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|   MAINE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  **Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)****Comprehensive Needs Assessment** **and** **SAU Consolidated Plan** C:\A97A5A85\AB06B948-4C96-4D56-90F5-15A480A36353_files\image001.png   |
| MSAD/SAU/RSU: State of Maine School Name: All Schools Contact Person: Chelsey Fortin-Trimble Mailing Address: 23 State House Station, Augusta, ME  Telephone: 624-6815 Email Address: Chelsey.a.fortin@maine.gov   |
| Superintendent (Printed Name): MAINE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EXEMPLAR | Telephone:   |
| Signature of the Superintendent  X\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  | Date:   |
| **For all schoolwide applicants, the needs assessment should be submitted to the Maine Department of Education Title I Office by July 1. Please list schools that are submitting individual schoolwide applications:** **Schoolwide applications should complete section 10. This section will be reviewed with a different rubric.**  A hard copy should be mailed to: Maine Department of EducationTitle I: Schoolwide23 State House StationAugusta, ME 04333-0023 |   |
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| **Section 1: Planning Team****1a. List the names of people and programs represented in the development of this plan. (Each group should have at least one participant. In the final SAU submission, please be sure to include an equitable selection of building and instructional leaders.)**  |
| **Name(s)** | **Title** |
|   | Parent(s)/Guardian(s) |
|   | Teacher(s) |
| **Chelsey Fortin-Trimble**  | **Federal Programs & Title I Director**  |
|  | School Administrator(s) |
| **Michele Mailhot (Mathematics Specialist), Morgan Dunton (ELA/Literacy Specialist)** | **Regional Representative** |
| **Chuck Lomonte** | **Title II Coordinator** |
|  | Community Member(s) |
| **Gayle Erdheim** | **Homeless Education Liaison** |
| **Richard Bergeron** | **Data Administrator**  |
| **April Perkins** | **Acting Title III: ESOL/Bilingual Education Director** |
| **Janette Kirk**  | **Deputy Director, OLS** |
| **Andrew Hudacs**  | **Director of Assessment**  |
| **1b. Describe how the team members were selected including dates of meetings, topics discussed, and outcomes from each meeting. Acceptable documentation includes meeting minutes, attendance sheets, and action plan documents.** **Maine DOE specialists and federal programs staff members from across the Department took responsibility for sections of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment most relevant to their work and responsibilities. Large group planning meetings were held to incorporate all elements into the plan in addition to small focused work group meetings to populate specific sections of the plan. The Department also utilized One Note to complete the work and provide ongoing access to the document and plan to all team members.**  |   |
| **1c. Describe how the team will communicate with the school and community.****Maine DOE will post this exemplar on the DOE website, in the Newsroom, and through distribution lists, as well as use during technical assistance sessions across the state. The Department continues to explore natural intersections of work between teams on the floor to reduce duplication of work, provide focused professional development and leverage all available resources to their greatest capacity.**  |   |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Data Collection and Analysis**   |

***Collection***

**Disaggregated Data Required:**

* 1. **Student Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year 2014-15** |   |   | **Year 2015-16** |   |   | **Year 2016-17** |   |   |
|   | **#** | **%** | **State Average** | **#** | **%** | **State Average** | **#** | **%** | **State Average** |
| All students |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Male |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Female |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Asian |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Black or African American |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Hispanic or Latino |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| White |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Two or more races |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) |   |   | **16.4 %** |  |  | **16.7%** |  |  | **17.2%** |
| English Learners (ELs) |   |   | **2.9%** |  |  | **2.9%** |  |  | **2.9%** |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students |   |   | **46.55%** |  |  | **47.64%** |  |  | **47.48%** |
| Homeless Students |   |   | **1.1%** |  |  | **1.2%** |  |  | **1.5%** |
| Migratory Students |   |   | **0.3%** |  |  | **0.3%** |  |  | **0.2%** |

* 1. **Title I**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year  | Program Enrollment | Population % |
| 2014 - 15 | **35,555** | **19.38%** |
| 2015 - 16 | **37,345** | **20.53%** |
| 2016 - 17 | **37,022** | **20.58%** |

* 1. **Community Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year 2014-15** |   |   | **Year 2015-16** |   |   | **Year 2016-17** |   |   |
|   | **#** | **%** | **State Average** | **#** | **%** | **State Average** | **#** | **%** | **State Average** |
| Community Members |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Male |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Female |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Asian |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Black or African American |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Hispanic or Latino |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| White |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Two or More Races |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Teacher Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year 2014-15** |   |   | **Year 2015-16** |   |   | **Year 2016-17** |   |   |
|   | **#** | **%** | **State Average** | **#** | **%** | **State Average** | **#** | **%** | **State Average** |
| Teachers |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Male |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Female |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| American Indian or Alaska Native |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Asian |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Black or African American |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Hispanic or Latino |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| White |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Two or more races |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Homeless Students Identified**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | State Average | Total Identified  | % of Total Student Population |
| 2014-15 | **1.1%** |  |  |
| 2015-16 | **1.2%** |  |  |
| 2016-17 | **1.5%** |  |  |

* 1. **English Learners** (if n count 5 or more, must complete chart: 6; if n count 20 or more, must complete Section 7)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Program # | Population % |
| 2014-15 | **5283** | **2.9** |
| 2015-16 | **5181** | **2.9** |
| 2016-17 |  |  |

