

School Improvement Plan

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Student Achievement	<p>AMO (CCR): Met all subgroup targets</p> <p>CCR All Tests: All Students subgroup increased 3% over past 3 years from 79% to 82% proficient which is 22% above the district (60%). Hispanic (75%) subgroup increased 16% and White (81%) subgroup increased 6% from 2013-2015.</p> <p>CCR Reading: Proficiency has increased 4% for All Students (76), 6% for Female (81%), 16% for Hispanic (68%) and 10% for White (79%) from 2013-2015.</p> <p>CCR Math: All Students subgroup has remained stable at 86% proficient from 2013-2015. Proficiency has increased 12% for SWD (40%), 10% for Black (72), 20% for Hispanic (88), and 5% for Multiracial (94%) from 2013-2015.</p> <p>CCR Science: All subgroups are above 83% proficient and the All Students subgroup is at 84%</p> <p>CCR Grade Level Data: Fourth grade had 12% gains with White subgroup in both Math (90%) and Reading (83%) from 2013-2015. Fifth grade had 22% gain in Reading (76%) and 14% gain in Math (88%) with White subgroup and a 7% gain with the All Students (92) subgroup in Math from 2013-2015</p> <p>GLP : All Students subgroup remains stable at 89% proficient with All Tests. All Students subgroup remains stable in both Reading (85%) and Math (91%) from 2013-2015. All Students (92%) subgroup increased 7% and all subgroups are above 80% proficient in Science.</p> <p>EVAAS: Overall school Met Expected Growth in 2015 at 0.46, Exceeded Expected Growth in 2014 at 2.62, and Exceeded Expected Growth at 5.70 in 2013. Overall 3 year average Met for Reading at 0.3 and Exceeded for Math at 1.7. Reading 3 year average for 5th grade Exceeded at 2.5, 4th grade Met at -0.9 and 3rd grade Met each year in Reading for past 2 years. Math 3 year average for 5th grade Exceeded at 3.0 and 4th Met at 0.4. 5th grade Exceeded at 3.3 for the 2015 school year. Kindergarten Exceeded at 7.4 and 1st Exceeded at 3.6 for the 2015 school year.</p>	<p>CCR All Tests: Subgroups that remain below 80% proficient are SWD (29%), LEP (51%), Male (79%), Black (68%) and Hispanic (75%).</p> <p>CCR Reading: Inconsistent proficiency with LEP subgroup for past 3 years – 2013 at 47%, 2014 at 63% and 29% in 2015. Subgroups performing below 80% in Reading for past 3 years are SWD (23%), LEP (29%), Male (70%), and Asian (78%). Subgroups that remain stable but are below 80% include Hispanic (68%), White (79%) and Multiracial (75%).</p> <p>CCR Math: Subgroups that remain below 80% proficient are SWD (40%), LEP (71%) and Black (72%).</p> <p>CCR Grade Level Data: Third grade had a 3%-5% decrease over 3 years in both Reading (76%) and Math (81%). Both Fourth (79%) and Fifth (71%) grades saw gains of 5% proficiency in Reading from 2013-2015 with the All Students subgroup but remains below 80%.</p> <p>GLP : Subgroups below 80% proficient in Reading are SWD (43%), LEP (48%) and Multiracial (75%) and below 80% in Math are SWD (50%) and LEP (74%).</p> <p>EVAAS: 4th grade Math Did Not Meet Expected Growth at -3.1 and 2nd grade Did Not Meet at -5.5 in Reading for the 2015 school year.</p>

