading Specialist @ $85,000 = $170,000 | $150,000.00 | $160,000.00 | $170,000.00 | $480,000.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 55 Teachers x 300 hrs x $48 per hour = $792,000 (Year 2) Extended Day: 55 Teachers x 300 hrs x $49 = $808,500 (Year 3) 55 Teachers x 300 hrs $50 per hr = $825,000 | $792,000.00 | $808,500.00 | $825,000.00 | $2,425,500.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 15 Instructional Assistants for 300 hrs x $38 = $171,000 (Year 2) 15 IA's for 300 hrs x $39 per hr = $175,500. (Year 3) 15 IA's for 300 hrs x 40 per hr = $180,000 | $171,000.00 | $175,500.00 | $180,000.00 | $526,500.00 |
| **Extended Day Substitutes:** (Year 1) Teachers ELO Program and SIG related teacher pull-out professional development for 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000 (Year 2) 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000. (Year 3) 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000. | $3,000.00 | $3,000.00 | $3,000.00 | $9,000.00 |
| **Extended Day :** (Year 1) 4 administrator salaries x 300 hrs = 70,200. 1 Principal Salary @ $60 x 300 hrs = 52,200. 3 administrators x $58 = $52,200 = 70,200. (Year 2) 1 Principal Salary = $61 per hr x 300 hrs = $18,300. 3 administrators x 300 hrs x $59 per hr = 53,100. totaling = 71,400. (Year 3) 1 Principal @ 300 hrs x $62 = 18,600. 3 administrators @ $60 per hr = $54,000 = 72,600 | $70,200.00 | $71,400.00 | $72,600.00 | $214,200.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 nurse x $48 x 300 hrs = $14,400. (Year 2) 1 nurse x $49 per hr x 300 = 14,700. (Year 3) 1 nurse @ $50 per hr x 300 hrs = $15,000. | $14,400.00 | $14,700.00 | $15,000.00 | $44,100.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $38 per hr = $19,000. (Year 2) 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $39 per hr = $19,500. (Year 3) 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $40 per hr = 20,000 | $19,000.00 | $19,500.00 | $20,000.00 | $58,500.00 |
| **(Year 1 = .75)** 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $75,000 **(Year 2 = .75)** 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $75,000 **(Year 3 = .25)** 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $75,000 | $56,250.00 | $56,250.00 | $18,750.00 | $131,250.00 |
| **(Year 1 = .75)** 1 FTE Climate and Culture @ $75,000. **(Year 2 = .75)** 1 FTE Climate and Culture @ $75,000. **(Year 3 = .25)** 1 FTE Climate and Culture @ $75,000. | $56,250.00 | $56,250.00 | $18,750.00 | $131,250.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 Security Guard for learning time for ELO @ $38 per hr = 11,400. (Year 2) 1 Security Guard for 300 hrs x $39 = 11,700. (Year 3) 1 Security for 300 x $40 per hr = $12,000 | $11,400.00 | $11,700.00 | $12,000.00 | $35,100.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 Custodian for170 hrs. @ 39.37 per hr = $6,693.00. (Year 2) 1 Custodian for 170 hrs x 39.37 = $6,693.00. (Year 3) 1 Custodian for 170 hrs x 39.37 = $6,693.00. | $6,693.00 | $6,693.00 | $6,693.00 | $20,079.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 hrs x $38 per hr = $11,400. (Year 2) 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 x $39 per hr = 11,700. (Year 3) 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 hrs x $40 per hr. = $12,000. | $11,400.00 | $11,700.00 | $12,000.00 | $35,100.00 |
| **Professional Development:** (Year 1) 55 Teachers x $48 per hr x 16 hrs. = 42,240. (Year 2) 55 Teachers x $49 per hr x 16 hrs = 43,120. (Year 3) 55 Teachers x $50 per hr x 16 hrs = $44,000. | $42,240.00 | $43,120.00 | $44,000.00 | $129,360.00 |
| **Professional Development:** (Year 1) 3 Administrators x $58 per hr. x 8 hrs = 1,392 (Year 2) 3 Adm x $59 per hr x 8 hrs = 1,416. (Year 3) 3 Adm. x $60 per hr x 8 hrs. = 1,440. | $1,392.00 | $1,416.00 | $1,440.00 | $4,248.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1,2,3) 9 Lunch Monitors for Summer ELO x 75 hrs @ 12.50 each = $8,438 | $8,438.00 | $8,438.00 | $8,438.00 | $25,314.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 1 SIG Supervisor to be shared within 2 SIG Schools @ $86,000 for School 6 and NRC. **(Year 2)** 1 Supervisor to be shared with 2 SIG Schools = 88,000 **(Year 3)** 1 Supervisor to be shared with 2 SIG = 90,000 . | $43,000.00 | $44,000.00 | $45,000.00 | $132,000.00 |
| **(Year 1)** Professional Development (PLC's) 15 Staff @ 20 hrs @ $34 per hr = 10,200. **(Year 2)** 15 Staff @ $34 per hr x 20 hrs = 10,200. **(Year 3)** 15 Staff @$34 per hr x 20 hrs = $10,200. | $10,200.00 | $10,200.00 | $10,200.00 | $30,600.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 = 1,200. **(Year 2)** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 per hr = 1,200. **(Year 3)** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 per hr = 1.200. Leadership Team | $1,200.00 | $1,200.00 | $1,200.00 | $3,600.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 = $3,400. **(Year 2)** 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 per hr = 3,400. **(Year 3)** 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 per hr = 3.400. | $3,400.00 | $3,400.00 | $3,400.00 | $10,200.00 |