* 1. **Student Behavior** (# of incidents)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Substantiated Incidents of Bullying | Restraints & Seclusions# of Instances | Illicit Drug Related | Alcohol Related | Weapons Possession | Violent Incident (with physical injury) | Violent Incident (without physical injury) | Other(identify using method chosen by school) |
| 2014-15 | **32** | **89** | **714** | **111** | **70** |  |  |  |
| 2015-16 | **29** | **53** | **792** | **122** | **57** |  |  |  |
| 2016-17 | **15** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. **Student Discipline - Expulsion**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | ExpulsionTotal | Student Population % Expelled | Expulsion with ServicesTotal | Expulsion without ServicesTotal |
| 2014-15 |   |   | **data suppressed** | **data suppressed** |
| 2015-16 |   |   | **data suppressed** | **data suppressed** |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Student Discipline –Suspension**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Year | SuspensionTotal | Student Population % Suspended | Special Education % Suspended | Out of School SuspensionsTotal | In School SuspensionsTotal | Removal to an Interim Alt Ed Setting by School Personnel | Removal to an Interim Alt Ed Setting by a Hearing Officer |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   | **1249** | **390** | **suppressed value** | **unavailable in DW** |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   | **740** | **166** | **suppressed value** | **unavailable in DW** |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Student Discipline - Consequences** (# of intentions used)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   Year | Community Service | Juvenile Justice Referral | Law Enforcement Referral | Restitution | Substance Abuse Counseling  | Substance Abuse Treatment  | Conflict Resolution or Anger Management  | Counseling  |
| 2014-15  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Student Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | ADA | Tardy % | % of Students Approaching Chronically Absent (missing 5-9% of total school days)  | % of Students Chronically Absent(missing 10% or more of total school days) | % of Students Truant |
| 2014-15  | **94.2** | **data not collected at state level** |  |   |   |
| 2015-16 | **94.4** | **data not collected at state level** |   |   | **2.2%** |
| 2016-17  |   |   |   |  | **2.6%** |

* 1. **High School Graduation Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year | 4 Year Cohort | 5 Year Cohort |
| 2014-15 | **86%** |  |
| 2015-16 | **86%** |  |
| 2016-17 | **unavailable** |  |

* 1. **Educational Opportunities Coursework** (High School)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Advanced Placement Enrollment | CTE Enrollment | Early College Enrollment  | Dual or Concurrent Enrollment  | Other  |
| 2014-15 | **1474** | **7922** | **219** | **688** |   |
| 2015-16 | **1069** | **8510** | **239** | **724** |   |
| 2016-17 | **Not available** | **8133** | **183** | **1124** |   |

* 1. **Literacy: Data Source # 1** MEA/State Assessment [information gathered from [MAARS](https://lms.backpack.education/public/maine)]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % | Grade 3: % | Grade 4: % | Grade 5: % | Grade 6: % | Grade 7: % | Grade 8: % | Grade 11: % |
| 2014-15\* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 | **50.58** | **48.03** | **52.33** | **52.01** | **46.33** | **47.62** | **48.39** | **59.63** |
| 2016-17 | **52.56** | **48.75** | **51.58** | **55.23** | **49.66** | **52.23** | **51.56** | **59.06** |

\*state assessment data not available (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium)

<https://lms.backpack.education/public/maine> Interactive Reports

* 1. **Literacy (Reading only): Data Source # 2** [National Assessment of Education Progress](http://www.maine.gov/doe/naep/) (NAEP)\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % | Grade 4: % | Grade 8:% |
| 2014-15 | **n/a** | **35%** | **41%** |
| 2015-16 |  |  |  |
| 2016-17\*\* |  |  |  |

\*Data available for grades 4 and 8

\*\*results not yet available

Districts should be using local data to complete the reports.

* 1. **Mathematics: Data Source # 1** MEA/State Assessment [information gathered from [MAARS](https://lms.backpack.education/public/maine)]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % | Grade 3: % | Grade 4: % | Grade 5: % | Grade 6: % | Grade 7: % | Grade 8: % | Grade 11  |
| 2014-15\* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 | **38.31** | **48.57** | **39.87** | **35.57** | **33.28** | **40.07** | **35.42** | **35.26** |
| 2016-17 | **38.54** | **45.94** | **43.72** | **35.81** | **32.90** | **41.21** | **35.28** | **34.87** |

\*state assessment data not available (Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium)

<https://lms.backpack.education/public/maine> Interactive Reports

* 1. **Mathematics: Data Source # 2** [National Assessment of Education Progress](http://www.maine.gov/doe/naep/) (NAEP)\*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % | Grade 4: % | Grade 8: % |
| 2014-15 |   | 23% | 30% |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |
| 2016-17\*\* |   |   |   |

Data available for grades 4 and 8

\*\*results not yet available

**Districts should be using local data to complete the reports.**

* 1. **Principal Profile**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Year(s) in the Role | Year(s) in the Role at Current School  | Level of Education  |  Bachelor’s Degree |  Master’s Degree |  Ph.D | ProfessionalPrincipal Certificate |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |

* 1. **Educator Profile**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | # of Classroom Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers  | Level of Education  |  % with Bachelor’s Degree |  % with Master’s Degree |  % with Ph.D. | Number of Years in the Classroom  |  % with Professional Certificate |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

***Analysis***

|  |
| --- |
| **2a. Describe your comprehensive needs assessment process, including your data sources. A robust comprehensive report will include multiple data sources that are triangulated and disaggregated.** * + **Statewide data is available for each grade 3-8 (eMPowerME) and 11 (SAT).**
	+ **Statewide data is also available for NAEP which only tests grades 4 and 8 in Maine, every two years (odd number years).**

**These two data sources are analyzed for consistency at the student performance level by grade level and also by subgroups. This allows us to verify interpretation of state data and helps us to clarify achievement levels, even though the two assessments are aligned to different standards.**  **At the school level, summative *and* formative data should be used. Districts should be using *local* data to complete the reports.**  **Attendance data is collected . . .** **Behavior and discipline data is collected and analyzed when . . .**  |
| **2b. Describe how your school collects data, analyzes, and responds to student absenteeism, tardiness, and truancy. Consider whether there are any specific demographic, grade span, or other subgroups that have unusually high attendance issues. Consider the outcomes of the attendance interventions your school employs.** **Statewide attendance, tardiness, and absenteeism data is currently not available. School and district level data should be locally available. Average daily attendance data at the school, district, and state level can be found in the MEDOE Data Warehouse. Local attendance data can be reviewed to examine and track chronic absenteeism of students.**   |
| **2c. Describe your data collection process for student behavior. Identify procedures used to determine substantiated behavior. Delineate student behavior based on grade span (PreK-5, 6-8, 9-12) and describe instructional and environmental supports.****State, district, and school level behavioral data is available in the MEDOE Data Warehouse.****Substantiated behavior is determined by . . .** **In PK - 5, student behavior is addressed by . . .** **In grades 6-8, student behavior is addressed by . . . .****In grades 9-12, student behavior is addressed by . . .**  |
| **2d. Describe your student disciplinary consequences in relation to the student code of conduct.** **Identify positive and restorative interventions that are evidence-based.**  |
| **2e. Describe any *challenges or limitations* that exist locally that hinder effective use of data and technology to both inform professional development and support student instruction.*** + **Results from annual assessment are available during the summer and analysis takes place as quickly as possible. Professional development in response to the most recent data begins in the fall and continues throughout the school year. Summer institutes provide deep foundations for the coming school year.**
	+ **Digging deeply into data is challenging as grades 3-8 data has not included released test items to provide exemplars for professional development.**
	+ **Maine DOE has provided limited support for instructional strategies to support classroom instruction in response to assessment data.**
	+ **While reports in grades 3-8 provide raw scores for items in sub-score categories, the scores are not reported as percentages nor are they provided as growth or vertical scale indicators that equate directly to performance levels.**
	+ **Practitioners may not understand how to make effective use of sub-score and subgroup information. Significant targeted professional support may be helpful.**

