

School Improvement Plan

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Student Achievement	<p>Overall school designation data indicates a “Met” status from 2011 – 2015 with a growth index in 2014 – 2015 of -0.56</p> <p>Overall EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5) increased 5.1% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (47% to 52.1%)</p> <p>Overall EOG college and career ready (levels 4,5) increased 4.3% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (37.9% to 42.2%)</p> <p>Overall reading EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5) increased 3.7% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (49% to 52.7%)</p> <p>Overall math EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5) increased 8.8% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (44.4% to 53.2%)</p> <p>Overall reading EOG college and career ready (levels 4,5) increased 4.9% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (38.5% to 43.4%)</p> <p>Overall math EOG college and career ready (levels 4,5) increased 2% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (38.5% to 40.5%)</p> <p>Grade 5 science EOG college and career ready (levels 4,5) increased 9.2% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (34.6% to 43.8%)</p> <p>Grade 3 reading EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5 increased 14.3% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (48.6% to 62.9%)</p> <p>Grade 5 reading EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5 increased 3.1% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (40.7% to 43.8%)</p> <p>Grade 3 math EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5 increased 15.5% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (43.1% to 58.6%)</p> <p>Grade 4 math EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5 increased 5.8% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (40.7% to 46.5%)</p> <p>Grade 5 math EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5 increased 5.3% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (49.4% to 54.7%)</p> <p>Grade 3 reading college and career ready (levels 4, 5 increased 6.9% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (43.1% to 50%)</p> <p>Grade 5 reading college and career ready (levels 4, 5 decreased 8.7% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (27.2% to 35.9%)</p> <p>Grade 3 math college and career ready (levels 4, 5) increased 2.5% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (36.1% to 38.6%)</p> <p>Grade 4 math college and career ready (levels 4, 5 increased 5.4% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (32.6% to 38%)</p> <p>Based on most recent 3 year average EVAAS school growth measure, grade 4 has a “Met” status with 0.6 points growth, and grade 5 has an “Exceed” status with 4.4 points growth in Math</p> <p>Based on most recent 3 year average EVAAS school growth measure, grades 4 has a “Met” status with 1.1 points growth, and grade 5 has a “Met” status with -1.4 points growth in reading.</p> <p>Based on 2015 EVAAS school growth measure, grade 3 has a “Met” status with -2.0 points growth in reading (BOG)</p> <p>Based on 2015 EVAAS school growth measure, grade K has an “Exceeded” status with 3.7 points growth in Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC)</p> <p>Based on 2015 EVAAS school growth measure, grade 1 has an “Exceeded” status with 16.8 points growth in Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC)</p> <p>Based on 2015 EVAAS school growth measure, grade 2 has a “Met” status with -1.4 points growth in Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC)</p>	<p>Grade 5 science EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5) decreased 2.5% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (49.4% to 46.9%)</p> <p>Grade 4 reading EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5 decreased 6.3% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (57% to 50.7%)</p> <p>Grade 4 reading college and career ready (levels 4, 5 decreased 1.7% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (45.4% to 43.7%)</p> <p>Grade 5 math college and career ready (levels 4, 5 decreased 1.6% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (46.9% to 45.3%)</p> <p>Based on most recent 3 year average EVAAS school growth measure, grade 5 has a “Not Met” status with -1.8 points growth (2015 data indicates -3.4 points growth) in science.</p> <p>EVAAS science Achievement group report indicates a “Not Met” growth status for levels 1, 2, 3 and 5 in 2015, and “Not Met” for the 3 year average with levels 1, 2, 3, and 4.</p> <p>EVAAS grade 4 reading Achievement group report indicates a “Not Met” growth status for level 2 with -3.1 points growth, and “Not Met” level 5 with -7.2 points growth.</p> <p>EVAAS grade 4 math Achievement group report indicates a “Not Met” growth status for level 1 with -4.8 points growth, and “Not Met” level 5 with -4.6 points growth.</p> <p>AMO status report indicates “Not Met” target for all students, black, and economically disadvantaged (EDS) subgroups in reading and math for 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015.</p> <p>AMO status report indicates “Not Met” target for students with disabilities (SWD) in math and reading, and academically gifted (AIG) in reading for 2014 – 2015.</p>