| **Total** | $1,471,463.00 | $1,506,967.00 | $1,467,471.00 | $4,445,901.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Personal Services- Employee Benefits (FICA, TPAF, HEALTH** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Total request** |
| **(Year 1)** 2 Reading Specialist @ $75,000 = $150,000 **(Year 2)** 2 Reading Specialist @ $75,000 = $150,000 **(Year 3)** 2 Reading Specialist @ $75,000 = $150,000 | $56,850.00 | $56,850.00 | $56,850.00 | $176,813.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 55 Teachers x 300 hrs x $48 per hour = $792,000 (Year 2) Extended Day: 55 Teachers x 300 hrs x $49 = $808,500 (Year 3) 55 Teachers x 300 hrs $50 per hr = $825,000 | $60,588.00 | $61,850.00 | $63,113.00 | $136,208.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 15 Instructional Assistants for 300 hrs x $38 = $171,000 (Year 2) 15 IA's for 300 hrs x $39 per hr = $175,500. (Year 3) 15 IA's for 300 hrs x 40 per hr = $180,000 | $13,082.00 | $13,426.00 | $13,770.00 | $26,738.00 |
| **Extended Day Substitutes:** (Year 1) Teachers ELO Program and SIG related teacher pull-out professional development for 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000 (Year 2) 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000. (Year 3) 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000. | $230.00 | $230.00 | $230.00 | $6,014.00 |
| **Extended Day :** (Year 1) 4 administrator salaries x 300 hrs = 70,200. 1 Principal Salary @ $60 x 300 hrs = 52,200. 3 administrators x $58 = $52,200 = 70,200. (Year 2) 1 Principal Salary = $61 per hr x 300 hrs = $18,300. 3 administrators x 300 hrs x $59 per hr = 53,100. totaling = 71,400. (Year 3) 1 Principal @ 300 hrs x $62 = 18,600. 3 administrators @ $60 per hr = $54,000 = 72,600 | $5,370.00 | $5,462.00 | $5,554.00 | $11,980.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 nurse x $48 x 300 hrs = $14,400. (Year 2) 1 nurse x $49 per hr x 300 = 14,700. (Year 3) 1 nurse @ $50 per hr x 300 hrs = $15,000. | $1,102.00 | $1,125.00 | $1,148.00 | $3,757.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $38 per hr = $19,000. (Year 2) 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $39 per hr = $19,500. (Year 3) 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $40 per hr = 20,000 | $1,454.00 | $1,492.00 | $1,530.00 | $10,052.50 |
| **(Year 1)** 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $75,000 **(Year 2)** 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $75,000 **(Year 3)** 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $75,000 | $24,319.00 | $21,319.50 | $7,106.50 | $52,745.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 1 FTE Climate and Culture @ $75,000. **(Year 2)** 1 FTE Climate and Culture @ $75,000. **(Year 3)** 1 FTE Climate and Culture @ $75,000. | $24,319.00 | $21,319.50 | $7,106.50 | $52,745.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 Security Guard for learning time for ELO @ $38 per hr = 11,400. (Year 2) 1 Security Guard for 300 hrs x $39 = 11,700. (Year 3) 1 Security for 300 x $40 per hr = $12,000 | $872.00 | $895.00 | $918.00 | $2,685.00 |
| **Extended Day: (Year 1)** 1 Custodian for 170 hrs @ 39.37 per hr = $6,693.00. **(Year 2)** 1 Custodian for 170hrs x 39.37 = $6,693.00. **(Year 3)** 1 Custodian for 170 hrs x 39.37 = $6,693.00. | $512.00 | $512.00 | $512.00 | $1,536.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1) 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 hrs x $38 per hr = $11,400. (Year 2) 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 x $39 per hr = 11,700. (Year 3) 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 hrs x $40 per hr. = $12,000. | $872.00 | $895.00 | $918.00 | $2,685.00 |
| **Professional Development:** (Year 1) 55 Teachers x $48 per hr x 16 hrs. = 42,240. (Year 2) 55 Teachers x $49 per hr x 16 hrs = 43,120. (Year 3) 55 Teachers x $50 per hr x 16 hrs = $44,000. | $3,231.00 | $3,299.00 | $3,366.00 | $9,896.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Professional Development:** (Year 1) 3 Administrators x $58 per hr. x 8 hrs = 1,392 (Year 2) 3 Adm x $59 per hr x 8 hrs = 1,416. (Year 3) 3 Adm. x $60 per hr x 8 hrs. = 1,440. | $106.00 | $108.00 | $110.00 | $324.00 |
| **Extended Day:** (Year 1,2,3) 9 Lunch Monitors for Summer ELO x 75 hrs @ 12.50 each = $8,438 | $646.00 | $646.00 | $646.00 | $1,938.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 1 SIG Supervisor to be shared within 2 SIG Schools @ $86,000 for School 6 and NRC. **(Year 2)** 1 Supervisor to be shared with 2 SIG Schools = 88,000 **(Year 3)** 1 Supervisor to be shared with 2 SIG = 90,000 . | $15,418.00 | $15,636.00 | $15,856.00 | $46,910.00 |