   |
| **2f. Describe your findings in consultation with families, teachers, and students (surveys, interviews, focus groups, questionnaires).** **Not all Maine DOE share the same level of understanding regarding the complexities associated with assessments and interpretation of data. Reports are currently provided in table format which may not be transparent in reporting data or easily understandable by parents. The Maine DOE will continue to explore strategies to engage with educators and families to ensure reporting and communication is more fluid and transparent.** |
| **2g. Review your data on homeless students looking especially for trends in: age/grade, numbers of unaccompanied and runaway youth, preschool aged children, geographic patterns, stability of attendance, academic progress and graduation, and delays in enrollment. Attempt to verify that your students who have been identified as homeless are automatically connected to the supports for which they are eligible (e.g. school nutrition programs, Title IA programs) and that you are able to evaluate whether homeless students have full access to all opportunities the school provides.****State level data is available on the Maine DOE homeless education web page and from the National Center for Homeless Education (**[nche.ed.gov](file:///C%3A/Users/gayle.erdheim/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/072O6TBC/nche.ed.gov)**). This data is collected from district enrollment information, so school and district level data should be locally available. Schools should be able to verify that homeless students have been identified as eligible for Title IA supports and free school meals.** |
| **2h. Summarize findings as to the strengths and areas for improvement of your current program as revealed through data analysis.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength: ELA/Literacy*** + **At grade 11, roughly 60% of students scored at or above state expectations in 2015/16 and 2016/17.**
		- **The Sat essay scores reveal that students understand the stimulus material (reading score average 5 of 8 possible points) and have an essential ability to craft a written response (writing score average 5 of 8 possible points).**
		- **Analysis of items suggests that students are more comfortable with literacy text analysis than other content areas.**
		- **Students are also generally understanding how to make meaning of words in context.**

 * + **In grades 3-8, 49% of students scored at or above state expectations in 2015/16 and 52% in 2016/17. This overall score shows a slight improvement, and white, female, and Asian students scored above the overall average in both years.**

 *Note: Possible points earned in sub-scores do not equate to proficiency within the sub-scores. Comparisons of percentage of possible points earned within a sub-score can only be made within a grade, not across grades. Percentage of possible points earned for comparisons between years is used, as the possible number of points in the sub-scores can vary from year to year. Information from this type of analysis can be used to make curricular decisions.* | **Possible Action Steps*** + - **Leverage close reading strategies to identify opportunities for learning transfer and independence.**
		- **Highlight standards that reflect strong student performance. Then, identify standards for additional professional development support to better understand implementation and enhance student learning.**
		- **Continue instructional practices that teach vocabulary through text-based methods.**
		- **GRADES 3-8: Local assessment data is needed to determine strengths and weaknesses within the ELA/literacy content area.**

  |
| **Area for Improvement: ELA/Literacy*** + **In grade 11, 41% of students score below state expectations. Economically disadvantaged, black or African American, special education, and English learners scored significantly lower than all students overall.**
		- **Overall scores for the SAT essay reveal that analysis is a weak area for most students, significantly lower in most cases. The average student score for analysis is roughly 3 of 8 points.**
		- **Analysis of the lowest performing items suggests that students struggle to analyze texts typically found in history/social studies and science content areas. In writing, expression of ideas is a consistent challenge.**

 * + **In grades 3-8, male students scored lower than females and black or African American, special education, and English learners scored significantly lower than the state average.**
 | **Possible Action Steps*** + - **Increase direct instruction of comprehension and analysis of informational text in lower grades.**
		- **Access grade level texts and model close reading strategies that focus on author craft, text structures and features, and use of evidence to support analysis.**
		- **Provide professional development for all teachers to better understand direct instruction of literacy skills in each content area including what makes content texts challenging.**
		- **Enhance writing instruction to elevate the use of source-based evidence to improve writing.**
		- **GRADES 3-8: Local assessment data is needed to determine strengths and weaknesses within the ELA/literacy content area.**
 |
| **Strength**: **mathematics*** + **In grade 11, roughly 35% of students scored at or above state expectations in 2015/16 and 2016/17.**
		- **Analysis of items suggests that students are more comfortable with multiple choice items, particularly those that are more procedurally based (plug and chug) rather than those that are conceptually based, and are located in the calculator active portion of the assessment.**

 * + **In grades 3-8, 39% of students scored at or above state expectations in 2015/2016 and in 2016/17.**
		- **Analysis of the percentage of possible points earned in the sub scores shows an increase from 2015/16 to 2016/17, in grades 3-8, for the Numbers, Operation, & Algebraic Reasoning and Mathematics Processes categories.**
		- **In grades 6-8, analysis of the percentage of possible points earned also increased in the Geometry, Statistics & Probability category from 2015/16 to 2016/17.**
		- **In grades 3 & 5, analysis of the percentage of possible points earned also increased in the Geometry, Measurement & Data category from 2015/16 to 2016/17.**