School Improvement Plan

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Process Data	<p>Letterland implementation has increased from 3 classrooms to 10 classrooms over the last three years (2013 - 2016).</p> <p>Literacy, Math and Science Nights have been reestablished in the 2015 - 2016 school year.</p> <p>PLTs consistently met, on average, 31 out of 36 weeks during the 2014 - 2015 and 2015 - 2016 school years with a structured PLT framework and objective outlined. PLT notes are reviewed in a weekly PLT case manager huddle. PLTs increased their use of data analysis to take next steps over the last year.</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Walkthroughs have not been completed with fidelity for the 2014 - 2015 and 2015 - 2016 school years</p> <p>Progress monitoring of students in red and yellow in mCLASS does not occur with fidelity for all classrooms</p>
Staff and Student Demographics	<p>North Carolina report card indicates a decrease of 0.2% points in teacher turnover rate from 2012 - 2013 to 2014 - 2015.</p> <p>North Carolina report card indicates there are 7 National Board Certified Teachers.</p> <p>North Carolina report card indicates 59.5% of certified staff have 10+ years of teaching experience.</p> <p>North Carolina report card indicates 45.9% of certified staff have advanced degrees.</p>	<p>North Carolina report card indicates teacher demographics does not match overall student demographics (75% of teachers are white, 20% are black; 23.1% of students are white, 58.3% of students are black).</p>
Perception	<p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey results indicated increased scores in ### survey responses from the 2013 - 2014 (state) to the 2014 - 2015 (district)</p> <p>Based on 2014 - 2015 district student survey results, 86.4% students feel that adults at their school treat them fairly compared to the district average of 88.5%</p>	<p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey results indicated a decrease of 1.2% points in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect in the school from 53.7% in 2013 - 2014 (state) to 52.5% in 2014 - 2015 (district).</p> <p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey results indicated a decrease of 7.9% that teachers are allowed to focus on educating students with minimal interruptions from 42.9% in 2013 - 2014 (state) to 35% in 2014 - 2015 (district).</p> <p>Based on 2014 - 2015 district student survey results, 79.3% of students feel that adults at their school listen to students compared to the district average of 86.4%</p> <p>Based on 2014 - 2015 district student survey results, 76.3% of students feel safe at school compared to the district average of 88.5%</p>

Priority Concerns/Problem Statement	Root Causes/Hypothesis (ICEL)	Solutions (evidence based)
<p>AMO status report indicates "Not Met" target for all students, black, and economically disadvantaged (EDS) subgroups in reading and math for 2012 - 2013 to 2014 - 2015, and AMO status report indicates "Not Met" target for students with disabilities (SWD) in math and reading, and academically gifted (AIG) in reading for 2014 - 2015.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of services • Time, model, schedule • Lack of PD/training to support different groups, lack of training for teachers of SWD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on hands on instruction in Math • Math Walkthroughs revised, implemented and shared with staff with fidelity • PLTs planning for content vocabulary and differentiated instruction in Math • Implementation of Spiral Review and Problem of the Day for Math • PLTs create and analyze common formative assessments for Math

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Priority Concerns/Problem Statement	Root Causes/Hypothesis (ICEL)	Solutions (evidence based)
Grade 5 science EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5) decreased 2.5% points from 2012 – 2013 and 2014 – 2015 (49.4% to 46.9%), and based on most recent 3 year average EVAAS school growth measure, grade 5 has a “Not Met” status with -1.8 points growth (2015 data indicates -3.4 points growth) in science.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fidelity of science instruction K-4, vertical planning for science instruction, accountability for instruction • Lack of time in schedule to teach science daily K-5 • Training needed for entire staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science notebook training • Science walkthrough tool revised, implemented and shared with fidelity • Professional development • Instructional time adjustments for 5th grade • Non-fiction texts focusing on Science
Grade 4 reading EOG proficiency (levels 3, 4, 5) decreased 6.3% points from 2012 – 2013 to 2014 – 2015 (57% to 50.7%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiated instruction • Common vocabulary/word walls/strategies across grade levels • Structured literacy block not happening across K-5 • Emphasis on writing school-wide in regards to comprehension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on differentiated instruction in Literacy • Literacy Walkthrough tool revised, implemented and shared with staff with fidelity • PLTs planning for content vocabulary and differentiated instruction in Literacy • PLTs create and analyze common formative assessments for Literacy • Take home book program established and implemented with fidelity

