

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I



2016-2017 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are not identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: TRENTON	School: Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School
Chief School Administrator: MS. LUCY FERIA	Address: 401-411 Brunswick Avenue, Trenton, NJ
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: lferia@trenton.k12.nj.us	Grade Levels: K-5
Title I Contact: Everene Downing	Principal: Ms. Kim Page
Title I Contact E-mail: edowning@trenton.k12.nj.us	Principal's E-mail: kpage@trenton.k12.nj.us
Title I Contact Phone Number: 609-656-4900 ext. 5773	Principal's Phone Number: 609-656-4791

Principal's Certification

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

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

Kim Page
Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held 3 (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$3,996,618, which comprised 97.45 % of the school’s budget in 2015-2016.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$3,906,172, which will comprise 98.21% of the school’s budget in 2016-2017.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2016-2017 include the following: (Please note; Title I funds are Blended for 2016-2017)

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Learning A-Z (Raz-Kids and Writing A-Z): Professional Development and online access to Raz-Kids and Writing A-Z, focusing on assessments and individualized lessons based on the latest reading and writing level of students, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.	1	Intervention to address student achievement in language arts (reading and writing), making sure the individual progress of every student is tracked on a regular basis, and individualized interventions are based on up-to-date data.	Professional Development and cost for online services	\$4,398
i-Ready and ReflexMath individualized math: Professional Development and online access to i-Ready and ReflexMath assessments and lessons focused on differentiation with emphasis on number sense, utilizing data to improve student learning, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.	2	Intervention to address student achievement in math, making sure the individual progress of every student is tracked on a regular basis, making sure every math class, in every lesson, is an opportunity to support the development of number sense.	Professional Development and cost for online services	\$1,573

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

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): "The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note:** A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

**Add lines as necessary.*

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Kim Page	Principal	X	X	X	
Elmer Arreaga	Teacher	X	X	X	
Linda Wyatt-Simpson	Counselor	X	X	X	
Dr. Olivia Russo	Literacy Leader	X	X	X	

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

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:

The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program’s annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
May 11-15, 2016	MLK Conference Room	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		x	
May 18-22, 2016	MLK Conference Room	Schoolwide Plan Development	X		x	
May 26-29, 2016	MLK Conference Room	Program Evaluation	X		x	

**Add rows as necessary.*

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

School's Mission

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

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

What is the school's mission statement?	Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School is dedicated to providing the highest quality educational program with the cornerstones of value learning, self-worth, and quality performance among students and staff along with a transition for students to a productive and responsible participation in society.
--	---

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

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

Evaluation of 2015-2016 Schoolwide Program *

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2015-2016, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

The 2015-16 school year allowed the staff of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School to implement the planned and suggested interventions as explained in the 2015-16 Title 1 School Wide plan. The school continued to focus on four priority areas: raising reading scores, improving mathematics scores, addressing student behaviors and engaging parents more frequently and more positively.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

The implementation process was strengthened this year by allowing a broad range of stakeholders to assume responsibility for moving elements of the plan forward. For instance, teachers, administrators and consultants collaborated to improve and build upon a school wide positive behavior support program to be implemented with fidelity in the coming school year. In addition, several teachers collaborated with administrators to implement an intervention plan that targeted students based on needs and abilities. The parent liaison worked closely with teachers on the Parent/Community Partnerships committee as well as parents in the PTO to engage parents in the life of the school more frequently through both academic and social events. The literacy leader worked diligently to bring more books into the hands of children and to establish a culture of reading in the school.

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

While elements of implementation were carried out smoothly, MLK experienced several challenges. The school underwent a change of leadership and although the transition went very smoothly, the previous plan was lacking in actionable and measurable goals. Supplemental materials remained a shortage—of primary concern were complete leveled libraries for teachers' classrooms. This resource allows students to take books home each evening to meet their at-home reading goal of 30 minutes. With the recent expanding of the school body to include additional classrooms, the existing inventory proved insufficient to service all classrooms at a comfortable level. The literacy leader held several book drives and teachers collaborated to make libraries function and share

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

DRA kits but additional resources were needed and not obtainable because of lack of funding. Human resources were also a challenge with a loss of a vice principal and other staff.

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

During the 2015-16 school year, MLK continued to use faculty committees that aligned with the priority issues. These committees, now established, were able to build on the work that had been started in the previous year. This provided a level of continuity in the work that allowed for expanding and supporting the plan's initiatives in a more targeted manner. For instance, members of the Priority School Initiative committee met several times over the school year to discuss and establish school wide behavioral expectations, a program for rewards and recognition, and a series of events related to building climate and culture. This information was developed and shared with all staff during a professional development day prior to the end of the 2015-2016 school year and will continue on the professional development days prior to the student's first day of school, allowing the entire faculty and staff to begin the year on the same page. One of the struggles during implementation was the ability to analyze and discuss data consistently. A challenge that surfaced was the teacher's level of comfort in analyzing and openly discussing school and classroom data.

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

Buy-in from all stakeholders began with initial discussions of the issues and concerns to include in the 2015-16 plan. Those early conversations allowed stakeholders to take interest in specific areas of the plan and engage in the school community to ensure program growth around literacy, mathematics, student behavior and parental engagement. Staff was able to collaborate during grade level and faculty meetings by analyzing math and literacy data as well as assessing the implementation of the positive behavior support program. In addition, faculty from across the school supported the many programs and events held for parents and students as organized by the parent liaison.