 *Note: Possible points earned in sub scores do not equate to proficiency within the sub scores. Comparisons of percentage of possible points earned within a sub score can only be made within a grade, not across grades. Percentage of possible points earned for comparisons between years is used, as the possible number of points in the sub scores can vary from year to year. Information from this type of analysis can be used to make curricular decisions.* | **Possible Action Steps** * + - **Leverage problem solving strategies to identify opportunities for learning transfer and independence.**
		- **Highlight standards that reflect strong student performance. Then, identify standards for additional professional development support to better understand implementation and enhance student learning.**
		- **Continue instructional practices that support procedural fluency through conceptual understanding, with and without the use of a calculator.**
		- **GRADES 3-8 & 11: Local assessment data is needed to determine strengths and weaknesses within the math content area.**

  |
| **Area for Improvement: mathematics****Student performance reflects weakness with conceptual items*** + **In grade 11, 65% of students score below state expectations. Economically disadvantaged, black or African American, special education, and English learners scored significantly lower than all students overall.**
		- **Analysis of the lowest performing items suggests that students struggle with grid-in items on both non-calculator and calculator sessions.**
		- **Analysis of the items suggests that students struggle with items that focus on concepts and modeling relationships, rather than solving for the solution.**

 * + **In grades 3-8, 61% of students score below state expectations. Economically disadvantaged, black or African American, special education, and English learners scored significantly lower than all students overall.**
 | **Possible Action Steps** * + - **Increase direct instruction of developing procedural fluency through conceptual understanding.**
		- **Access grade level problems that support identifying relationships between quantities, support students in modeling these relationships through visual and mathematical representations without the need for finding the solutions.**
		- **Provide professional development for all teachers to better understand direct instruction of supporting conceptual understanding, modeling relationships visually and mathematically, without necessarily solving for a solution.**
		- **GRADES 3-8 & 11: Local assessment data is needed to determine strengths and weaknesses within the math content area.**

  |
| **Area for Improvement**    | **Possible Action Steps**   |

 |
| **2i. After determining the strengths and areas for improvement of the current school programs, the needs assessment process requires research-based solutions to be identified. This process should overlap other district/school initiatives for school improvement. Describe what best practices were reviewed, any visits made to high achieving schools, the techniques used to solicit whole staff and parent input to the plan, and how solutions were matched to priority needs.** **The Maine DOE implements a State School Improvement team that meets on a monthly basis to review the work, determine next steps and review any pertinent data and feedback related to school improvement indicators. The Maine DOE provides access to DirigoStar, a dynamic school improvement management tool to currently identified schools which contains embedded best practice research around school improvement core priorities. The State team reviews annual surveys provided to identified schools to determine summer institutes and embedded school year regional professional development sessions.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 3: Professional Practice**  |
| **3a. Describe teachers’ process for assessing student progress (frequency, evaluation methods, and recording).** **Maine SAUs submit on an annual basis performance reports to the ESEA Federal Programs team. SAUs are required to review outcome performance indicators set as part of the application process and report upon progress made. The ESEA Federal Programs team utilizes the performance report data during the annual ESEA Consolidated Application for federal funds. Team members maintain documentation of review notes in order to ensure allowability and compliance with ESSA.**  **Schools identified for support complete on a quarterly basis a status report providing a snap shot in time regarding the focus of the work to date and completion of development tasks. School improvement coaches complete a semi-annual review of assigned schools and a synopsis of the work to date and next steps for development.**  **For Title II teachers and/or administrators may use a variety of state/local common assessments to assess student progress. Evaluation methods are articulated through the application process through measurable goals. Goals may be utilized for data analysis to identify areas of strength and weakness for identification of professional development needs as well as programmatic needs.** **Teachers have made decisions about common assessments to include for assessing student progress including NWEA, Local ELA and Math Benchmark Assessments, and the State Assessment. Cut scores are established through our content area PLC's for each subject area and grade level. Decisions are also made through these PLC's regarding frequency (schedule) of administration, frequency of reporting, and method of reporting for each assessment in each content area. Analysis of student data will also include any external variables that could impact achievement.**   |
| **3b. Describe teachers’ and instructional teams’ process for creating and maintaining individual instruction plans for students based on achievement data.** **The Maine DOE school improvement team meets on a monthly basis to discuss wins and challenges with the schools to which they are assigned. This is also a time for coaches to calibrate their work and thinking regarding expectations around a specific indicator.**  **Data is provided as a part of the process mentioned above. It is then analyzed by teams of teachers. The team will also hear from support personnel regarding students’ habits of work, social and emotional wellness, and any other external factors including supplemental services and/or special needs identification etc. Students identified as a high risk by the team will be evaluated every 4-6 weeks, based on the student needs. Each student will be assigned a "case manager" that consolidates all data to develop a personalized learning plan that is specific to the student's strengths and areas for growth. The school team analyzes each student a minimum of once per trimester using** [**PLP Template**](http://education.vermont.gov/sites/aoe/files/documents/edu-personalized-learning-sample-template.pdf)**.**  |
| **3c. Describe the specific supplemental intervention and strategies that maintain the integrity of included programs to ensure the needs of the students targeted by those programs are being met.** **Supplemental supports and interventions to SAUs are conducted due a variety of reasons including:** * + **As a result of an ESEA Desk monitoring review/audit and associated findings**
	+ **Invoicing irregularities and concerns**
	+ **Requested technical assistance from the SAU**

 **The leadership team will hear from support personnel regarding students’ habits of work, social and emotional wellness, and any other external factors including supplemental services and/or special needs identification etc. Students identified as a high risk by the team will be evaluated more often (possibly weekly) depending on their level of need. “The three levels of support/need are; High Need- Students receive a myriad of interventions specific to their individual need, Moderate Need- Students receive interventions specific to their individual need, these students can often benefit from short term interventions. Low Need- These students need minimal amounts of intervention/ monitoring.**  |
| **3d. Describe district support for program implementation. Include individuals’ names, titles, and assigned responsibilities.** **Supports are provided to SAUs through a variety of sources including:*** + **Regional Title I network meetings (Title IA staff)**
	+ **Regional Superintendent meetings (Regional Representatives)**
	+ **Regional School Improvement Professional Development Seminars**
	+ **Summer Literacy Institute**