School Improvement Plan

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Process Data	<p>Instructional Practices and Effectiveness Survey: 86% of teachers use reader's response notebooks, and 92% of teachers found them to be either effective or highly effective 88% of teachers use science notebooks in daily instruction and 94% of teachers found them to be either effective or highly effective 94% of teachers use TRC question stems for guided reading and homework to enhance written comprehension, and 91% found them to be either effective or highly effective</p> <p>Cedar Fork Vocabulary Instruction Survey: 95% of teachers feel their academic language instruction is effective 75% of teachers feel somewhat effective teaching tier 2 vocabulary 100% of teachers would like professional development targeted on improving vocabulary 77% of teachers would like to have vertical discussions/observations/sharing next year</p>	<p>Instructional Practices and Effectiveness Survey: 77% of teachers "never" or "sometimes" use a variety of data to create team time groups for math</p> <p>Cedar Fork Vocabulary Instruction Survey: 33% of teachers feel limited in knowledge to teach tier 2 vocabulary 28% of teachers do not plan tier 2 instruction in ELA and 45% in math 56.3% of teachers occasionally (not regularly) plan tier 2 vocabulary instruction, 17% do not plan tier 2 vocab instruction at all 37.5% of teachers feel tier 2 vocabulary instruction is random or sporadic 90% of teachers are either unsure of or do not think there are enough resources at CFES 54% of teachers feel they do not have time to teach tier 2 vocab to students 35% of teachers feel they do not have time to teach academic vocab to students 40% of teachers would be willing to share at a professional development event or have someone observe their vocabulary instruction</p>
Staff and Student Demographics	<p>Subgroup data has remained steady for the past three years: black (10%), LEP (11%), Hispanic (5%), and Multi (4).</p> <p>The Asian subgroup increased (48% in 2012-13 to 54% in 2014-2015) and the White subgroup decreased (31% in 2012-2013 to 26% in 2014-2015). The percentage of SWD decreased from 7% in 2012-2013 to 5% in 2014-2015.</p> <p>Teachers with Masters degrees has increased from 21 in 2012-2013 to 25 in 2014-2015.</p> <p>26% of teachers exceeding EVASS. 70% of teachers meeting EVASS.</p> <p>Teaching staff has balanced years of experience with 19 teachers with 0-3 years, 16 teachers with 4-10 years, and 19 teachers with 10+ years.</p>	<p>The student population at Cedar Fork has increased by almost 200 students in the past three years (767 in 2012-2013 to 951 in 2014-2015). There have been 0 long term suspensions for the past three years.</p> <p>Teacher turnover rate has increased from 9% in 2012-2013 to 13% in 2014-2015.</p> <p>Teacher demographics does not reflect student demographics with 92% of teachers being white.</p>

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Perception	<p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey: For the past 3 years, between 89% and 93% of teachers feel CFES is a good place to work and play 100% of teachers agree the school environment is clean and well maintained, the school clearly communicates with the community, CFES does a good job of encouraging parent involvement, teachers provide useful information about student learning, parents/guardians are aware of what is going on in the school, students understand expectations for conduct, school administrators support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom, the faculty work in a safe environment, teachers are held to high professional standards, leadership facilitates using data to improve learning, PLT's are aligned to the SIP, teachers require students to work hard, teachers believe almost every student has the potential to do well on assignments,</p> <p>Student Survey: For the past 3 years, over 96% of students feel safe at CFES. 97% of students agreed that they work hard to meet teacher expectations</p> <p>100% of parents surveyed said that the Curriculum Nights were highly informative.</p>	<p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey: 32% of teachers at CFES feel class sizes are reasonable 47% feel that teachers have access to instructional technology (33% less than the state average) 67% feel there is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect 58% of teachers feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to them 64% of teachers feel professional development is differentiated</p> <p>Student Survey: 23% of students feel they do not get challenging work 25% of students feel they do not have a say about what happens to them at school</p>

Priority Concerns/Problem Statement	Root Causes/Hypothesis (ICEL)	Solutions (evidence based)
ELA scores have dropped over the past 3 years (from 80.6 to 82.8 to 78.6) for our Asian subgroup.	A lack of consistent, on-going professional development in academic language Staff turnover Lack of consistent AIG teacher/instruction Team time/intervention not built into the master schedule Lack of data to measure impact of academic language instruction Enrollment/large class size	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The leadership team actively engages staff in ongoing development and coaching necessary to support academic vocabulary instruction. 2. The leadership team facilitates PD and coaching for all staff members on assessments and data sources to inform decisions. 3. Schedules provide adequate time for training and coaching support. 4. Processes, procedures, and decision-rules established for data-based problem-solving. 5. Data sources are used to evaluate the implementation and impact of the academic language taught.