| **(Year 1)** Professional Development (PLC's) 15 Staff @ 20 hrs @ $34 per hr = 10,200. **(Year 2)** 15 Staff @ $34 per hr x 20 hrs = 10,200. **(Year 3)** 15 Staff @$34 per hr x 20 hrs = $10,200. | $780.00 | $780.00 | $780.00 | $2,340.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 = 1,200. **(Year 2)** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 per hr = 1,200. **(Year 3)** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 per hr = 1.200. Leadership Team | $92.00 | $92.00 | $92.00 | $276.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 = $3,400. **(Year 2)** 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 per hr = 3,400. **(Year 3)** 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 per hr = 3.400. Leadership Team | $260.00 | $260.00 | $260.00 | $780.00 |
| **Total** | $210,103.00 | $206,197.00 | $179,866.00 | $546,422.50 |
| **Purchased Professional and Technical Services** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Total request** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Middle School University:** College prep Classes aligned to school theme provided by university partner for students in grades 6-8 2 x per week | $40,000.00 | $40,000.00 | $40,000.00 | $120,000.00 |
| **Lower Grade Industry Enrichment:** Enrichment classes connected to school theme provided by industry partner for students in grades k-5 2 x per week. | $20,000 | $20,000 | $20,000 | $60,000.00 |
| **Professional Development External Provider:** Consultant to provide PD in partnership with school administrators for the bi-monthly pd sessions. | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $30,000.00 |
| **Professional Development External Provider:** Consultant to provide PD for teachers in utilizing positive social/emotional support strategies. | $27,950.00 | $27,950.00 | $27,950.00 | $83,850.00 |
| **Adult Ed Literacy Program:** Community Development Center to provide adult literacy classes to two cohorts of parents. | $10,000.00 | $10,000.00 | $10,000.00 | $30,000.00 |
| **Configuration/set up** cost for Smartboards | $7,650.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $7,650.00 |
| **Total** | $115,600.00 | $107,950.00 | $107,950.00 | $331,500.00 |
| **Supplies and Materials** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Total request** |
| **Instuctional Supplies** for the Extended Day Learning | $13,101.00 | $10,000.00 | $8,000.00 | $31,101.00 |
| **Non-Instructional Supplies** for the Extended Day Learning | $1,239.00 | $6,000.00 | $1,000.00 | $8,239.00 |
| **Technology** | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(Year 1)** 80 (10 Pack) Handheld devices (Apple ipad 16 GB including AppleCare Protection Plan and Auto Enroll) for student use to practice individual skills, enhance classroom instruction and facilitate differentiated learning. **(Year 2)** 40 (10 pk) Ipads **(Year 3)** 40 (10 PK) Ipads | $43,040.00 | $21,520.00 | $21,520.00 | $86,080.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 100 Ipad Covers Apple (Year 2) 40 Ipad Covers **(Year 2)** 40 Ipad Covers **(Year 3)** 40 Ipad Covers | $3,900.00 | $1,560.00 | $1,560.00 | $7,020.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 3 Ipad Carts **(Year 2)** 1 Ipad Cart **(Year 3)** 1 Ipad Cart | $5,400.00 | $1,800.00 | $1,800.00 | $9,000.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 10 Smartboards @ 1,599 | $15,990.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $15,990.00 |
| **(Year 1)** Misc. Materials for Smartboads | $6,510.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $6,510.00 |
| **(Year 1)** 1 Volume Voucher for Educational Apps (Year 2) 1 Volume Voucher for Educational Apps | $1,000.00 | $1,000.00 | $0.00 | $2,000.00 |
| **Total** | $90,180.00 | $41,880.00 | $33,880.00 | $165,940.00 |
| **Equipment** | | | | |
| | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Total request** |
| **Total** | | | | |
| **Other Buses/Refreshments** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Total request** |
| **(Year 1) Student Admissions** 1 field trip each x $10 per student (Year 2) Student Admissions - 1 field trip each x $10 per student. (Year 3) 1 Field trip each x $10 per student. | $4,650.00 | $4,650.00 | $4,650.00 | $13,950.00 |
| **(Year 1)** Student Incentives - 465 Students **(Year 2)** 465 Students **(Year 3)** 465 Students | $20,000.00 | $10,000.00 | $5,000.00 | $35,000.00 |
| **(Year 1)** Transportation-buses for 465 field trips **(Year 2)** Transportation-buses for 465 field trips. **(Year 3)** transportation - buses for 465 field trips. | $4,000.00 | $4,000.00 | $4,000.00 | $12,000.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(Year 1,2,3,)** Registration Fees for 5 staff members for conferences. | $500.00 | $500.00 | $500.00 | $1,500.00 |
| **(Year 1,2,3)** Travel reimbursement for staff members conferences | $800.00 | $800.00 | $800.00 | $2,400.00 |
| **(Year 1,2,3)** Teacher Incentives | $20,000.00 | $20,000.00 | $20,000.00 | $60,000.00 |
| **(Year 1,2,3)** Refeshments for parents/family/staff community | $7,500.00 | $7,500.00 | $7,500.00 | $22,500.00 |
| **Total** | $57,450.00 | $47,450.00 | $42,450.00 | $147,350.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Year One Costs: | $1,944,796.00 |
| Total Year Two Costs: | $1,910,444.00 |
| Total Year Three Costs: | $1,831,617.00 |
| TOTAL DIRECT COSTS: | $5,686,857.00 |