  **State Model:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** | **Responsibilities** | **Caseload** | **Timeline** |
| **CL** | **Principal** | **Oversight/Facilitation of Content Area PLC's and Team Meetings** | **-** | **On-going** |
| **JV** | **Assistant Principal** | **Facilitation of Content Area PLC's and Team Meetings** | **-** | **On-going** |
| **SD** | **ELA Literacy Coach** | **Facilitation of Content Area PLC's** |  **AT, IA, KL** | **Weekly**  |
| **PP** | **Gr. 8 Social Studies Teacher** | **Case Manage / Team Mtg Participant** | **AC, PD, IR, LM, AT** | **Daily Team Meetings** |
| **KB** | **Gr. 8 Math Teacher** | **Case Manage / Team Mtg Participant** | **JK, LM, GA** | **Daily Team Meetings/ Content area PLCs** |

 |
| **3e. Articulate at minimum three clear, measurable, attainable, and timely goals you have created based on your needs assessment. Also, detail specific changes in the instructional program that you will implement in order to achieve said goals. If you have identified areas beyond instruction such as counseling, aspirations, or other related services, please include those items here.****District and School Goals:**  **Goal #1: Academic and School Improvement- Improve teacher use of evidence-based instructional strategies to support student achievement in mathematics and English language arts.** **Indicator: (Assessment or mechanism used to track progress in meeting goal): Teacher Surveys and Self-Reflections** **2017-2018 Outcomes :** * + **90% Of teachers involved in the professional development or coaching will report implementation of new and already learned strategies as measured by district surveys and self-reflections.**
	+ **80% Of the students will exhibit expected growth (40th SGP) from fall to spring on reading assessment for grades 1-4**

  **Goal #2 Academic and School Improvement- Improve teacher use of evidence-based instructional strategies to support student achievement in mathematics and English language arts.** **Indicator: (Assessment or mechanism used to track progress in meeting goal): Teacher Surveys and reflections.** **2017-2018 Outcomes:*** + **100% of teachers will report implement of new strategies as measured by district surveys and reflections.**

 **For schoolwide authority, schools should be sure to include at minimum of one math achievement goal and one ELA achievement goal.**   |
| **3f. Describe how the district will carry out its plans for comprehensive interventions and supports and targeted interventions and supports.**  **The Maine DOE will gather data from submitted SAU CNA/SAU Consolidated Plans to determine overarching areas of challenge across the state in order to determine next steps in providing statewide, regional and district supports to meet identified needs.**   |
| **3g. Describe how teachers and school leaders will identify the eligible children in need of these services in consultation with parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and specialized instructional support personnel in schools operating a targeted assistance school program (under 1115-ESSA).** **Upon review of the CNA/SAU Consolidated Plan data the Maine DOE will monitor and track areas of challenge across the state. Supports and interventions will be targeted to regions within the state demonstrating a high need in similar areas of focus or concern. Ongoing conversations will be maintained with SAU superintendents and key central office staff to ensure necessary supports are received.**  **A criterion for eligibility is program specific. This should be determined in partnership between school and district leadership teams.**  |
| **3h. Describe how the SAU will improve strategies to facilitate effective transitions for students from middle school to high school, and from high school to post-secondary, such as coordination with institutions of higher education, employers, and other local partners and increased student access to early college, dual or concurrent enrollment opportunities or career counseling.** * + - * **Common Activities between grade levels**
			* **Reading Buddies etc.**
			* **Freshman and Grade 6 orientation days**
			* **Orientation activities between buildings**
			* **EOY Academic Parent-Teacher Teams**
			* **Visitations to CTE's by younger grade levels**

  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 4: Personnel Policy and Procedures**  |
| **4a. Describe how professional learning for educators is aligned with classroom observations and teacher evaluations.**  * + **School Leaders are following district professional practice model. (This should be detailed from the local perspective).**
	+ **Data from observations and evaluations inform professional learning needs. (This should be detailed from the local perspective).**
	+ **District's Leadership role is to help principals and administrators practice and improve their coaching skills to improve teacher quality. (This should be detailed from the local perspective).**

  |
| **4b. How does professional learning coordinate with other professional development requirements and opportunities available district-wide, as aligned to the data analysis?****Leadership Team should review staff surveys and review evaluation data to determine district PD needs for staff. The use of the data from data team should help inform PD needs. (e.g. Students that are identified as ELs are struggling in the areas of math and science and are disproportionately not meeting standards). This data would inform Leadership Team to give all staff PD opportunities in meeting the needs of ELs.**  |
| **4c. Describe district and school procedures and protocols for recruiting, evaluating, rewarding, and replacing instructional staff.*** + **Post online**
	+ **Local newspaper ad**
	+ **Share with other schools/organizations**
	+ **Other states have merit pay**
	+ **Replace instructional staff**
	+ **Collaboration with Universities**
	+ **Building Leadership Pipeline Locally**
	+ **Encourage Teacher Leadership/Building Leadership**

  |
| **4d. Describe the district and school induction program to support newly hired teachers in their first year at the school, whether new to the field of teaching or experienced.**  |
| **4e. Describe the school leader’s role in setting a clear vision and direction for the school while continuously elevating professional practice schoolwide.****Principal's/School Leader is the strategic thinker:**  **Policy Procedures*** + **Teaching and Learning**
		- **Instructional Teams**
		- **Evaluation and Supervision of School Personnel**
		- **Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment**
		- **Determining Professional development Needs**
	+ **District/ Community Mission-Vision &Values**
	+ **School Culture**