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Priority Concerns/Problem Statement	Root Causes/Hypothesis (ICEL)	Solutions (evidence based)
Math scores have dropped over the past 3 years from 96.1 to 90.9 for our Asian subgroup.	A lack of consistent, on-going professional development in academic language Staff turnover Lack of consistent AIG teacher/instruction Team time/intervention not built into the master schedule Lack of data to measure impact of academic language instruction Enrollment/large class size	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The leadership team actively engages staff in ongoing development and coaching necessary to support academic vocabulary instruction. 2. The leadership team facilitates PD and coaching for all staff members on assessments and data sources to inform decisions. 3. Schedules provide adequate time for training and coaching support. 4. Processes, procedures, and decision-rules established for data-based problem-solving. 5. Data sources are used to evaluate the implementation and impact of the academic language taught.

Data Summary

Describe your conclusions

A comprehensive look at our data indicates that our strengths include all subgroups have met or exceeded targeted AMO proficiency, students feel positive about school and teachers value time spent in PLTs. This data indicates that our priority concerns are consistent drops in the past three years specially for the Asian subgroup in both reading and math. To address this priority concern, we plan to provide targeted, ongoing professional development in the area of academic language, provide adequate time in the schedule for academic language instruction, participate in a book study focused on the use of academic language, and create a walk through document to measure the implementation of academic language strategies being taught.

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
Principal:	Che-Von Stone
Date:	Aug - 2016

SIP Team Members

Name	School Based Job Title
1 Amanda Moffett	Teacher
2 Cathy Vogt	Instructional Support Personnel
3 Che-Von Stone	Principal
4 Chelsea Francis	Teacher
5 Debbie Keelean-Fuller	Parent
6 Elizabeth Irwin	Teacher
7 Erica Figard	Teacher
8 Jena Kehler	Assistant Principal
9 Jill Huffman	Teacher
10 Kelsey Purtee	Teacher
11 Laura Zauflik	Teacher
12 Leonor Both	Teacher Assistant
13 Lindsey Hensler	Teacher
14 Liz Miller	Instructional Support Personnel
15 Martha Diaz	Instructional Support Personnel
16 Maureen Rogne-Percy	Instructional Support Personnel
17 Maureen Stills	Teacher
18 Molly Dillon	School Improvement Chair
19 Shannon Lange	Teacher
20 Steven Henderson	Teacher
21 Valerie Langdon	Teacher

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
Date:	May - 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

At Cedar Fork Elementary School we provide stimulating, challenging, and relevant instruction. Working together and sharing talents enables us to achieve excellence. We provide a safe, nurturing environment. We meet the needs of all students through the use of research based practices. Collaboration and planning take place both within and across grade levels and special areas. We ensure that all learners are prepared for the 21st century. We respect, encourage, and celebrate diversity.

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

At Cedar Fork Elementary School, we believe that everyone including staff, parents, and community has a contribution to make in creating a successful learning environment. We value the importance of a nurturing and safe environment that is developmentally and age appropriate for each child. We are committed to providing highly qualified mentors for beginning teachers. All teachers are supported by administration and the school community to further encourage teacher retention. The supportive culture within the PLTs fosters continued growth for teachers and students. By utilizing all available data we measure our progress and guide instructional decisions. We model respect, responsibility, and compassion so that these traits can be carried with each learner throughout life.

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
LEA:	Wake County (920)

School Goal		
<p>By June 2018, Cedar Fork Elementary will meet or exceed expected growth targets in reading and math as measured by EOG's and reported by EVAAS. The overall performance composite will increase from 86% to 90% as measured by 3-5 EOG's and K-2 report cards.</p>		
Goal Manager	Strategic Objective	State Board of Education Goal
Molly Dillon	Learning and Teaching	Globally Competitive Students
Resources		
<p>TA training, Master Schedule, Revised Bloom's Taxonomy, Math Talk, EVAAS, Intervention Plan, Duty Free Lunch and Planning, Healthy Active Children Policy, Safe and Orderly Schools Plan, Character Education Plan, Parent and Community Volunteers, C-MAPP, Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) to collaborate with peers, DPI wiki, Discovery Education, Case 21/common formative assessments, Brain Pop, Study Jams, AIG teacher(s), resource teachers, parental engagement, ability to utilize DPI flexibility with funds transfer, K-3 Read to Achieve Plan, Teacher Retention and Recruitment, Letterland (grades K-2)</p>		