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

At the beginning of the year, staff perceptions were positive, as noted from feedback during opening meetings and professional development sessions. Staff participated in a climate and culture survey. Participation in committee meetings showed staff eagerness to implement and support a variety of literacy, math and climate/culture-focused programs to implement the school wide plan.

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

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

MLK began the 2015-16 school year with Back to School night, where an abundance of parents indicated an excitement about the possibilities of that could unfold throughout the year. During the whole-group session, parents were briefed on the new positive behavior program as well as math and literacy initiatives. As the year progressed, MLK enjoyed partnerships and support from community members. Parent perceptions were measured through the climate and culture survey. Sign in sheets measured participation rates for events including parents and community members. We strive to create a tool to measure community perceptions after events for next year.

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

Elements of the mathematics and language arts programs were shared with staff during the opening meetings of the school year, with further refining happening during grade level meetings. Teachers received support during one-on-one meetings and group sessions – for example the literacy leader worked closely to provide strategies and guidance to groups as well as direct classroom support. Administration provided support individually and through group sessions throughout grade level meetings and staff meetings in order to assist teachers throughout the year. Administrators and teachers were able to roll out elements of the literacy and math programs to parents during a variety of collaborative sessions aimed at engaging parents in supporting their students with reading, math, benchmark preparations and understanding elements of PARCC.

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Interventions were based on student data. Tier III students were identified and intervention strategies such as Waterford, Lexia, iREADY, Reflex Math, and guided reading were used with this group of students. The daily schedule at M.L.K. has included an intervention period at the end of the day in which all students needing intervention are provided instruction. Second grade bilingual teachers chose to create an intervention plan that fit within the expectations of the school wide plan: students were grouped according to similar reading levels and received 40 minutes of intervention by switching to a teacher who would guide reading instruction at their level and then offer even more targeted support with small group instruction. This type of leveled, targeted intervention was mirrored in first grade as well. While these are examples are specific, it is clear that the intervention period needs to be revamped for next school year.

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

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Teachers used various strategies to provide students with small group and one-on-one instructional interventions each day. In addition, students were supported by paraprofessionals who provided supplementary, focused instruction aimed at raising their literacy and math skills.

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

With the use of edConnect and online testing for grades 3-5, placing technology in students' hands was a primary focus of the instructional program. Students were exposed to a variety of software beyond word processing, which allowed for their quick acclimation to the online assessments. This made the second year of PARCC testing a smooth process because students were accustomed to reading and answering on-screen items. Most teachers throughout the school consistently use interactive SmartBoard lessons during both math and literacy blocks. All students in the school have access to RAZ Kids, an online reading tool that provides leveled books and monitors students progress. Several other web-based programs have begun to be implemented, including Lexia, Waterford, Reflex Math and iREADY.

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

Teachers need additional support in utilizing data from the many programs in order to use that data to drive instruction. With this software, teachers enjoyed the ability to analyze student performance based on CCSS, which provided information on areas for re-teaching in whole group, small group and individualized instruction. Programs assisted in providing differentiated learning experiences for our students.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

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

Evaluation of 2015-2016 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

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

English Language Arts	2014-2015	2015-2016	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	35%		The writing and reading workshop instructional model provided each student with Tier 2 interventions during the small group instruction. Tier 3 interventions were offered to students based on identified need. Students with IEPs received support through pull-out resource room instruction. Professional development focused on balanced literacy, close reading, writing across the curriculum and small group instruction.	The overall number of students scoring partially proficient in this grade level shows that there were still issues with a transient student population along with discipline that negatively impacts student performance on statewide assessments. The coherency of guided reading was successful in helping students with reading. There were few Tier 3 interventions available for general ed students because the Intervention Teacher position was not funded.
Grade 5	40%		The writing and reading workshop model instructional model provided each student with Tier 2 interventions during the small group instruction. Tier 3 interventions were offered to students based on identified need. Students with IEPs received support through pull-out resource room instruction. Professional development focused on balanced literacy, guided reading and small group instruction.	The in-class interventions for this grade did not result in proficiency. The intervention teacher position was not funded, so extra support was not available for students.

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

Mathematics	2014-2015	2015-2016	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	41%	NA	Students were provided with tier 2 intervention. The instruction alternated between LAL and Mathematics. (One-to-one conference, in-class support, resource room for small group instruction, iREADY, Reflex technologies)	The overall number of students scoring partially proficient in this grade level could have been affected by attendance, a transient student population, along with discipline that negatively impacts student performance on statewide assessments. New programs that were implemented have not been given sufficient time to evaluate and assess progress.
Grade 5	32%	NA	Students were provided with tier 2 intervention. The instruction alternated between LAL and Mathematics. (One-to-one conference, in-class support, resource room for small group instruction, iREADY, Reflex technologies)	The overall number of students scoring partially proficient in this grade level could have been affected by attendance, a transient student population, along with discipline that negatively impacts student performance on statewide assessments. New programs that were implemented have not been given sufficient time to evaluate and assess progress.