Data Summary

Describe your conclusions

Powell has identified three primary concerns that are contributing to slow proficiency growth and an increased achievement gap between the highest (white) and lowest performing subgroups (Economically Disadvantaged and Students With Disabilities). To improve, Powell will focus on improving math, literacy and science instruction to increase EOG proficiency in all subgroups through targeted professional development and instructional walkthroughs. Powell will also focus on cultivating a positive learning environment to increase student motivation and address behavioral needs that are impacting student achievement through targeted professional development and data review.

School Improvement Plan
Membership of School Improvement Team

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
Principal:	Curtis Brower
Date:	Apr - 2016

SIP Team Members

	Name	School Based Job Title
1	Curtis Brower	Principal
2	Deb Bray	Teacher
3	Heather Capps	Teacher
4	Jamila Smith	Teacher
5	Jennifer Medlin	Teacher
6	Jessica Gill	School Improvement Chair
7	Melissa Hart	Assistant Principal
8	Michelle Krasner	Teacher
9	Paula Barnes Cardinale	Teacher
10	Reneta Price	Teacher
11	Robin Edwards	Instructional Support Personnel
12	Sandy Thurmond	School Improvement Chair
13	Trina Bruner	Parent

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
Date:	Apr - 2016

Mission Statement

Wake County Public School System will provide a relevant and engaging education and will graduate students who are collaborative, creative, effective communicators and critical thinkers.

Vision Statement

The Powell community will become inventive and resourceful risk-takers through cooperative exploration and play.

Core Beliefs

- Every student is uniquely capable and deserves to be challenged and engaged in relevant, rigorous, and meaningful learning each day.
- Every student is expected to learn, grow, and succeed while we will eliminate the ability to predict achievement based on socioeconomic status, race, and ethnicity.
- Well-supported, highly effective, and dedicated principals, teachers, and staff are essential to success for all students.
- The Board of Education, superintendent, and all staff, while sustaining best practices, will promote and support a culture of continuous improvement, risk-taking, and innovation that results in a high-performing organization focused on student achievement.
- The Board of Education, superintendent, and all staff value a diverse school community that is inviting, respectful, inclusive, flexible, and supportive.
- The Wake County residents value a strong public school system and will partner to provide the support and resources to fully realize our shared vision, accomplish the mission, and sustain our core beliefs.

Value Statement

- Powell Center for Play and Ingenuity believes that all students are uniquely capable and deserve to be challenged through rigorous, inventive, and meaningful learning every day, to reach their potential.
- Powell believes that every student will successfully learn through creative and cooperative exploration and play, successfully engage critical thinking and effective communication, regardless of socioeconomic status, race, and ethnicity.
- Powell values highly effective and well supported administration, teachers, and all staff in an open, positive, creative environment as essential to the success of all students.
- All Powell Staff, while upholding best practices value, promote, and support a culture of continuous improvement, risk-taking, innovation and collaboration that results in a highly performing system.
- All Powell staff value a diverse school community that is inviting, safe, respectful, inclusive, flexible and supportive of play and ingenuity.
- Powell values a strong magnet program and will partner with the community and families to provide the support and resources to fully realize our shared vision, accomplish our mission, and sustain our core beliefs.