  |
| **4f. Describe how leadership is distributed among lead teachers, instructional coaches, and additional personnel.** Machine generated alternative text: Team  Level  PLC's  Data  Team  Leadership  Team  Content  Area  PLC's **Leadership Team: Established representation from all school level stakeholders including administration, teachers, support staff, paraprofessionals, etc. Group is responsible for communication to their various interest groups. Group leads all aspects of school improvement and instruction including academic, school culture, policy and procedures, evaluation and supervision, logistical (schedule, traffic patterns, etc.), professional development and school improvement needs. Group is informed by the Data Team, Team Level PLC's and Content Area PLC's.** **Team Level PLC's: Established process for RTI to occur for all students. Three tiered approach is implemented through the use of PLP's. Team meets daily to discuss students and adjust programming and interventions for each student. Individual student data is analyzed and informs process.** **Content Area PLC's: Group makes all curriculum, instruction, and assessment decisions in each content area. All content area teachers participate in Content area PLC. Group meets bi-monthly. Group passes all major documents and decisions through Leadership Team. Group is informed by Data Team.** **Data Team: Mines school level and district level data to help inform Leadership Team and** PLC's**. \*\*\* Note: It is important for Team Level PLC's to mine and analyze their student level data.** |
| **4g. Describe the role of the school leadership team in decision making pertaining to providing well-rounded curricula, evidence-based instructional practices, and impactful professional learning.** **Leadership Team: Established representation from all school level stakeholders including administration, teachers, support staff, paraprofessionals, etc. Group is responsible for communication to their various interest groups. Group leads all aspects of school improvement and instruction including academic, school culture, policy and procedures, evaluation and supervision, logistical (schedule, traffic patterns, etc.), professional development and school improvement needs. Group is informed by the Data Team, Team Level PLC's and Content Area PLC's.** |
| **4h. Describe how the district will identify and address any disproportion that results in economically disadvantaged students or minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, inexperienced, or out-of-field teachers.** **Both Data Team and Team Level PLC's continually monitor data for any irregularities or a disproportionate data results for all student groups including economically disadvantaged, ESOL, SPED, and all major racial groups. They do this by…** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 5: Family and Community Engagement** |
| **5a. Describe how families are involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the school’s instructional program. Specifically address how you ensure the involvement of families with diverse perspectives, representative of your school population.** **The Maine DOE has provided family engagement technical assistance sessions to SAUs sharing effective strategies for engaging families in addition to the construction of purposeful and meaningful family/parent engagement policy documents/exhibits and parent/school compacts.**  |
| **5b. Describe your data collection process for assessing school climate. Identify how you understand the perceptions of students, staff, and families, as related to keeping students safe and healthy and improving their learning environments.****The Maine DOE morale team provided a morale survey to all department staff to determine areas of concern and strength. As a result of the survey, each DOE staff member was assigned a small group to tease out the key areas of concern and build upon the areas of strength. The feedback was provided to the Morale team and a summary presented to Department leadership with the goal of enhancing the work environment.**  |
| **5c. Describe the efforts made to increase awareness, acceptance, and integration of multilingual and multicultural students in the school community (if applicable).**  |
| **5d. Attach the required Title I building parent involvement policy and describe family activities that implement the policy.****The school provides a variety of opportunities to be involved including literacy and math nights, muffins with mom, and PIE nights. It is challenge to engage families and the turnout to events is often low. The school is working to provide professional development to staff regarding engagement strategies with staff continuing to build relationships with family members. Staff is working towards ensuring having a contact point once per month with each family. The school continues to refine programming through the implementation of the parent survey which is utilized to determine parent needs and a focus for family engagement.**  |
| **5e. Describe linkages to community based services and programs provided in partnership with the school.**  **The school has partnered with:*** + **Local foodbank to assist students experiencing food instability. The school counselor, homeless liaison and social worker provide referrals.**
	+ **The Salvation Army to provide winter coats for kids, Christmas assistance, foodbank, housing vouchers and back to school supplies.**
	+ **YMCA or Boys & Girls club for afterschool programming (scholarship program)**
	+ **HeadStart program to provide Pre-K with overlap to school family nights**

 |
| **Section 6: Accountability**  |
| **6a. Complete the chart** (Refer to Section 2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment | Subject | Administration Dates | Utilization of Results (Classroom and Schoolwide) | Communication Plan  |
| MEA |  Math | 3/19/2018 – 4/13/2018 | Content specialists analyze results to determine strengths and areas for improvement, identify evidence-based strategies to support student learning, and design professional learning opportunities to enhance instruction. | * + - Monthly meetings with superintendents and curriculum leaders
		- Email listserv and newsroom articles
		- Statewide professional development events
		- Targeted school support professional development.

  |
| NAEP | Math | N/A | Next administration will occur in 2019 |   |
| MEA | Literacy | 3/19/2018 – 4/13/2018 | Content specialists analyze results to determine strengths and areas for improvement, identify evidence-based strategies to support student learning, and design professional learning opportunities to enhance instruction. | * + - Monthly meetings with superintendents and curriculum leaders
		- Email listserv and newsroom articles
		- Statewide professional development events
		- Targeted school support professional development.
 |
| NAEP | Literacy  | N/A | Next administration will occur in 2019 |   |

  |
| **6b. Describe the procedures for measuring and reporting annual student progress.****GUIDANCE****The Maine Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) provides information about the academic progress of students, schools, and the state as a whole. This system includes State assessments, known as the Maine Educational Assessments (MEA), which measure the progress of Maine's students toward the content standards adopted for Maine students. Additionally, national and international assessments help us interpret the success of Maine's students in comparison to students in other states and nations. Students in grade 3-8 take Maine statewide accountability assessment called the eMPowerME, which measure what our students know and can do in the subject areas of mathematics and English, Language Arts & Literacy. This is a summative assessment that is administered in a multi-week testing window in March and April. The statewide accountability assessment for students in their 3rd year of high school is the College Board SAT. The College Board has one statewide test date and one makeup test date for Maine students to be assessed.**  **EXEMPLAR****The Maine Department of Education releases a report annually for schools and districts called the ESEA Report Cards. The ESEA Report Cards are designed to meet federal requirements for data reporting as outlined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). States are required to provide an annual report card to inform stakeholders about the progress of students and schools on indicators of student achievement, graduation rates, status of ESEA accountability and information on fully certified teachers. Report Cards are made publicly available in the** [**Maine Assessment and Accountability Reporting System (MAARS)**](https://lms.backpack.education/public/maine)**, which is an online interactive data platform for accessing information about how Maine's students performed on state assessments beginning in 2015-16 in mathematics, English language arts/literacy, and science.**  |
| **6c. Describe how assessment results are used to improve instructional practices schoolwide. (we are approaching this item as meaning *statewide*)*** + **Content specialists study sub-score results to determine areas of strength and need for improvement as aligned to content student learning standards.**
	+ **The SAT School Day test form is available from College Board and schools can view students' performance data, item analysis, and sub score category information by student and school through the K-12 Reporting portal provided by College Board.**
	+ **Grades 3-8 data can be further analyzed with the use of**
	+ **Design of professional support and learning opportunities for the field will be informed by research-based best practices demonstrated to support student learning and performance. Emphasis is placed on conceptual understandings of content area learning.**
	+ **Professional learning opportunities throughout the school year include:**
		- **Full single day or multi-day workshop sessions to learn instructional practices and experience exemplar methodology**
		- **Dine and discuss sessions offered regionally to support implementation of instructional practices that support improvement**
		- **Early release/late start collaborative learning opportunities delivered through recorded events, text studies, digital meeting spaces, and asynchronous or individualized plans.**
	+ **Provide models of formative assessments, classroom observations, and other tools to support evaluation of continuous growth and improvement.**
	+ **Provide targeted support for schools identified as Tier II and Tier III**