# S-11
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM A
*Personal Services - Salaries*
*Function & Object Codes 100-100 and 200-100*

**REVISED JUNE 24, 2014**

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

**952,184NOTES**: Copy this form. Refer to Part III, Constructing a Grant Application Budget, of the *Discretionary Grant Application* for instructions. Complete all columns. Use multiple lines for a single entry if necessary.

| PROGRAM GOAL/ OBJECTIVE/ ACTIVITY | FUNCTION & OBJECT CODE | POSITION/NAME | COST CALCULATION<br>For **full-time** positions: total annual salary x percent of time to the grant project = total<br>For **part-time** positions: rate ($) per hour x number of hours per week x number of weeks per year = total | GRANT REQUEST AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.5 | 100-100 | **2 FTE** Reading Specialist @ $75,000 | 2 **FTE** Reading Specialist @ $75,000 | ***150,000*** |
| 7a.1 | 100-100 | **Extended Day:** 55 Teachers x 300 hrs x $48 per hours = $792,000. | 55 teachers x 300 hrs x $48 per hours = ***$792,000.*** | ***$792,000.*** |
| 7a.1 | 100-100 | **Extended Day :** 15 Instructional Assistants for 300 hrs x $38 = $171,000 | 15 IA's for Extended Day for 300 hrs x $38 per hr= ***$171,000*** | ***$171,000*** |
| 7a.1 | 100-100 | **Extended Day Substitutes**: Teachers ELO Program and SIG related teacher pull-out professional development<br>30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000 | Substitutes for Teachers : ELO Program and SIG related teacher pull-out professional development<br>30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000 | ***$3,000*** |
| 7a.1 | 200-100 | **Extended Day:** 4 administration salaries x 300 hrs. | 3 administrators x 300 hours x $58 per hour = $52,200. 1 Principal Salary = $60 per hour x 300 hours = $18,000. Totaling = ***$70,200*** | ***$70,200*** |
| 7a.1 | 200-100 | **Extended Day:** at 1nurse $48.x 300 hours=$14,400 for the extended day learning | 1 Nurse x 300 hrs x $48 per hour = ***$14,400.*** | ***$14,400*** |
| 7a.1 | 200-100 | **Extended Day:** 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $38 per hr = $19,000 | 2 Secretaries x 250 hrs x $38 per hour = ***$19,000*** | ***$19,000*** |

100-100 → 1,116,000

200-100 → 103,600

PAGE 1219600

# S-11
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM A
*Personal Services - Salaries*
*Function & Object Codes 100-100 and 200-100*

REVISED JUNE 24, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.3<br>7b.1 | 200-100 | **.75 Data Analysis @ $56,250** | 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $56,250 | ***$56,250*** |
| 5.4<br>7b.4 | 200-100 | **.75 Climate and Culture @ $56,250** | 1 FTE Data Analysis @ $56,250 | ***$56,250*** |
| 7a.1 | 200-100 | **Extended Day:** 1 Security Guard for learning time for extended day leaning time to keep the site safe for all students. | 1 Security Guard x 300 hrs x $38 per hour = ***$11,400.*** | ***$11,400.*** |
| 7a.1 | 200-100 | **Extended Day:** 1 Custodian for 170 days for 1 hr per day @ $39.37 per hr = $6,693.00. | 1 Custodian x 1 hr per day x $39.37 per hr x 170 days = ***6,693.*** | **6,693** |
| 7a.1<br>7b.5 | 200-100 | **Extended Day:** 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 hrs x 38 per hr = $11,400 | 1 Parent Coordinator x 300 hrs x $38per hr = ***11,400*** | ***11,400*** |
| 4.4 | 200-100 | **Professional Development:** 55 Teachers x $48 per hour for 16 hours = $42,240 | Professional Development: 55 Teachers x $48 per hour for 16 hours = $42,240 | ***42,240*** |
| 4.4 | 200-100 | **Professional Development:** 3 Administrators x $58 per hour x 8 hours = $1,392 | Professional Development: 3 Administrators x $58 per hour x 8 hours = $1,392 | ***1,392*** |
| 7a.1 | 200-100 | **Lunch Monitors** for Summer ELO | Lunch Monitors for Summer ELO = $8,438<br>9 Lunch Monitors for Summer ELO x 75 hrs @ 12.50 = $8,438 | ***8,438*** |
| 8.1 | 200-100 | **SIG Supervisor** to be shared within 2 SIG Schools | 1 SIG Supervisor @ $86,000 (.50 Salary) for School 6 | ***43,000*** |
| 4.7 | 200-100 | Professional Development (PLC's) 15 Staff @ 20 hrs @ $34 per hr = 10,200 | Professional Development (PLC's) 15 Staff @ 20 hrs @ $34 per hr = $10,200 | ***10,200*** |
| 1.8 | 200-100 | 3 Administrators x 10 hours x $40 = $1,200 (Leadership Team) | 3 Administrators x 10 hours x $40 = $1,200 (Leadership Team) | ***$1,200*** |
| 1.8 | 200-100 | 10 Teachers x 10 hrs x $34 per hr = $3,400 (Leadership Team) | 10 Teachers x 10 hours x $34 = $3,400 (Leadership Team) | ***$3,400*** |
| | | | ***Total*** | ***$1,471,463*** |

100-100 1116,000 TOTAL 200-100 355,463

PAGE 200-150 251,863

# S-12
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM B
*Personal Services – Employee Benefits*
*Function & Object Code 200-200*

REVISED JUNE 24, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

**NOTES**: Copy this form. Refer to Part III, Constructing a Grant Application Budget, of the *Discretionary Grant Application* for instructions. Complete all columns. Use multiple lines for a single entry if necessary.