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

**Evaluation of 2015-2016 Student Performance
Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)**

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

English Language Arts	2014 - 2015	2015-2016	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Kindergarten	EUA 1=65%	EUA 1=62.3%	Students were provided with Tier 2 interventions during small group instruction throughout the day. Placing students in specific skills-based groups to work with paraprofessionals provided additional support.	The percentage of students scoring below basic on the EUAs indicates that the interventions provided during small group instruction and pull-out sessions were somewhat effective, but not as effective as needed. Going forward, teachers need to capitalize on the strategies that worked and improve the process for 2016-17. These scores also account for the bilingual and dual language kindergarten classrooms testing in English as there is not a comparable Spanish LA assessment available.
	EUA 2=19%	EUA 2=29.1%		
	EUA 3=21%	EUA 3=N/A		
	EUA 4=14%	EUA 4=		
Grade 1	EUA 1=67%	EUA 1= 91.2%	Students were provided with Tier 2 interventions through small group instruction during the literacy block. In addition, grade 1 teachers provided targeted interventions for student groups based on phonics skills and reading levels across the grade. Resources teachers, as needed, provided additional supports.	Positive results from the intervention varied for individual students, but overall 1 st grade students decreased their proficiency performance on End of Unit Assessments. This demonstrates a need for more interventions. These scores also account for the four bilingual first grade classes testing in English because there is not a comparable Spanish LA assessment available.
	EUA 2=37%	EUA 2= 65.75%		
	EUA 3=43%			
	EUA 4=31%			
Grade 2	EUA 1=65%	EUA 1= 67.3%	Students were provided with Tier 2 interventions during small group instruction portion of the literacy block. Resource teachers, as needed, provided additional supports.	The results in student growth in second grade could be attributed to intervention remaining classroom specific, as opposed to flexible grouping across the grade level.
	EUA 2=25%	EUA 2= 59.05%		

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

	EUA 3=48%			These scores also account for the two bilingual second grade classes testing in English because there is not a comparable Spanish LA assessment available.
	EUA 4=53%			

Mathematics	2014 -2015	2015-2016	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <i>did or did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Kindergarten	EUA 1=28%	EUA 1 =19.1%	Students were provided with Tier 2 intervention through small group instruction and one-on-one conferences during the Math block. Placing students in specific skills-based groups to work with paraprofessionals provided additional support.	The percentage of students scoring below basic on the EUAs did decrease, however still indicate that more interventions need to be provided during small group instruction and pull-out sessions. Going forward, teachers need capitalize on the strategies that worked and streamline the process for 2016-17.
	EUA 2=12%	EUA 2=37.89%		
	EUA 3=4%			
	EUA 4=14%			
Grade 1	EUA 1=48%	EUA 1= 64.8%	Students were provided with Tier 2 intervention through small group instruction and one-on-one conferences during the Math block. Placing students in specific skills-based groups to work with teacher provided additional support.	Overall 1 st grade students decreased their proficiency performance on End of Unit Assessments. Benchmark assessment results indicate that intervention was not effective and that more intervention needs to be provided.
	EUA 2= 20%	EUA 2=56%		
	EUA 3=13%			
	EUA 4=26%			
Grade 2	EUA 1=74%	EUA 1 = 92.4%	Students were provided with Tier 2 intervention through small group instruction and one-on-one conferences during the Math block. Placing students in	Overall 2 nd grade students decreased their proficiency performance on End of Unit Assessments. Benchmark assessment results indicate that intervention was not
	EUA 2=50%	EUA 2=81.08%		

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

Grade 2	EUA 1=74%	EUA 1 = 92.4%	specific skills-based groups to work with teacher provided additional support.	effective. Benchmark assessments indicate that a solid foundation in math facts would further support student success.
	EUA 2=50%	EUA 2=81.08%		
	EUA 3=34%			
	EUA 4=53%			

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

Evaluation of 2015-2016 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – Implemented in 2015-2016

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)						
ELA	Students with Disabilities	<p>Differentiated Instruction by introducing and teaching grade level material at their functional level.</p> <p>Implementation of accommodations/ interventions outlined in IEPs.</p> <p>Access to software/technology.</p> <p>Flexible grouping.</p> <p>One on ones provided as needed.</p> <p>Habits of discussion</p>	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher lesson plans indicating use of IEP interventions. Progress monitoring PLC meetings. Benchmark and formative assessment analysis. Child Study Team Annual Review Meeting outcomes. 	<p>Represents the % of SPED students performing at proficient levels on EUAs.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 516 1950 621"> <tr> <td>ELA</td> <td>EUA 1</td> <td>EUA 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%12.5</td> <td>%24.14</td> </tr> </table>	ELA	EUA 1	EUA 2		%12.5	%24.14
ELA	EUA 1	EUA 2									
	%12.5	%24.14									
Math	Students with Disabilities	Differentiated Instruction by introducing and teaching grade level material at their	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher lesson plans indicating use of IEP interventions. Progress monitoring 	<p>Represents the % of SPED students performing at proficient levels on EUAs.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 1360 1950 1466"> <tr> <td>MATH</td> <td>EUA 1</td> <td>EUA 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>%12.5</td> <td>%24.14</td> </tr> </table>	MATH	EUA 1	EUA 2		%12.5	%24.14
MATH	EUA 1	EUA 2									
	%12.5	%24.14									

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
		functional level. One on ones provided as needed.		PLC meetings. • Benchmark and formative assessment analysis. • Child Study Team Annual Review Meeting outcomes.	
ELA	Homeless	NA (Strategies would include: Differentiated Instruction by introducing and teaching grade level material at their functional level.)			NA
Math	Homeless	NA (Strategies would include: Differentiated Instruction by introducing and teaching grade level material at their functional level.)			NA
ELA	Migrant	NA (Strategies would include: Differentiated Instruction by introducing and teaching grade level material at their functional level.)			NA