 |
| **6d. Explain how the school will provide individual assessment results to families.****The Maine Department of Education releases a report annually for schools and districts called the ESEA Report Cards. The ESEA Report Cards are designed to meet federal requirements for data reporting as outlined in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). States are required to provide an annual report card to inform stakeholders about the progress of students and schools on indicators of student achievement, graduation rates, status of ESEA accountability and information on fully certified teachers. Report Cards are made publicly available in the** [**Maine Assessment and Accountability Reporting System (MAARS)**](https://lms.backpack.education/public/maine)**, which is an online interactive data platform for accessing information about how Maine's students performed on state assessments beginning in 2015-16 in mathematics, English language arts/literacy, and science.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 7: English Learner Data Collection and Analysis**(if n count 20 or more, must complete Section 7)  A significant amount of the data requested in Section 7 is not available at the state level due to rules of data suppression for the purposes of confidentiality. Some data are not reported publicly or not collected at the state level. Districts will have access to their local data either through their own local data systems, NEO, MAARS, or the Data Warehouse. |

* + **Demographics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Total Enrollment | American Indian or Alaska Native % | Asian or Pacific Islander % | Black or African American % | Hispanic or Latino % | White % | Two or More Races % |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Student Attendance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | ADA |   | Tardy % |   | % of Students Approaching Chronically Absent (missing 5-9% of total school days)  |   | % of Students Chronically Absent(missing 10% or more of total school days) |   | % of Students Truant |   |
|   | Non EL  | EL  | Non EL  | EL  | Non EL  | EL  | Non EL  | EL  | Non EL  | EL  |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **High School Graduation Rate**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | 4 Year Cohort |   | 5 Year Cohort |   |
|   | Non EL  | EL Students | Non EL  | EL Students |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Educational Opportunities/Coursework (High School)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Advanced Placement Enrollment |   | CTE Enrollment |   | Early College Enrollment |   | Dual or Concurrent Enrollment |   | Other |   |
|   | Non EL  | EL  | Non EL  | EL  | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL  | EL  |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Special Education (IDEA)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | State Average |   | Population # |   | Population % |   |
|   | All Students | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Literacy: Data Source # 1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % |   | Grade\_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   |
|   | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**6-1. Former EL Proficiency - Literacy: Data Source #1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Year | Number of Years after Exiting |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 1 |   | 2 |   | 3 |   | 4 |   |
|   | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Third and fourth year exited students were not previously reported. It is a new federal requirement that data on these students be collected.

* 1. **Literacy: Data Source # 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % |   | Grade\_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   |
|   | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL | Non EL | EL |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**7-1. Former EL Proficiency - Literacy: Data Source #2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Year | Number of Years after Exiting |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 1 |   | 2 |   | 3 |   | 4 |   |
|   | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Mathematics: Data Source # 1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

 **8-1. Former EL Proficiency - Mathematics: Data Source #1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Year | Number of Years after Exiting |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 1 |   | 2 |   | 3 |   | 4 |   |
|   | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Mathematics: Data Source # 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Proficient Student % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   | Grade \_ % |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**9-1. Former EL Proficiency - Mathematics: Data Source #2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Year | Number of Years after Exiting |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | 1 |   | 2 |   | 3 |   | 4 |   |
|   | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % | Not Proficient % | Proficient % |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Composite Proficiency Level on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | 1.0-1.9 % | 2.0-2.9 % | 3.0-3.9 % | 4.0-4.9 % | 5.0 (exit) % | 6.0 (exit) %  |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* 1. **Long-term English Learners**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Grade \_ % | Grade \_ % | Grade \_ % | Grade \_ % | Grade \_ % |
| 2014-15 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2015-16 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2016-17 |   |   |   |   |   |