| POSITION/NAME | GRANT REQUESTED SALARY AMOUNT | FICA 7.65% | TPAF 14.25% | PERS | WRKR'S COMP | UNEMPLY. | DISABIL. | HEALTH _____ | OTHER SPECIFY: _____ ----------% | TOTAL % OF BENEFITS | GRANT REQUEST AMOUNT (BENEFITS ONLY) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2 FTE Reading Specialist @ $75,000** | **150,000** | **11,475** | **21,375** | | | | | **24,000** | | **38** | **56,850** |
| **Extended Day:** 55 Teachers x 300 hrs x $48 per hour = $792,000. | **792,000** | **60,588** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **60,588** |
| **Extended Day :** 15 Instructional Assistants for 300 hrs x $38 = $171,000 | **171,000** | **13,082** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **13,082** |
| **Substitutes:** Substitutes for Teachers ELO Program and SIG related teacher pull-out professional development 30 teachers @ $100 per day = $3,000 | **3,000** | **230** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **230** |

200-200 ——— 30,750

# S-12
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM B
*Personal Services – Employee Benefits*
*Function & Object Code 200-200*

REVISED JUNE 24, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Extended Day:** 3 VP administration salaries x 300 hrs. x $58 = $52,200 1 Principal x 300 hrs x $60 = 18,000 | **70,200** | **5,370** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **5,370** |
| **Extended Day:** at 1nurse $48.x 300 hours=$14,400 for the extended day learning | **14,400** | **1,102** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **1,102** |
| **Extended Day:** 2 Secretaries x ~~300~~ hrs x $38 per hr = $22,800 | ~~22,800~~ 21,660 | ~~1,744~~ 1454 | | | | | | | | **7.65** | ~~1,744~~ 1454 |
| **1 Data Analysis @ $56,250** | **56,250** | **4,303** | **8,016** | | | | | **12,000** | | **43** | **24,319** |
| **1 Climate & Culture @ $56,250** | **56,250** | **4,303** | **8,016** | | | | | **12,000** | | **43** | **24,319** |
| **Extended Day:** 1 Security Guard for learning time for extended day leaning time to keep the site safe for all students. 300 hours x $38 =11,400 | **11,400** | **872** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **872** |
| **Extended Day:** 1 Custodian for 170 days for 1 hr per day @ $39.37 per hr = $6,693.00. Fica .0765 | **6,693** | **512** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **512** |

200-200
57948

# S-12
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM B
*Personal Services – Employee Benefits*
*Function & Object Code 200-200*

**REVISED JUNE 24, 2014**

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Extended Day:** 1 Parent Coordinator for 300 hrs x $38 per hr = 11,40 | **11,400** | **872** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **872** |
| **Professional Development:** 55 Teachers x $48 per hour for 16 hours = $42,240 | **42,240** | **3,231** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **3,231** |
| **Professional Development:** 3 Administrators x $58 per hour x10 hours = 1,392 | **1,392** | **106** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **106** |
| Lunch Monitors for Summer ELO = 9 x 75 hrs. x $12.50 = $8,438 | **8,438** | **646** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | **646** |
| **SIG Supervisor** to be shared within 2 SIG Schools (.5) for School 6 & NRC @ $43,000each | **43,000** | **3,290** | **6,128** | | | | | **6,000** | | **36** | **15,418** |
| **Professional Development** @ (PLC's) 15 Staff @ 20 hrs @ $34 per hr = $10,200 Fica | **10,200** | **780** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | ***780*** |
| **Leadership Team** 3 Administrators x 10 hrs x $40 per hr = $1,200 | **1,200** | **92** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | ***92*** |
| **Leadership Team** 10 teachers x 10 hrs x $34 per hr = $3,400 | **3,400** | **260** | | | | | | | | **7.65** | ***260*** |
| **Total** | | | | | | | | | | | ***$210,393*** |

200-200

21405 3

# S-12
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM B
*Personal Services – Employee Benefits*
*Function & Object Code 200-200*

REVISED JUNE 24, 2014

| |
|---|
| **NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant** |
| **SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools |

# S-13
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM C
*Purchased Professional and Technical Services*
*Function & Object Codes 100-300 and 200-300*

REVISED June 24, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

**NOTES**: Copy this form. Refer to Part III, Constructing a Grant Application Budget, of the *Discretionary Grant Application* for instructions. Complete all columns. Use multiple lines for a single entry if necessary.

| PROGRAM GOAL/ OBJECTIVE/ ACTIVITY | FUNCTION & OBJECT CODE | DESCRIPTION/PURPOSE | RATE: HOURLY, DAILY, FLAT FEE | TIME REQUIRED | GRANT REQUEST AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7a.4<br>7a.2 | 200-300 | **Middle School University:** College prep classes aligned to school theme provided by university partner for students in grades 6 – 8 2x per week | 100 per class session | 400 classes | 40,000 |
| 7a.3<br>7a.5 | 200-300 | **Lower Grade Industry Enrichment:** Enrichment classes connected to school theme provided by industry partner for students in grades K – 5 2x per week | 50 per class session | 400 classes | 20,000 |
| 4.3<br>4.5 | 200-300 | **Professional Development External Provider:** Consultant to provide professional development in partnership with school administrators for the bi-monthly professional development sessions | 1,000 per day | 10 Days | 10,000 |
| 4.1<br>4.6<br>7b.7<br>7b.10 | 200-300 | **Professional Development External Provider:** Consultant to provide professional development for teachers in utilizing positive social/emotional support strategies | 17 full days @ $1,350 per day<br>5 full workshops @ 1,000 | Total of 17 full days and 5 workshops | 27,950 |
| 7b.2<br>7b.6 | 200-300 | **Adult Ed Literacy Program:** Community Development Center to provide adult literacy classes to two cohorts of parents | 5,000 per cohort | 2 cohorts | 10,000 |
| 5.8 | ~~200-340~~ 200-500 | Configuration/set-up cost for Smartboards | 765 flat fee | 10 classrooms | 7,650 |
| Total | | | | | **$115,600** |