School Goal		
By June 2018, Powell Elementary will increase overall EOG proficiency from 52% to 58% and meet growth in all subgroups as measured by AMO target data.		
Goal Manager	Strategic Objective	State Board of Education Goal
Jessica Gill	Achievement	Healthy Responsible Students
Resources		
DPI Flexibility in Financial Transfers Access to WCPSS achievement data for comparison Elementary (K-3 Read to Achieve Plan) Title 1 funding EVAAS Safe and Orderly Schools Plan Duty Free Lunch and Planning Healthy Active Children Policy (K-8) Character Education Plan		

Key Process
<p>1. Teachers and staff will utilize manipulatives and leveled grouping during math instruction to increase student ability to construct meaning of abstract mathematical ideas and concepts.</p> <p>Tier Tier 1 / Core</p> <p>Process Manager Heather Capps</p> <p>Measurable Process Check(s) The math committee, PLTs, and administrators will review NKT, benchmark and/or common formative assessments quarterly in order to assess professional development and next steps for student success.</p>

Action Step(s)
<p>1. Staff will participate in the beginning of the year training focused on hands on and differentiated instruction.</p> <p>Timeline From 7/2016 To 8/2016</p> <p>2. Math committee will review/revise district math walkthrough tool.</p> <p>Timeline From 9/2016 To 11/2016</p> <p>3. Math committee will share revised math walkthrough tool with faculty.</p> <p>Timeline From 11/2016 To 12/2016</p>

4. Math committee will pilot revised math walkthrough tool.

Timeline From 12/2016 To 6/2017

5. Staff will implement schoolwide math walkthrough tool.

Timeline From 7/2017 To 6/2018

6. PLTs will identify content vocabulary and plan for differentiated instruction utilizing instructional strategies from professional development.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

7. Staff will implement the math Problem of the Day and Spiral Review with fidelity. (August 2016- June 2018)

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

8. PLTs will create and analyze common formative assessments (CFA)

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

Key Process

2. Teachers and staff will implement k-5 science curriculum with fidelity in order to increase students' overall proficiency.

Tier

Tier 1 / Core

Process Manager

Jennifer Medlin

Measurable Process Check(s)

The Science committee and administrators will conduct walkthroughs quarterly in order to assess professional development needs. The PLT, Science committee, and SIT will analyze unit assessment data quarterly in order to determine the next steps for student success.

Action Step(s)

1. Staff will participate in the beginning of the year science notebook training.

Timeline From 7/2016 To 8/2016

2. Science committee will review/revise district Science walkthrough tool

Timeline From 8/2016 To 9/2016

3. Science committee will share revised science walkthrough tool with faculty (August 2016 -September 2016)

Timeline From 8/2016 To 9/2016

4. Science committee will conduct a baseline walkthrough to determine current implementation of science instruction.

Timeline From 9/2016 To 10/2016

5. SIT will look at the baseline walkthrough data and plan/align professional development.

Timeline From 10/2016 To 12/2016

6. Staff will implement school wide Science walkthrough tool.

Timeline From 7/2017 To 6/2018

7. PLTs will identify academic/content vocabulary and plan for direct instruction utilizing instructional strategies from professional development

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

8. Administration will review EVAAS effectiveness data with 5th grade teachers and make instructional adjustments as needed. (July 2016-June 2018)

Timeline From 7/2016 To 6/2018

9. Staff will research, review, and purchase non-fiction science based text to supplement the science kits.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

Key Process

3. Teachers and staff will incorporate written comprehension and differentiated instruction to increase overall student achievement.

Tier

Tier 1 / Core

Process Manager

Michelle Krasner

Measurable Process Check(s)

The literacy committee, PLTs, and administrators will review KEA, mClass, benchmarks and/or common formative assessments quarterly in order to assess professional development and next steps for student success.

Action Step(s)

1. Staff will participate in the beginning of the year training focused on written comprehension and differentiated instruction.