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)										
Math	Migrant	NA (Strategies would include: Differentiated Instruction by introducing and teaching grade level material at their functional level.)			NA										
ELA	ELLs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESL services • Literacy/SIOP training • SIOP strategies implemented in instruction • I&RS support made available • Bilingual services • Newcomers received additional time 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis • Carried out progress monitoring during PLC meetings • Benchmark and formative assessment analysis • Teacher lesson plans • Student growth on Can-do descriptors 	<p>Represents the % of ELLs performing at proficient levels on EUAs.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 719 1770 984"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>EUA 1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>K</td> <td>52.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st</td> <td>24.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd</td> <td>8.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	EUA 1	K	52.6%	1 st	24.2%	2 nd	36%	3 rd	8.6%
Grade	EUA 1														
K	52.6%														
1 st	24.2%														
2 nd	36%														
3 rd	8.6%														
Math	ELLs	<p>ESL services</p> <p>Bilingual services</p>	Ongoing		<table border="1" data-bbox="1409 1084 1770 1295"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>EUA 1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>K</td> <td>79.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st</td> <td>34.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd</td> <td>7.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Represents the % of ELLs performing at proficient level on EUAs.</p>	Grade	EUA 1	K	79.5%	1 st	34.6%	2 nd	7.8%		
Grade	EUA 1														
K	79.5%														
1 st	34.6%														
2 nd	7.8%														

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)								
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Close Reading, RAZ kids. Writing Across the Curriculum,	Ongoing		EUAs, writing portfolios, DRA scores <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 464 1770 675"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>PARCC ELA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd</td> <td>10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4th</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th</td> <td>5.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Represents the % of Students that met or exceeded expectations on PARCC ELA	Grade	PARCC ELA	3rd	10.2%	4th	11%	5th	5.3%
Grade	PARCC ELA												
3rd	10.2%												
4th	11%												
5th	5.3%												
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	PD Provided: Unpacking Math Standards iReady and Reflex Math assessments and lesson focused on differentiation with emphasis on number sense, utilizing data to improve student learning, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.	Ongoing	On-Demand data provided by i-Ready and ReflexMath online services for each grade level, class and student.	iREADY, ReflexMath, EUAs <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 850 1770 1097"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>PARCC MATH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd</td> <td>5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4th</td> <td>5.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th</td> <td>3.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Represents the % of Students that met or exceeded expectations on PARCC MATH	Grade	PARCC MATH	3rd	5.6%	4th	5.3%	5th	3.9%
Grade	PARCC MATH												
3rd	5.6%												
4th	5.3%												
5th	3.9%												

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

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

Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2015-2016 to Address Academic Deficiencies

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	NA ESY(Extended School Year)			EYS Data Unavailable.
Math	Students with Disabilities	NA ESY(Extended School Year)			EYS Data Unavailable.
ELA	Homeless	NA			NA
Math	Homeless	NA			NA
ELA	Migrant	NA			NA
Math	Migrant	NA			NA
ELA	ELLs	Extended Day program Curriculum addressed deficits identified in the AMAO	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program lesson plans • Pre, post and interim assessments • Teachers’ anecdotal notes 	Pre and Post Assessments, improved classroom performance
Math	ELLs	Extended Day program Curriculum addressed deficits identified in the AMAO	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program lesson plans • Pre, post and interim assessments • Teachers’ anecdotal notes 	Pre and Post Assessments, improved classroom performance
ELA	Economically	No extended day			NA

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

ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	No extended day programs in place.			NA
Math	Economically	No extended day			NA

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

Evaluation of 2015-2016 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – Implemented in 2015-2016

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Lexia Learning			EUAs, writing portfolios
Math	Students with Disabilities	PD Provided: Math standards Maximize math skills for struggling students i-Ready and ReflexMath individualized math: Professional Development and online access to i-Ready and ReflexMath assessments and lessons focused on differentiation with emphasis on number sense, utilizing data to improve student learning, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.		On-Demand data provided by i-Ready and ReflexMath online services for each grade level, class and student.	iREADY, ReflexMath, EUA

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Homeless	NA			NA
Math	Homeless	NA			NA
ELA	Migrant	NA			NA
Math	Migrant	NA			NA
ELA	ELLs	PD Provided: Writing Mini-Lessons Close Reading Reading and Writing Workshop Lesson Planning Scoring DRA's Writing, portfolio and Rubrics	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans • Walk-throughs • Visible word walls meeting requirements • Running records and student growth • Guided reading groupings • Guided reading lesson plans • Writing portfolios • Authentic feedback on writing 	DRA/EDL, EUA
Math	ELLs	PD Provided: Math standards Maximize math skills for struggling students i-Ready and	Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans • Formative assessments • On-Demand data provided by i-Ready and ReflexMath online services for each grade level, 	iREADY, ReflexMath, EUA