200-300 107,950 J
200-500 7,650 J
1 115,600

**S-13**

**BUDGET DETAIL FORM C**

*Purchased Professional and Technical Services*
*Function & Object Codes 100-300 and 200-300*

REVISED June 24, 2014

| |
|---|
| **NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant** |
| **SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools |

0. *

0. *

75,840. +
5,547. +
7,087. +
467. +
38,941. *

# S-14
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM D
*Supplies and Materials*
*Function & Object Codes 100-600 and 200-600*

Date: April 1, 2014

**provement Grant**
16, Paterson Public Schools

Refer to Part III, Constructing a Grant Application Budget, of the *Discretionary Grant Application* for instructions. multiple lines for a single entry if necessary.

| OBJECTIVE/ ACTIVITY | UNCTION & OBJECT CODE | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT COST (UC) | QUANTITY (Q) | GRANT REQUEST AMOUNT (GR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 80 (10 Pack) Handheld devices (Apple iPad 16GB including AppleCare Protection Plan and Auto Enroll) for student use to practice individual skills, enhance classroom instruction and facilitate differentiated learning. | 538 | 80 | ***43,040*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 100 iPad covers Apple W72055465 | 39 | 100 | ***3,900*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 3 iPad Carts for Security and Charging Station | 1,800 | 3 | ***5,400*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | Volume Voucher for Educational Apps | 1,000 | 1 | ***1,000*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 10 Smartboards @ $1,599 | 1,599 | 10 | ***15,990*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 10 Dry erase boards | 359 | 10 | ***3,590*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 10 VGA Splitter | 42 | 10 | ***420*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 15 VGA + Audio M-M | 26 | 10 | ***260*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 15 HDMI M-M | 21 | 10 | ***210*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 15 USB A-B | 7 | 10 | ***70*** |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 10 VGA = Audio M-M | 22 | 10 | ***220*** ✓ |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 3m USB A-B | 4 | 10 | ***40*** ✓ |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | Misc Materials | 150 | 10 | ***1500*** ✓ |
| 5.8 | 100-600 | 10 HDMI M-M | 20 | 10 | ***200*** ✓ |

100-600 15840 (75840) 1

**S-14**

**BUDGET DETAIL FORM D**

*Supplies and Materials*

*Function & Object Codes 100-600 and 200-600*

Date: April 1, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**

**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.9 | 100-600 | General Supplies for extended day time | | | |
| | | • Composition paper without margin | 4.45 | 300 | 1,335 |
| | | • Dixon Pencils 50 Count | 12.08 | 50 | 604 |
| | | • Composition Note Books 201384 | 3.00 | 173 | 519.00 |
| | | • Dixon Max Crayons 8 404229 BX/8 | 0.50 | 60 | 30.00 |
| | | • Dixon Max Crayons 16 404239 BX/16 | 0.90 | 250 | 225.00 |
| | | • Acme Ruler 12' Clear Staple 398734 | 0.60 | 200 | 120.00 |
| | | • Pendaflex File Folders 3 Tab 812796 | 12.30 | 10 | 123.00 |
| | | • Hanging File Folders 645587 | 12.60 | 20 | 252.00 |
| | | • Binney & Smith Crayola Col. Pencil 300525 | 1.30 | 150 | 195.00 |
| | | • Binney & Smith Crayola Markers BIN587709 | 2.30 | 150 | 345.00 |
| | | • Binney & Smith Crayola Non Washable 860124 | 2.30 | 150 | 345.00 |
| | | • Beginner Pencil w/eraser DIX33312 | 3.50 | 50 | 175.00 |
| | | • Eraser Markers Chisel Tip BLK 742318 | 3.00 | 25 | 75.00 |
| | | • Sanford EXPO Dry-Erase Markers 502195 | 3.40 | 30 | 102.00 |
| | | • Sanford EXPO Erase Markers 742318 | 3.80 | 30 | 114.00 |
| | | • Dry-Erase Markers 742319 | 3.00 | 30 | 90.00 |
| | | • Dry-Erase Markers 502195 | 3.40 | 40 | 136.00 |
| | | • Low Odor Dry-Erase Marker Set 554359 | 8.50 | 20 | 170.00 |
| | | • Elmer's Clear Glue Stick 831987 | 9.50 | 12 | 114.00 |
| | | • Elmer's Glue All Purpose Glue 511246 | 1.25 | 100 | 125.00 |
| | | • Binney & Smith Crayola Chalk 387512 | 0.50 | 40 | 20.00 |
| | | • Binney & Smith Crayola Chalk Assor. 069194 | 0.40 | 20 | 8.00 |
| | | • Swingline Desk Stapler 103846 | 1.50 | 30 | 45.00 |
| | | • OIC Standard Jaws Staple Remover 902631 | 0.80 | 25 | 20.00 |
| | | • 3M Scotch Tape DeskTop Dispenser 567884 | 3.00 | 25 | 75.00 |
| | | • Staples Refillable 130575 | 1.00 | 15 | 15.00 |
| | | • Duck High-Perf. Masking Tape 835793 | 2.00 | 25 | 50.00 |
| | | | 1.20 | 50 | 60.00 |
| | | | 1.20 | 50 | 60.00 |