***Analysis***

|  |
| --- |
| **7a. Describe teachers’ process for assessing an EL’s progress toward English language proficiency (frequency, evaluation methods, and recording), both including and apart from ACCESS for ELLs 2.0.****The Maine Department of Education (DOE) does not require any particular assessments to be used beyond ACCESS for ELLs. Every EL has a Language Acquisition Committee (LAC), which is responsible for annually (at minimum) updating the EL's Individual Language Acquisition Plan (ILAP). A LAC is composed of members such as the student's ESOL teacher, parent, classroom teacher, school administrator, and others (such as the student himself/herself) as deemed appropriate. ILAPs are not reviewed by the Maine DOE.** |
| **7b. Describe the school’s process for determining whether an individual student is making adequate yearly progress toward English language proficiency, as well as the interventions used if adequate yearly progress is not made.** **This is done through the LAC and ILAP process. Moving forward, the Progress in English Language Proficiency (ELP) indicator will also provide valuable information to schools regarding a student's annual growth targets.**   |
| **7c. Describe how an individualized program of service is determined for each EL.** **A student's individualized program of service is to be based on ACCESS for ELLs scores, academic performance, and other elements as deemed necessary by the SAU.**  |
| **7d. Describe how content instruction is integrated into English language development so that ELs are able to attain grade-level standards while acquiring English.****While many SAUs are moving towards a model of instruction that addresses English language development (ELD) and academic content simultaneously, some SAUs continue to focus primarily on ELD in dedicated EL classrooms until a student has reached a certain level of proficiency in English. Newcomer programs that remove ELs from the mainstream are allowable by federal regulation, but it is recommended that the program not exceed one year and that ELs are in mainstream classes (with ESOL-certified teacher support) as quickly as possible. WIDA ELD standards are explicitly linked to language functions needed for success in various academic areas. Academic content is best learned in conjunction with grade-level and proficiency-level appropriate ELD standards. The Maine DOE provides guidance for schools as they transition to an integrated model.**   |
| **7e. Describe how language learning, multiculturalism, and the particular needs of immigrant and refugee students are integrated into professional development for all staff.****At this time the Maine DOE does not require all teachers to have completed coursework in multiculturalism or immigrant/refugee issues. Professional development organized by the DOE does not always incorporate a multicultural perspective. However, steps are currently being taken within the DOE to change this.** **At Portland Public Schools, exemplary efforts have been made to include ESOL teachers on all teaching and learning teams. RTI, Gifted and Talented, literacy, and trainings of teacher leaders involve people with EL expertise. The current focus in the district of proficiency-based learning approaches is incorporating a specific focus on differentiation for diverse learners.**  |
| **7f. Describe district and school procedures and protocols for recruiting, evaluating, rewarding, and replacing ESOL-endorsed instructional staff.****The DOE does not currently actively recruit ESOL teachers to work in schools. ESOL is a targeted need area, so the requirements for certification have been adjusted in order to encourage more teachers to become certified.** **In an effort to encourage teachers to seek ESOL-endorsement, Lewiston Public Schools have partnered with the University of Maine at Farmington to offer courses needed for ESOL certification at the district's central office.**  |
| **7g. Describe how families of ELs are involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the school’s instructional program.****A student's LAC should include at least one family member to advocate for the student's needs. The school must take the family's preferences as to the type and frequency of ESOL services into consideration**. |
| **7h. Describe the efforts made to ensure that families of ELs feel welcomed and valued as members of the school community and are empowered as advocates for ELs’ needs. Include an explanation of how translation and interpretation services are utilized for the benefit of families and how families are informed of their right to these services.** **The Maine DOE has contracted with TransACT in order to provide districts with access to ESSA parent notices in several of Maine's most commonly spoken languages. Also, the Language Use Survey that schools are required to administer to families enrolling in a district for the first time explains that families have a right to interpretation/translation. The Language Use Survey is available in English and twenty-five other languages. A notice was recently published through the DOE Newsroom in seven languages to explain to families the purpose of ACCESS for ELLs.**  **A new initiative at Biddeford Schools, Biddeford Rising, is an example of how a district can welcome and empower families of ELs and immigrants. Through Biddeford Rising, families and school staff come together for conversations about the school community, its strengths and challenges, and ways to improve it.**  |
| **7i. Explain how the school provides ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 results to families.**   **The Maine DOE does not provide ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 results to families, but it does provide guidance to schools to ensure that families receive results in a format they can understand. Section 1111of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires that parents of ELs be provided with individual, descriptive, and diagnostic reports of academic assessment "in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand." Section 1112 further specifies that this requirement applies as well to the provision of information about an EL's level of English language proficiency. The Maine DOE has published a brief notice for parents called the** [**Purpose of ACCESS for ELLs**](http://www.maine.gov/doe/access/documents/The-Purpose-of-ACCESS.pdf)**. SAUs are encouraged to provide this notice to parents via the SAU's website, at parent-teacher conferences, and/or by other means.** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7j. Summarize findings as to the strengths and areas for improvement of your current program as revealed through data analysis.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength** | **Possible Action Steps**   |
| **Strength** | **Possible Action Steps**   |
| **Area for Improvement**  | **Possible Action Steps**   |
| **Area for Improvement**  | **Possible Action Steps**   |

 |
| **7k. After determining the strengths and areas for improvement of English language acquisition programs, the needs assessment process requires research-based solutions to be identified that will be used. This process should overlap other district/school initiatives for school improvement. Describe what best practices were reviewed, any visits made to high achieving schools, the techniques used to solicit whole staff and parent input to the plan, and how solutions were matched to priority needs.**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 8: Coordination** |
| **8a. Describe how the program will coordinate with other programs such as Even Start, Head Start, or other preschool programs at the elementary level, or School-to-Work, Perkins, or other state programs at the secondary level.**  **The Maine DOE utilized cross team collaboration in order to complete the CNA/SAU Consolidated Plan exemplar. This process has enabled team members across teams to provide their content area and subject matter expertise to complete the document with fidelity. The work started regarding the development and completion of the plan will continue as Maine DOE staff continue to provide technical assistance to central office and school staff regarding how to complete the required elements of the document.**   |
| **Section 9: Evaluation and Reevaluation**  |
| **9a. Describe the process your planning team will use to annually evaluate progress towards reaching each of the identified goals. Specify the evaluation process timeline and the method of reporting results to school staff, district administration, and families.** **A review of the CNA/SAU Consolidated plan will be conducted on an annual basis with necessary revisions and edits completed in consultation with department staff and through the recommendations of SAU staff.**  |
| **Section10: Fiscal Requirements****(To be completed for Title I Schoolwide Authorization only)** |
| **10a. List the federal and state sources of funding in addition to Title I that contribute to the schoolwide program (SWP) (i.e., Migrant, Title II, etc.).** **The school incorporates Title I, II, III and IVA funds to the schoolwide programs in an effort to upgrade the educational program.**   |
| **10b. Describe how Title I funds and funds from other sources will be used to implement the schoolwide program. Include the following major categories: salaries and benefits, instructional materials, parent involvement, professional development, and technology.****Local, state and federal funds listed above are consolidated into a single virtual "pot" of funds in order to upgrade the educational program at the school. The overall budget amount is constitutes a percentage (%) contribution of federal, local and state funds. For each of the above categories, the corresponding % is drawn from the appropriate funding source. E.g.** **Budget:** **45% local** **5% Title IVA****9% Title II****15% Title I** **2% Title II****24% State** **Each time salaries and benefits are paid, 5% of the amount comes from Title IVA, 9% from Title II, 15% Title I etc.** **This ensures that the contribution to upgrading the educational program at the school is comparable to the % of funds contributed to the budget.**  |
| **10c. Document that the SWP has adequate funds to effectively carry out the activities described in this plan.**Machine generated alternative text: Budget Categor•,•  2 FTE  Instructional Program Total:  17 FTE  S. FTE  Son  Apple  |