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)								
		ReflexMath individualized math: Professional Development and online access to i-Ready and ReflexMath assessments and lessons focused on differentiation with emphasis on number sense, utilizing data to improve student learning, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.		class and student.									
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	PD Provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing Mini-Lessons • Close Reading • Reading and Writing Workshop • Lesson Planning • Scoring DRA's • Writing, portfolio and Rubrics 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans • Walk-throughs • Visible word walls meeting requirements • Running records and student growth • Guided reading groupings • Guided reading lesson plans • Writing portfolios Authentic feedback on	EUAs, writing portfolios, DRA scores <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 987 1770 1200"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>PARCC ELA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd</td> <td>10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4th</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th</td> <td>5.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Represents the % of Students that met or exceeded expectations on PARCC ELA	Grade	PARCC ELA	3rd	10.2%	4th	11%	5th	5.3%
Grade	PARCC ELA												
3rd	10.2%												
4th	11%												
5th	5.3%												

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)								
				writing									
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	<p>PD Provided: Math standards</p> <p>Maximize math skills for struggling students</p> <p>i-Ready and ReflexMath individualized math: Professional Development and online access to i-Ready and ReflexMath assessments and lessons focused on differentiation with emphasis on number sense, utilizing data to improve student learning, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Walkthroughs, lesson plans, teacher feedback.</p> <p>On-Demand data provided by i-Ready and ReflexMath online services for each grade level, class and student.</p>	<p>iREADY, ReflexMath, EUAs</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 399 1770 646"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1409 399 1587 488">Grade</th> <th data-bbox="1593 399 1770 488">PARCC MATH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1409 493 1587 535">3rd</td> <td data-bbox="1593 493 1770 535">5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1409 540 1587 591">4th</td> <td data-bbox="1593 540 1770 591">5.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1409 596 1587 646">5th</td> <td data-bbox="1593 596 1770 646">3.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Represents the % of Students that met or exceeded expectations on PARCC MATH</p>	Grade	PARCC MATH	3rd	5.6%	4th	5.3%	5th	3.9%
Grade	PARCC MATH												
3rd	5.6%												
4th	5.3%												
5th	3.9%												
ELA	All categories of teachers	Close Reading, RAZ kids. Writing Across the Curriculum,	YES	Walkthroughs, lesson plans, teacher feedback, usage	EUAs, writing portfolios, DRA scores								

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)								
Math	3 RD , 4 th and 5 th grade teachers	<p>PD Provided: Math standards</p> <p>Maximize math skills for struggling students</p> <p>i-Ready and ReflexMath individualized math: Professional Development and online access to i-Ready and ReflexMath assessments and lessons focused on differentiation with emphasis on number sense, utilizing data to improve student learning, and supporting diverse learners by individualized online lessons.</p>	Ongoing	<p>Walkthroughs, lesson plans, teacher feedback.</p> <p>On-Demand data provided by i-Ready and ReflexMath online services for each grade level, class and student.</p>	<p>iREADY, ReflexMath, EUAs</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1409 354 1770 602"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>PARCC MATH</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd</td> <td>5.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4th</td> <td>5.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th</td> <td>3.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Represents the % of Students that met or exceeded expectations on PARCC MATH</p>	Grade	PARCC MATH	3rd	5.6%	4th	5.3%	5th	3.9%
Grade	PARCC MATH												
3rd	5.6%												
4th	5.3%												
5th	3.9%												

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

***Family and Community Engagement* Implemented in 2015-2016**

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Home reading program Literacy workshops/Literacy Night for parents	Yes	Reading logs Sign in sheets Surveys	Reading growth measured by DRA
Math	Students with Disabilities				Growth on Math EUAs
ELA	Homeless	NA			NA
Math	Homeless	NA			NA
ELA	Migrant	NA			NA
Math	Migrant	NA			NA
ELA	ELLs	Home reading program Multiple Literacy workshops/Literacy Night for parents	Yes	Reading logs Sign in sheets Surveys	Reading growth measured by DRA
Math	ELLs		Yes	Sign in sheets Surveys	Growth on Math EUAs
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Home reading program Multiple Literacy workshops for parents	Yes	Reading logs Sign in sheets Surveys	Reading growth measured by DRA

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

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Multiple math workshops for parents	Yes	Sign in sheets Surveys	Growth on Math EUAs

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

Principal's Certification

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

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

Ms. Kim Page

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): “A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). ”

2016-2017 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2016-2017

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Academic Achievement – Reading	Report Cards, DRA Scores, District Benchmarks	Running records, report cards, attendance data, discipline data
Academic Achievement - Writing	Report Cards, DRA Scores, District Benchmarks	Rubrics, writing portfolios, report cards, attendance data, discipline data
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	Report Cards, DRA Scores, District Benchmarks	Rubrics, assessment scores, attendance data, discipline data
Family and Community Engagement	Event Calendar Sign In Sheets	Event sign in sheets indicate that family events need to be offered at various times to accommodate parent schedules. Sign in sheets also indicate that parent participation does not proportionally represent our student population numbers. There is a need to find new ways to engage parents.
Professional Development	Grade Level Meetings, Turn-key training, Faculty Meetings	Professional development topics during grade level and faculty meetings were driven by district and school administration. In addition, teachers attending professional development sessions outside of the school were able to turn-key during grade level meetings. As information about the instructional plan was shared in meetings, the implementation was monitored through school and district walk-throughs. Data indicates that there is continued need to review and clarify three-part objectives, formative assessments and clarify the information collected on lesson plans.