Key Process
<p>1. Classroom teachers, resource teachers, and specialists will embed the strategic use of academic language and high yield instructional strategies across all content areas to increase reading and written comprehension.</p>
Tier
Tier 1 / Core
Process Manager
Amanda Moffett
Measurable Process Check(s)
<p>1. The administrative team and teachers will create, conduct, and analyze quarterly walk-throughs/instructional rounds data to measure implementation of strategic use of academic language.</p> <p>2. The School Improvement Team will collect and analyze Case 21 data and mCLASS assessments quarterly (particularly monitor and analyze the language strand and TRC data) to measure impact on student achievement</p> <p>3. School improvement will analyze responses from classroom teachers, resource teachers, and specialists will take an Instructional Implementation/Effectiveness survey twice a year to determine professional development needs.</p>

Action Step(s)
<p>1. Admin team and staff will vote to determine action step leaders for the SIP.</p>
Timeline
From 8/2016 To 8/2016
<p>2. Admin team will provide differentiated, spiraling professional development in the area of academic language (strategies).</p>
Timeline
From 8/2016 To 6/2018

School: Cedar Fork ES**Plan Year** 2016-2018**LEA:** Wake County (920)

- 3.** Classroom teachers, resource teachers, and specialists will participate in a differentiated Book Study using books such as Bringing Words to Life (2nd edition), Classroom Instruction that Works: Research Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, and others, meeting monthly and orchestrated by IRT.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 2/2017

- 4.** Admin team and teachers will work together to create and develop the walk through document that will be used throughout the year to collect data on if and how academic vocabulary is being taught.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2017

- 5.** Staff involved in the book club will present strategies learned and ways to incorporate these strategies in the classroom to staff.

Timeline From 2/2017 To 2/2017

- 6.** Admin team and the Walk Through team will conduct walk throughs using the document created to ensure fidelity and consistency in use.

Timeline From 2/2017 To 5/2018

- 7.** PLT's will use one PLT a month to identify academic/content vocabulary, plan, and implement effective strategies to teach academic language in content areas.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2017

- 8.** Specialists will incorporate academic vocabulary and Tier II word walls on a weekly basis, as monitored by walk throughs.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 5/2018

- 9.** PLT's will use one PLT to create a presentation for all staff to showcase academic vocabulary strategies that have worked for them in the current year.

Timeline From 6/2017 To 6/2017

- 10.** Admin and Walk Through team will conduct quarterly walk throughs using the Academic Language Walkthrough Sheet.

Timeline From 3/2017 To 6/2018

- 11.** Once every quarter, vertical discussions will take place between grade levels, focusing on vocabulary strategies that are used and successful.

Timeline From 8/2017 To 6/2018

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

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:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:
Differentiated Book Study (all content areas)	All teachers	Vocabulary
Academic Language/Tier 2 Vocabulary	All teachers	Vocabulary
Differentiation/Rigor Training	All teachers	Vocabulary/Instruction
Creating Authentic Common Formative Assessments	2-5 Classroom Teachers	Vocabulary/Instruction