100-600

5547

5547

# S-14
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM D
*Supplies and Materials*
*Function & Object Codes 100-600 and 200-600*

Date: April 1, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.9 | | • Heavyweight Quadrille Pad AMP22000 | 2.45 | 100 | 245.00 |
| | | • DIXON Driole Presharpened Pencils No.2573932 | 1.60 | 50 | 80.00 |
| | | • BM Post-It Notes Blank Assort Colors 852242 | 7.40 | 25 | 185.00 |
| | | • Pop Up Notes Assort. Pastel 501737 | 10.60 | 10 | 106.00 |
| | | • 3M Post It Office Pack Notes 609828 | 19.40 | 25 | 485.00 |
| | | • 3M Post It Notes Dispenser 461960 | 6.00 | 2 | 12.00 |
| | | • Big Wite-Out Quick Dry Correc Fluid 419036 | 11.00 | 5 | 55.00 |
| | | • Quartet Noiseless Dustless ChalkBD | 1.90 | 10 | 19.00 |
| | | • Sanford Magic Rub 507053 | 4.00 | 25 | 100.00 |
| | | • Staples Arrowhead Cap Eraser Pink | .30 | 50 | 15.00 |
| | | • Ultra Heavy Duty Shipp | 19.80 | 10 | 198.00 |
| | | • DIXON Class PK Pencils 601593 | 11.00 | 25 | 275.00 |
| | | • Esselte Oxford Index Card 517581 | .10 | 30 | 3.00 |
| | | • Index Cards 517730 | 1.60 | 25 | 40.00 |
| | | ◦ Esselte Oxford Index Card 517813 | 2.00 | 25 | 50.00 |
| | | • Economy Top-Tap File Folder Letter Size 474347 | 9.40 | 10 | 94.00 |
| | | • Hanging File Folders Standard Green 521252 | 10. | 10 | 100.00 |
| | | ◦ Pacon Sunworks Construction Paper Assort 871454 | 8.50 | 30 | 255.00 |
| | | ◦ Friskers 5 Scissors 12-Class Pks FSK95017197 | 18.00 | 25 | 450.00 |
| | | • Composition Paper w/o Margin PAC2433 | 4.50 | 150 | 675.00 |
| | | • Handwriting Paper PAC2420 | 6.00 | 150 | 900.00 |
| | | • Storybook Paper Long Way Ruled 826002 | 4.00 | 150 | 600.00 |
| | | • Multi-Program Handwriting Paper PAC2422 | 6.00 | 150 | 900.00 |
| | | • Ruled Newsprint Practice Paper PAC2637 | 3.70 | 150 | 555.00 |
| | | • NewsPrint Unlined PAC3347 | 3.50 | 50 | 175.00 |
| | | • Composition Blank Book 801626 | 2.25 | 100 | 225.00 |
| | | | 1.40 | 100 | 140.00 |
| | | | 1.50 | 100 | 150.00 |
| | | | | 100-600 | 7087 |

# S-14
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM D
*Supplies and Materials*
*Function & Object Codes 100-600 and 200-600*

Date: April 1, 2014

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.9 | | • Bright 20lb Pink Sheet/RM 490878<br>• Bright 24lb Fuchsia 500 Sheets 733095<br>• Bright 20lb Yellow 500 Sheets 490954<br>• Astrobright Paper 24lb Terra Yellow 491164<br>• Astrobright Paper Green 495469<br>• Bright 20 lb Blue 490955<br>• Twin Pocket Light Blue 907693<br>• Elmer Corrugated Projected BD White 610511 | 10.50<br>11.00<br>10.00<br>12.00<br>19.00<br>10.00<br>5.75<br>52.00 | 2<br>1<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>40<br>1 | 21.00<br>11.00<br>30.00<br>36.00<br>57.00<br>30.00<br>230.00<br>52.00 467 |
| 5.9 | 200-600 | Flexible 1" Binders 614451 | 3.00 | 25 | 75.00 |
| 5.9 | 200-600 | 2" Binders 354069 | 8.50 | 10 | 85.00 |
| 5.9 | 200-600 | 3"Binders 358177 (6 per box) | 31.00 | 9 | 279.00 |
| 4.8 | 200-600 | *Teach Like a Champion* by Doug Lemov | 16.00 | 50 | 800 1239 |
| | | ***Total*** | | | ***$90,180*** |

100-600 4,467 ✓

200-600 1239 ✓

1706

REVISED JUNE 24, 2014

# S-16

## BUDGET DETAIL FORM F

*Other Purchased Services, Other Objects, Purchased Property Services, Travel, Indirect Costs, **Buildings***
*Function & Object Codes 100-500, 100-800, 200-400, 200-500, 200-580, 200-800, 200-860, 400-720*

| |
|---|
| **NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant** |
| **SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools |