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

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Leadership	Superintendents walkthrough, formal evaluations	Based on walkthrough feedback and recommendations made by the Asst. Superintendent while there have been marked improvements, instruction should be monitored more closely.
School Climate and Culture	Survey, feedback to committee, discipline referrals	After implementing the positive behavior expectations and supports, faculty is determined to build upon the progress that has been made in the school culture across the student body.
School-Based Youth Services	NA	
Students with Disabilities	Report Cards, DRA Scores, District Benchmarks	After using data that is comparable to general education, the team determined that portfolio evaluations of student work might better serve in assessing student growth in math and literacy. Guidelines and rubrics for portfolio evaluations will have to be determined.
Homeless Students	NA	NA
Migrant Students	NA	NA
English Language Learners	WIDA, classroom assessments, Report Cards, District Benchmarks	Student growth in ELL is noted in WIDA scores and promotion out of the program. There is a need to minimize impact to the ELL push-in instructional program and build capacity between ELL and general education teachers to collaborate for effective delivery of instruction.
Economically Disadvantaged	Free and reduced lunch	Less than 5% of students at MLK do not receive free or reduced lunch. Students will receive the same interventions and supports as the general population of the school.

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

2016-2017 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process* *Narrative*

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

Similar to previous years, faculty were engaged in a series of conversations and data analysis sessions to assess progress of the 2015-16 plan and determine the needs for the 2016-17 school year. This happened during grade level meetings and faculty meetings, where collaboration and interest could be fostered.

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

Data was collected from several sources that included report card grades, student surveys, benchmark assessment scores, DRA, iREADY and Lexia. The staff used the board-approved data analysis protocol to examine scores and grapple with questions on how to use the data to drive instruction and plan for the 2016-17 school year.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

The data points examined by the school focused on assessments compiled by sources outside of the school and reputed to be valid and reliable. Scores from PARCC, DRA, iREADY, Lexia and state benchmark assessments are created to measure specific achievement in reading and math, with the benchmark assessments being aligned to specific standards.

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

2015-16 math data revealed that there is a consistent need to focus on basic math facts in all grades. Grade level instruction is hindered by the lack of math fact fluency (one digit addition, subtraction, multiplication, division on sight), which prevents teachers from instructing on grade level.

2015-16 literacy data from unit benchmarks revealed that students consistently score below basic in reading and writing. Reading and writing served as a priority focus for 2015-16. Initial DRA scores showed that teachers needed to use the scores to drill down to specific needs of students and address the shortcomings with small group or individualized instruction.

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

2015-16 discipline data revealed that the positive behavior plan needs to be revised in order to meet the needs of the students and needs to be implemented school wide in the fall of 2016.

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

Teachers continued to receive job-embedded professional development throughout the 2015-16 school year. Data reveals that previous professional development on three-part objectives, close reading, small group instruction, guided reading, and writing concise lesson plans needed to be revisited in order to support teaching and learning throughout the building. Professional Development needs to be provided on classroom management, student engagement, data analysis, and teacher support systems. Data points used to make these determinations included staff surveys, lesson plan reviews, walkthrough data and observations.

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

Educationally at-risk students are identified by a review of individual, classroom and grade-level data points as well as permanent records. In addition, a group of teachers and administrators analyzed data will be analyzed to identify students who were at-risk of continued slip in math and literacy. These identifying points will become the basis for the intervention plan for students based on need.

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

Teachers work closely with the school counselor, child study team, and administrators to support students who may need academic interventions beyond the scope of classroom practice. Teachers follow the Intervention and Referral Services process and then work collaboratively with the counselor to find solutions for the student. In addition, teachers at grade levels collaborate to form flexible grouping of students across classrooms to provide the most targeted math and literacy intervention instruction.

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

NA

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

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

The school follows district protocol for addressing the needs of and supporting homeless students and by consulting the district homeless liaison.

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

The school complies with the district assessment calendar that requires K-5 classes to administer a variety of assessments including Word Analysis, DRA, iREADY, and state benchmarks as well as state standardized tests as required by grade specifications. In addition to this assessment, teachers are encouraged to develop classroom formative assessments that track student progress as they develop and acquire skills and knowledge based on state academic standards.

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

The school works with preschools in the Trenton area to arrange for students to come and visit the school and preview kindergarten classrooms. As students transition from elementary to middle school, they are invited to participate in a transition day at the middle school so acclimation can begin. The school counselor is integral to the transition process for 5th grade students.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2016-2017 school wide plan?

The areas of priority focus remain the same for the 2016-17 school wide plan. The determination of the priority problems came from a series of meetings with faculty to assess growth based on the 2015-16 plan. Data reveals that while progress has been made in certain areas, it is not substantial enough growth to sustain without a continued, targeted plan.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

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

2016-2017 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

Based upon the school’s needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	Literacy—Reading and Writing	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Reading and Writing Students continue to read below grade level. The majority of tested students score partially proficient on Language Arts Portion of the PARCC in reading comprehension and writing. 67% of all students read below grade level. Across grade levels, EUA writing scores are below basic.	Students math skills and ability to problem solve remain a concern across all grades. The majority of the tested students score Partially Proficient on the Mathematics portion on the PARCC; Most students score below passing on the district benchmark.
Describe the root causes of the problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students enter current grade reading below level which prevents teachers from instructing on grade level • There is a large bilingual population however DRA scores are reported only in English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students lack basic math facts (addition, subtraction and multiplication) • Students' low reading ability hinders their success with word problems.
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	All
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	ELA	Math
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Response to Intervention Reading Workshop Guided Reading 30 minutes independent reading at home	Response to Intervention Math Workshop Math Skills Review Differentiated Instruction

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

	Explicit word instruction	Online Math Supports
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Common Core State Standards are identified prior to intervention instruction.	Common Core State Standards are identified prior to intervention instruction.