Timeline From 7/2016 To 8/2016

2. Literacy committee will implement district literacy walkthrough tool with fidelity.

Timeline From 9/2016 To 6/2018

3. Literacy committee will share revised literacy walkthrough tool with faculty.

Timeline From 9/2016 To 6/2018

4. PLTs will identify academic/content vocabulary and plan for differentiated instruction utilizing instructional strategies from professional development.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

5. Literacy Committee will develop a plan for implementing a take home book program.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 9/2016

6. Staff will implement the Take-Home book program with fidelity.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

7. PLTs will create and analyze common formative assessments (CFA)

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

Key Process

4. Teachers and staff will increase student motivation and cultivate a positive learning environment.

Tier

Tier 1 / Core

Process Manager

Robin Edwards

Measurable Process Check(s)

The PLT's, PBIS team and SIT will analyze quarterly survey data to determine the next steps for student success.

Action Step(s)

1. PBIS committee will refresh behavior structures around our new theme.

Timeline From 5/2016 To 8/2016

2. Staff will participate in the beginning of the year trainings focused on brain research and classroom management strategies.

Timeline From 7/2016 To 8/2016

3. Teachers and staff will incorporate brain researched strategies into their classroom management and daily activities to increase positive student interactions and engagement.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

4. PBIS team will create and implement student and staff surveys quarterly.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

5. PBIS team will share survey data with all stakeholders twice a year.

Timeline From 1/2017 To 6/2018

School Improvement Plan

Date	May - 2016
Waiver Requested	
NA	
How will this waiver impact school improvement?	
NA	
Please indicate the type of waiver:	Local
Please indicate the policy to be waived	NA

Date	May - 2016
Waiver Requested	
NA	
How will this waiver impact school improvement?	
NA	
Please indicate the type of waiver:	Local
Please indicate the policy to be waived	NA

Date	May - 2016
Waiver Requested	
NA	
How will this waiver impact school improvement?	
NA	
Please indicate the type of waiver:	Local
Please indicate the policy to be waived	NA

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:
Hands on and differentiated instruction in math	Entire Staff	Goal 1
Science Notebook training	Entire staff	Goal 1
Literacy training focused on written comprehension and differentiated instruction	Entire staff	Goal 1
Trainings focused on brain research and classroom management strategies	Entire staff	Goal 1

School Improvement Plan**Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities**

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2017-2018

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:
---------------	----------------------	------------------------

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit	<p>What data will be used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal behavior expectation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MClass K-2, 4th and 5th grade - Teacher's College - running records, Report Cards, EOG, Previous Case 21, teachers input, anecdotal notes, KEA, 3rd Grade BOG <p>What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for academics or behavior?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students who are red and/or yellow in two or more mClass measures will be discussed at Best Service Meetings K - 3rd grade students who have a red TRC are identified as needing intensive interventions K - 3rd grade students who have a yellow TRC are identified as needing strategic interventions 4th & 5th grade students will be identified through triangulation of data points Digging deeper assessments will be administered as needed Students will exit intervention when benchmark is achieved and maintained as evidenced by progress monitoring data points, digging deeper, and/or formative assessment data well as mutual agreement of all stakeholders, including teachers, administration, and parents <p>What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for academics or behavior?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly collaboration between intervention, Core, ESL, CCR teachers and all other stakeholders Ongoing weekly PLTs will review student data and their response to instruction New students arriving throughout the year demonstrating a need, as evidenced by the outlined above assessments, will be discussed at PLTs and documented on class summaries <p>How will your team determine the effectiveness of this plan, as evidenced by at least 70% of served students responding to interventions based on Rate of Improvement and/or transitioning towards Core benchmarks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After benchmarking periods, student data will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of intervention Matrix 	<p>Number Knowledge Test in Kindergarten</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMC (Assessing Math Concepts)-individual test in October. 	<p>What data will be used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal behavior expectations?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher-collected data on daily behaviors indicate an intensity or frequency of the behavior that is greater than that of their peers. SIRs behavior incident reports show three major referrals or a pattern of minor referrals. <p>What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for behavior?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Students entering strategic interventions will have a at least three major behavioral incident reports, OR Students entering strategic interventions will have a documented pattern of classroom behavioral concerns as reported by classroom teachers and staff Students will exit intervention when benchmark is achieved (80%) and maintained as evidenced by SIRs data, Kid Talk data, CICO data and/or mutual agreement of stakeholders. <p>What frequency, structures, and processes will be utilized to identify students exhibiting a need for academic or behavior intervention throughout the year?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior data will be reviewed monthly at PLTs and PBIS meetings. Behavior data will be reviewed quarterly in School Improvement meetings and as scheduled in Intervention meetings. PLTs will review grade level behavior data during Kid Talk and delve deeper into specific student data. The PBIS Team will review behavior data and assess structures needed to support behavior improvement. Teachers/staff will consult with administration and student services regarding students with on-going behavior difficulties. How will your team determine the effectiveness of this plan, as evidenced by at least 70% of served students responding to interventions based on Rate of Improvement and/or transitioning towards Core benchmarks? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The team will look at SIRs data, weekly reports and/or teacher-collected data to determine that at least 70% of served students are responding to the prescribed interventions.