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

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2017-2018

Development Activities for

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

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
<p>Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit</p>	<p>The following data will be used to indicate students who need additional services: MTSS Early Warning System Indicators K-3: mCLASS TRC (accuracy & oral comprehension) and Dibels data; digging deeper assessments 4-5: EOG below 4, ELA Report Card grades below a 3 (administer running records), mCLASS DORF and DAZE, Case 21 Assessments, digging deeper assessments, ACCESS scores Threshold for Entry into the Problem Solving Cycle: students , demonstrating a need in two or more measures (excluding composite). Team refers to WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart to guide decisions. Exit: Reference WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart as well as gaining mutual agreement of all stakeholders. PLTs will meet with their case managers once every 5-6 weeks. Intervention Team will meet on an as needed basis to problem solve Tier III students. We intend to meet quarterly to problem solve Tier III students. During the Problem Solving Cycle PLTs/Intervention Team will follow the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart to guide decisions. At MOY & EOY, the intervention team will pull the mCLASS DEF report to determine the number of students responding to interventions.</p>	<p>The following data will be used to identify students MTSS Early Warning System Indicator K-1: Number Knowledge Test 1-5: Report Card, EOY math summative or EOG, digging deeper assessments K-5: Math SIP subgroup tracking document Threshold for Entry into the Problem Solving Cycle: K/1st reference WCPSS Using NKT to Make Data-Based Decisions. 2-5: Math Report Card grades below a 3, EOGs and Case 21 assessments below a 3, common assessments Exit: Reference WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart as well as gaining mutual agreement of all stakeholders. PLTs will meet with their case managers once every 5-6 weeks. Intervention Team will meet on an as needed basis to problem solve Tier III students. We intend to meet quarterly to problem solve Tier III students. During the Problem Solving Cycle PLTs/Intervention Team will follow the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart to guide decisions. At MOY & EOY, the intervention team will pull K/1st NKT scores in Oasis. 2-5: The intervention team will pull report card data, formative assessment data, and EOY benchmark data, common formative assessment data</p>	<p>Core: SIRS discipline data: Major referrals will be consistently collected and entered into Easi K-5 Report Card: Work habits and behavior grades below a 3 ENTRY (Must show need in at least 2 data points) Strategic: Report Card Grade 2 or below 3 Major Referrals 6 Unexcused Absences Classroom data points (behavior contracts) 1 Suspension Intensive: Report Card Grade 2 or below 3/month Major Referrals 10 Unexcused Absences Classroom data points (behavior contracts) 1 Suspension If student is not making progress in Tier II after 2 interventions have been provided, student will then be considered for Tier III plan. MTSS Explorer Early Warning System: -Red (Likely Intensive support needed): 4 or more consecutive unexcused absences for current quarter -Yellow (Likely strategic support needed): 3 consecutive unexcused absences for current quarter -Green (Likely core support only): 2 or fewer consecutive unexcused absences for current quarter EXIT: Plan to gradually decrease intensity, frequency, and/or duration of intervention. Continue to monitor success within Core. Strategic: Student has met at least 70% success rate based on expectations and outlined in Tier II Plan. Intensive: Student has met goal(s) outlined in formal Tier III Plan (FBA/BIP). PLTs will meet with their case managers once every 5-6 weeks. Intervention Team will meet on an as needed basis to problem solve Tier III students. We intend to meet quarterly to problem solve Tier III students. During the Problem Solving Cycle PLTs/Intervention Team will follow the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart to guide decisions. At BOY, MOY & EOY, the intervention team will use TFI data to evaluate the effectiveness of the behavior structures outlined in the intervention matrix.</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Intervention Structure	<p>Classroom teachers will provide differentiated core in flexible homogeneous groups.</p> <p>Students in need of strategic support will receive intervention 2 to 4 days a week for 20-30 minutes per session with no more than 6 in a group.</p> <p>Students in need of intensive support will receive interventions 4 to 5 days a week for 20-30 minutes per session with no more than 6 in a group.</p> <p>Interventions will be delivered during grade level specific, protected, non-core instruction blocks of time.</p>	<p>Classroom teachers will provide differentiated core in flexible homogeneous groups.</p> <p>Students in need of strategic interventions will receive intervention 2 to 4 days a week.</p> <p>Students in need of intensive interventions will receive interventions 4 to 5 days a week.</p> <p>Interventions will be delivered during grade level specific, protected, non-core instruction blocks of time.</p>	<p>Strategic Options: Check-In, Check-Out Mentoring Small Social/Emotional Groups Brief PTR Structure: Core + strategic intervention, which will vary by group size, frequency, and duration based on student need and responsiveness.</p> <p>Intensive Options: PTR framework for FBA/BIP aligned with wraparound services Structure: Core + Intensive interventions will vary by frequency and duration based on student need and responsiveness</p> <p>Interventions will be delivered during grade level specific, protected, non-core instruction blocks of time, as well as lunch groups and arrival/dismissal times.</p>
Instruction	<p>All stakeholders will be informed of instructional decisions & planning by attending grade level PLTs.</p> <p>Digging deeper assessments will be administered, as outlined by WCPSS Universal Screening & Diagnostic Assessment Flowchart</p> <p>K-2 Phonics Intervention lessons will follow Letterland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensive will follow Letterland Intervention Strand • Strategic will follow Letterland Small Group Lessons <p>3-5 Phonics intervention lessons will use Recipe for Reading</p> <p>K-2 Comprehension Intervention lessons will use Reading A-Z and Benchmark Connections.</p> <p>3-5 Comprehension and Fluency Intervention lessons will use Anchor Comprehension, FastTrack, and Reading A-Z.</p> <p>All intervention formats will be direct and explicit instruction based on student need and guided by assessment data, collaboration, and anecdotal notes</p> <p>Intervention Team will keep a MTSS Explorer Ad Hoc group of students receiving interventions</p>	<p>All stakeholders will be informed of instructional decisions & planning by attending grade level PLTs.</p> <p>Assessing Math concepts diagnostic assessments will be administered for Kindergarten & 1st grades as outlined by the WCPSS Selecting the Appropriate AMC Assessment</p> <p>K-5 will follow lessons from Kathy Richardson's Assessing Math Concepts</p> <p>All intervention formats will be direct and explicit instruction based on student need and guided by assessment data, collaboration, and anecdotal notes</p> <p>Intervention Team will keep a MTSS Explorer Ad Hoc group of students receiving interventions.</p>	<p>All stakeholders will be informed of instructional decisions & planning by attending grade level PLTs.</p> <p>Strategic: Explicit behavioral/social emotional instruction + Tier 2, targeted intervention as outlined in Tier 2 plan.</p> <p>Intensive: Explicit behavioral/social emotional instruction + Tier 3, targeted intervention as outlined in Tier 3 plan</p> <p>Fidelity checks will be a part of every student's Tier II/Tier III plan within EASi and the Intervention Team will be checked using the TFI three times a year.</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Cedar Fork ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
School Year:	2016-2017