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

2016-2017 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process
Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Climate and Culture	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	Student attendance, chronic absenteeism, student referrals continue to be an issue which effect the climate and culture of the building.	
Describe the root causes of the problem	Root causes may include low parental buy-in, low school morale and lack of student engagement.	
Subgroups or populations addressed	Entire student population	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	All	
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Character education, mentoring, student clubs and activities	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	The intervention addressed the whole child and establishes a culture of learning and a positive environment for the students where they want to attend and to learn.	

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

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . “

2016-2017 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Modifications per IEPs Tier III interventions and progress monitoring Personalized behavior plans	Teacher Teacher/Administrator Teacher/Child study team	Final scores Anecdotal notes, running records, DRA scores Increased time on task, anecdotal notes, behavior rubrics	Tomlinson, C., & Moon, T. (2013). <i>Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom.</i> Taylor, J.F. (2001) <i>From defiance to cooperation: real solutions for transforming the angry, defiant, discouraged child.</i>
Math	Students with Disabilities	MY Math Intervention Program	Teachers Administration	Growth measured by the SMI and the Benchmark Assessment	What Works Clearinghouse Mathematics Policy Research Standards of Efficacy Research
ELA	Homeless	NA			NA
Math	Homeless	NA			NA
ELA	Migrant	NA			NA
Math	Migrant	NA			NA
ELA	ELLs	ESL services Literacy/SIOP training SIOP strategies	Teacher/Bilingual Department Teacher/district Teacher	Growth in WIDA indicators, ACCESS assessment, EUAs, running records and anecdotal notes	Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English Language Learners in the Content Areas. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 1010-1038.

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		implemented in instruction			
		I&RS support made available	Teacher/Counselor/ Family		
		Bilingual services	Bilingual teachers/ Bilingual department		
		Newcomers received additional time	Teacher		
Math	ELLs	ESL services	Teacher	Growth in EUAs, running records and anecdotal notes	Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English Language Learners in the Content Areas. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 1010-1038.
		Bilingual services	Teacher/Bilingual Department		
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Differentiated instruction	Teacher	Final scores	Tomlinson, C., & Moon, T. (2013). <i>Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom</i> .
		Tier III interventions and progress monitoring	Teacher/ Administrator	Anecdotal notes, running records, DRA scores	
		Personalized behavior plans	Teacher/Child study team	Increased time on task, anecdotal notes, behavior rubrics	Taylor, J.F. (2001) <i>From defiance to cooperation: real solutions for transforming the angry, defiant, discouraged child</i> .

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

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Differentiated instruction Tier III interventions and progress monitoring Personalized behavior plans	Teacher Teacher/Administrator Teacher/Child study team	Final scores Anecdotal notes, running records, DRA scores Increased time on task, anecdotal notes, behavior rubrics	Tomlinson, C., & Moon, T. (2013). <i>Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom.</i> Taylor, J.F. (2001) <i>From defiance to cooperation: real solutions for transforming the angry, defiant, discouraged child.</i>
ELA					
Math	All categories of students	*Reflex math—individualized math	Teacher	Progress as tracked on Reflex Math	Response to intervention, https://www.reflexmath.com/RTI

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Extended School Year	District personnel	As documented on IEP review	
Math	Students with Disabilities	Extended School Year	District personnel	As documented on IEP review	
ELA	Homeless	NA			NA
Math	Homeless	NA			NA
ELA	Migrant	NA			NA
Math	Migrant	NA			NA
ELA	ELLs	ELL services SIOP	ELL extended day teachers	Growth in WIDA indicators, ACCESS assessment, EUAs, running records and anecdotal notes	Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English Language Learners in the Content Areas. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 1010-1038.
Math	ELLs	ELL services SIOP	ELL extended day teachers	Growth in EUAs, running records and anecdotal notes	Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English Language Learners in the Content Areas. <i>Review of Educational Research</i> , 1010-1038.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	NA			NA
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	NA			NA

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

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA					
Math					

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

2016-2017 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	See below			
Math	Students with Disabilities	See below			
ELA	Homeless	NA			
Math	Homeless	NA			
ELA	Migrant	NA			
Math	Migrant	NA			
ELA	ELLs	As determined by Bilingual Dept.			
Math	ELLs	As determined by			

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
		Bilingual Dept.			
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	See below			
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	See below			
ELA	All categories of teachers	Writing Workshop Running Records Close Reading	Administrator Literacy Leader	Sign in sheets Lesson Plans Walkthroughs Meeting Minutes	Ede, L. (1987). A sourcebook for basic writing teachers. Allington, R.L. (2001). What Really Matters for Struggling Readers.
Math	All categories of teachers	Math Centers Project Based Math Teaching and Learning Reflex Math	Administrator Math Lead Teacher	Sign in sheets Lesson Plans Walkthroughs Meeting Minutes	What Works Clearinghouse Mathematics Policy Research

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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

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

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2016-2017 school year)

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

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2016-2017? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