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Intervention Structure	<p>What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark or universal behavior expectation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Service: Intervention teachers will pull out or push in for strategic literacy groups 2-3 days/week for 15-20 minutes/day • Intervention Service: Intervention teachers will pull out or push in for intensive literacy groups 4-5 days/week for 30-45 minutes/day • Classroom Service: Teacher will provide small group literacy instruction, based on skill deficit, 5-15 minutes, 1-3 days/week. <p>How does your master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The literacy block allows Core teachers to provide small group instruction and intervention teachers to provide intensive and strategic services during Daily 5 rotations, outside of mini-lessons • The master schedule provides flexibility for specialists to push in to classrooms for the last 30 minutes of each day 	TBD	<p>What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark or universal behavior expectation?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Individualized intensive student interventions by the classroom teacher and other staff responsible for the student. 2. Interventions will be determined based on the student need and could include social skills training, parent collaboration, consultation, small group or individual counseling, agency referrals, CICO, home visits, incentive plans/behavior contracts, etc.. <p>How does your master schedule allow delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to core?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specific student concerns may be addressed on an individual as needed basis.

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Instruction	<p>What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPS Model through PLT discussion • Ongoing formative assessments • Teacher Observations • mClass progress monitoring and written response student samples • Collaborative Planning <p>What is the intervention lesson format(s) for academic or behavior?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-2 Letterland intervention lessons • All intervention formats will be direct and explicit instruction based on student need and guided by assessment data, collaboration, and anecdotal notes <p>How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The progress monitoring data will show a positive response to intervention • Teacher Walk-through data • Collaborative Planning and PLT agenda and notes 	TBD	<p>What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?</p> <p>1. Teaching and utilization of PBIS structures to align common expectations and language.</p> <p>What is the intervention lesson format(s) for academic or behavior?</p> <p>1. Classroom teachers and school staff will re-teach expectations to students. 2. Classroom teachers and school staff will teach replacement behaviors for students not following expectations. 3. Classroom teachers and school staff will reinforce students meeting expectations. 4. Interventions will be determined based on the student need and could include social skills training, parent collaboration, consultation, small group or individual counseling, agency referrals, CICO, home visits, incentive plans/behavior contracts</p> <p>How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?</p> <p>1. Evidence of intervention fidelity will be through the analysis of teacher documentation, anecdotal notes, PLT notes, PBIS meeting notes</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Assessment and Progress Monitoring	TBD	TBD	<p>What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Behavior data collection tools 2. SIRS incident report 3. Anecdotal Notes 4. Behavior Contract 5. Behavior Intervention Plan documentation <p>How does the data guide your instruction?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Patterns will indicate functions of behavior and areas of concern in order to identify specific interventions. <p>How often will you progress monitor?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As needed per the student and the intervention. <p>What is the process for analyzing the data & making data-based decisions?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion among Intervention Team, PLTs, School Improvement and PBIS Teams
Curriculum/Resources	TBD	TBD	<p>What evidence based materials and resources will be used to support the academic or behavior strategic intervention?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PBIS structures and procedures 2. Research based strategies for specific behaviors

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Powell ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2017-2018

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit			
Intervention Structure			
Instruction			
Assessment and Progress Monitoring			
Curriculum/Resources			