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Assessment and Progress Monitoring	<p>mCLASS TRC progress monitoring kits, Dibels Next Measure for FSF, PSF, NWF, DORF, Duration, frequency & intensity will be adjusted based on progress monitoring data points and following the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart</p> <p>Tracking student attendance with intervention services</p> <p>Every 20 days for Strategic Need Every 10 days for Intensive Need</p> <p>TRC progress monitoring will follow same timeline, without the written comprehension piece (running record and oral comprehension only)</p> <p>Using a problem solving framework, along with the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart, PLTs and Intervention Team will analyze data to make data-based decisions</p>	<p>Math fact fluency probes, computation probes, word problem probes and common assessments https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1s2404GEUNjsUVb4Xp_hi1ErKwRAXdxBursZNOTJm4QU/edit#gid=1290840775</p> <p>Duration, frequency & intensity will be adjusted based on progress monitoring data points and following the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart</p> <p>Tracking student attendance with intervention services</p> <p>Every 3 to 4 weeks for Strategic Need Every 2-3 weeks for Intensive Need</p> <p>Using a problem solving framework, along with the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart, PLTs and Intervention Team will analyze data to make data-based decisions</p>	<p>Strategic: Progress monitoring based upon entry/exit criteria will be documented in Easi and targets will be outlined in Tier II Behavior Intervention plan.</p> <p>Intensive: Progress monitoring based upon entry/exit criteria will be documented in Easi and targets will be outlined in Tier III Behavior intervention plan.</p> <p>Duration, frequency & intensity will be adjusted based on progress monitoring data points and following the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart</p> <p>Tracking student attendance with intervention services</p> <p>Progress monitor every 4 to 6 weeks</p> <p>Using a problem solving framework, along with the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart, PLTs and Intervention Team will analyze data to make data-based decisions</p>
Curriculum/Resources	<p>K-2 Word Work: Strategic: Letterland Small Group lessons Intensive: Letterland Intervention Strand</p> <p>3-5 Word Work: Recipe for Reading K-5: The Reading Strategies Book EASi Progress Monitoring Master List spreadsheet</p> <p>EASi Master List of Interventions</p>	<p>K/1: WCPSS Strategic Interventions to Support K-2 Mathematics document & Linking AMC Instruction document for intensive students Assessing Math Concepts book EASi Progress Monitoring Master List spreadsheet</p> <p>1-5: EASi Master List of Interventions</p>	<p>Core: Core Behavior Systems and Structures</p> <p>Strategic: Check In Check Out Mentor Program Check-N-Connect Why Try Anxiety Workbook (school counselors K-12) Second Step, Steps to Respect CMAPP curriculum (small groups) Teachers Encyclopedia of Behavior Management</p> <p>Intensive: PRT-Prevent, Teach, Reinforce</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Cedar Fork 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			