Stakeholders from across the school will be responsible for evaluating the implementation and progress of the 2016-17 school wide plan. Internally, teachers and administrators will have the opportunity to evaluate growth under the school wide plan by looking at benchmark and reading/math score data during district supported data reviews. This analysis will allow stakeholders to determine if efforts for growth are on target or not. In addition to internal reviews, MLK looks forward to feedback from external sources.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

One of the challenges that MLK may face is time and financial constraints that may affect implementation of professional development. MLK will plan carefully and thoughtfully in order to capitalize on human resources by discovering expertise within the building before seeking outside resources for professional development. Each priority problem is essential for academic success. Through careful planning, this challenge can be quelled.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

Buy-in is a key element to the success of the plan. Teachers were engaged in developing the plan during grade level, faculty and committee meetings. These same meeting times will serve as the vehicle to continue faculty buy-in. Parents will continue to work with the Parent Liaison to build the family-school-community relationships and support the school wide plan.

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

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

Through the use of surveys, anecdotal feedback, meetings and minutes, the school will gauge the perceptions of the staff. This information will be used to strengthen engagement.

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?

The school will use surveys, meetings and input from the Parent Liaison to gauge perceptions of the community.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

Time for interventions will be allocated in the schedule and supported by specialists as needed. In addition to the “intervention period,” students will receive Tier 2 intervention support in the classroom during small group guided instruction. Teachers will be provided with additional professional development to ensure effective and efficient use of small group instruction time.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

Students will receive instructional interventions outside of the regular instructional program (meaning in addition to the math or literacy block, but still within the school day). Students will also receive support during the class period through individual conferences or small group instruction with the teacher.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

MLK staff is fortunate to have access to technology such as laptops, iPads, SmartBoards, and desktop computers. Various purchased and free software programs that expose students to skills in both literacy and math support the instructional program.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

The school will use multiple measures to gauge effectiveness: usage and progress reports, anecdotal notes, DRA, iREADY, Lexia, Waterford, and benchmark scores to determine the effectiveness of the interventions.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

Evaluation results of the school wide plan will be shared with stakeholders in a variety of ways. The results will be disseminated during meetings with stakeholders and published as appropriate.

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

**Provide a separate response for each question.*

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

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

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

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Students with Disabilities	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, Special Education teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
Math	Students with Disabilities	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, Special Education teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
ELA	Homeless	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, ELA teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
Math	Homeless	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, Math teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.

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

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	Migrant				
Math	Migrant				
ELA	ELLs	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, ELL teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
Math	ELLs	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, ELL teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
ELA	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, ELA teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
Math	Economically Disadvantaged	Parent meetings/ Conferences/Workshops	Parent Liaison, Literacy Leader, Math teachers, SLT	Student growth as shown on report card grades, district benchmarks, and standardized test results	Stevenson, D., & Baker, D. The Family-School Relation and the Child's School Performance. Child Development.
ELA					
Math					

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

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

2016-2017 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?

Family and community engagement are essential to MLK's success. The administrators, staff and parent liaison will develop a calendar focused on parental workshops, seminars, meetings and celebrations. To support the school wide plan, several of these events will focus parents on how to support their students in how to build math and literacy skills, how to understand math and reading assessments, how to engage students in homework sessions and how to strengthen the home-school relationship.

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

Parents will be engaged in the development of the written parent involvement policy through questionnaires and surveys. As school staff and parent leadership review the policy, updates and amendments will be done in a collaborative manner.

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

The school plans to share the Involvement Policy with parents during Back to School night; hard copies will be available for parents in the Liaison's office and the main office of the school. In addition, the policy will be published on the school website.

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

The school will follow a similar process for creating the school-parent compact. Realizing this is a document that must serve both the school and families, meetings will be held to review and amend the compact as necessary,

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

The parent compact will be distributed on the first day of school and again at Back to School night. Copies will also be available in the Parent Liaison's office, the main office and on the school's website.

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

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

Student achievement data will be shared with parents during parent meetings following benchmarks. In addition, student achievement data is published by the New Jersey State Department of Education and shared at district board meetings.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives

(AMAO) for Title III?

The school will look for direction from the district offices; in the past, the Office of Funded Programs has generated a letter and sent to every home.

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

Parents will receive results at Back to School Night.

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

The school-wide plan was shared with the Parent Liaison who engaged parents in conversations about the priority issues. Ideas and concerns were collected and shared with the planning committee to include in the plan.

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

Parents are informed about student achievement during Parent-Teacher conferences, through regular interim and report card reports. In addition, parents are always invited to reach out to teachers and find out about their child's progress.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2016-2017 parent involvement funds?

Parent involvement funds will be used to engage parents during daytime and evening meetings where they will receive information about school-wide initiatives and programs. Funds will also be used to host Literacy and Math game nights, movie nights, and to invite a local expert to speak to parents on parenting skills which will help them improve their relationships with their children.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

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

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

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

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	100%	High quality professional development Building teacher leadership capacity Teacher led PLCs Provide tuition reimbursement in content areas Offer credit in salary schedule up to 14 years in areas of critical shortage Aspiring Leaders Summer Program Web-based application system requires identification of Highly Qualified Teachers status.
	0	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0	
	0	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	100%	High quality professional development
	0	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0	
	0	

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

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district. Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
Job fairs Media advertisements District sponsored professional growth opportunities	District Administrator