REVISED JUNE 24, 2014

# S-16
## BUDGET DETAIL FORM F

*Other Purchased Services, Other Objects, Purchased Property Services, Travel, Indirect Costs, Buildings*
*Function & Object Codes 100-500, 100-800, 200-400, 200-500, 200-580, 200-800, 200-860, 400-720*

**NGO TITLE: School Improvement Grant**
**SCHOOL NAME:** School 6, Paterson Public Schools

**NOTES**: Copy this form. Refer to Part III, Constructing a Grant Application Budget, of the *Discretionary Grant Application* for instructions. Complete all columns. Use multiple lines for a single entry if necessary.

| PROGRAM GOAL/ OBJECTIVE/ ACTIVITY | FUNCTION & OBJECT CODE | DESCRIPTION/COST CALCULATION | GRANT REQUEST AMOUNT |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7a.8 | 100-800 | **Student Admissions** (1) field trip each student (465) students x $10 per student (Botto House, Ellis Island, United Nations, Paterson Museum, County Courthouse Mock Trials, etc) | ***$4,650*** ✓ |
| 3.3 | 100-800 | **Student Incentives** (465) students<br>Quarterly Honor Roll Luncheons – (8) Luncheons x 50 Students x $10 each = $4,000<br>Grade 6 – 8 Washington DC Culminating Trip – 50 Students x $240 each = $12,000<br>Grade K – 5 Book Trip – 100 Students x $40 each = $4,000 | ***$20,000*** ✓ |
| 7a.9 | 200-500 | **Transportation** for field trips for (465) students, teachers, and parents. 10 buses @ $400 = 4,000 (Botto House, Ellis Island, United Nations, Paterson Museum, County Courthouse Mock Trials, etc) | ***$4,000*** ✓ |
| 4.10 | 200-500 | **Registration fees** for conferences (5 staff members x 1 conference x $100/conference = $500) (Local university and research-based provided conferences aligned to school needs) | ***$500*** ✓ |
| 1.9 | 200-580 | **Travel reimbursement** for (4) Administrators x 600 miles per Administrator x .31 = $744 + $56 tolls = $800 for NJDOE Meetings | ***$800*** ✓ |
| 3.2<br>5.5 | 200-800 | **Teacher Incentives** (40 teachers x $500/incentive = $20,000, yearly incentive based on student achievement for materials from vendors such as Scholastic and Teacher Created materials for a program that is over and above the normal classroom time. | ***$20,000*** ✓ |
| 7b.9 | 200-800 | **Refreshments** for parents/family/staff community outreach nights ($400 x 10 monthly parent meetings + $700 x 5 parent professional development workshops = $7,500) | ***7,500*** ✓ |
| | | ***Total*** | ***$57,450*** |

~~add: Configuration/set-up Smartboards (200-500 – 7550)~~

100-800 / 24,650 ✓
200-500 / 4500 ✓
200-580 / 800 ✓
200-800 / 27500 ✓
57450

FINAL

**Form S-17**
**NJ DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**
REVISED 6/24/14

# APPLICATION FOR FUNDS - BUDGET SUMMARY

LEA Name: Paterson Public Schools

School Name: School 6 County/LEA/School Code: 31 / 4010 /

NGO Title: School Improvement Grant (Cohort 2 – Year2) NGO#:

| BUDGET CATEGORY | FUNCTION & OBJECT CODE | GRANT FUNDS REQUESTED STATE FUNDS (Column 1) | FEDERAL FUNDS (Column 2) | SIG FUNDS (Column 3) | SIG ADMIN COST SUMMARY (Column 4) | SIG TOTAL Sum of columns 3 &4 (Column 5) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| INSTRUCTION | | | | | | |
| Personal Services - Salaries | 100-100 | | | 1,116,000 | | 1,116,000 |
| Purchased Professional & Technical Services | 100-300 | | | | | |
| Other Purchased Services | 100-500 | | | | | |
| Supplies and Materials | 100-600 | | | 88,941 | | 88,941 |
| Other Objects | 100-800 | | | 24,650 | | 24,650 |
| **SUBTOTAL - INSTRUCTION** | | | | 1,229,591 | | 1,229,591 |
| SUPPORT SERVICES | | | | | | |
| Personal Services - Salaries | 200-100 | | | 355,463 | | 355,463 |
| Personal Services – Employee Benefits | 200-200 | | | ~~210,393~~ 210103 | | ~~210,393~~ 210 |
| Purchased Professional & Technical Services | 200-300 | | | ~~115,325~~ 107450 | | 115,325 107 |
| Subgrant Cost Summary | 200-320 | | | | | |
| Purchased Property Services | 200-400 | | | | | |
| Other Purchased Services | 200-500 | | | 4,500 12150 | | 4,500 12150 |
| Travel | 200-580 | | | 800 | | 800 |
| Supplies and Materials | 200-600 | | | 1,239 | | 1,239 |
| Other Objects | 200-800 | | | 27,500 | | 27,500 |
| Indirect Costs | 200-860 | | | | | |
| **SUBTOTAL - SUPPORT SERVICES** | | | | ~~715,220~~ 715205 | | ~~715,220~~ 715 |
| | | | | | | |
| Buildings | 400-720 | | | | | |
| Instructional Equipment | 400-731 | | | | | |
| Noninstructional Equipment | 400-732 | | | | | |
| **SUBTOTAL - FACILITIES** | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL COST** | | | | ~~1,944,811~~ 1944796 | | ~~1,944,811~~ 1944 |

Richard Kilpatrick
School Business Administrator/Chief Fiscal Officer

Date