

School Improvement Plan

School:	Olds ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Student Achievement	<p>AMO DATA</p> <p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From 2012/13 to 2014/15 our EDS students improved in reading proficiency by 11%. Although they have not met target, they have made growth and showed a consistent increase. Our AG students exceed target proficiency in reading by 7% for the 2014-2015 school year. Black students met or exceeded proficiency in 2012/13 and 2013/14. The subgroups <i>ALL</i>, <i>White</i>, and <i>AG</i> met or exceeded proficiency each year since 2012. <p>Math</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black students progressed by about 5% from 2012/13 to 2014/15 <p>End of Grade Test Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school met growth in Reading and Math in grades 3-5 each year from 2012/13 to 2014/15. Overall, from 2012/13 (54%) to 2014/15 (69%) there was a 15% increase in students performing at levels 4 and 5 (College and Career Ready). Overall, from 2012/13 (63%) to 2014/15 (75%) there was a 13% increase in students performing at levels 3, 4, and 5. <p>English Language Arts (ELA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From 2013-2015 Olds Reading scores were above WCPSS. 83 % of students were proficient at a level 3, 4, or 5 from 2013/14 to 2014/15. 4th grade had 2% growth from 2013/14-2014/15 From 2013/14 to 2014/15, 5th grade maintained proficiency at 81%. <p>Mathematics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From 2013/14 to 2014/15, overall math scores were above WCPSS: Grade 3 at 85% proficiency; Grade 4 at 82% proficiency; Grade 5 at 81% proficiency. In 2014-2015, 3rd Grade met expectations with 79% proficiency (WCPSS at 71%). From 2013/14 to 2014/15 3rd Grade made a 6% increase in proficiency 2014-2015 4th Grade met expectations with 70% proficiency (WCPSS at 67%) 2014-2015 5th Grade met expectations with 69% proficiency (WCPSS at 69%) <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5th Grade Science exceeded expectations with 84% proficiency and was higher than WCPSS proficiency in 2013-2014. <p>Report Card Data</p> <p>ELA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, the school averages for percent proficient in ELA were at or above 86% in Quarters 1 through 4. In 2014-2015, Grades K, 1st, 2nd and 4th were at or above 90% proficiency in each quarter. In 2015-2016, Quarters 1 and 2, students in K-5 were at 89% proficient. In Q3 of 2015/16, 1st, 3rd, 4th and 5th ELA report cards stayed consistent or improved from 2nd to 3rd Quarter. In 2015/16, 3rd Grade ELA report cards have stayed consistent across all quarters. In 2015/16, K-1 ELA report cards have remained above 94% all quarters. <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, the school averages for percent proficient in Math were at or above 86% in Quarters 1 through 4. In 2014-2015, Grades K, 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 5th were at or above 80% in each quarter. In 2015-2016, Quarters 1 and 2, students in K-5 were at 89% proficient. In 2015/16, the school average increased 1% from Q1 (88%) to Q2 (89%). <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, Quarters 1 through 4, students in K-5 were 90% proficient. In 2015-2016, Quarters 1 and 2, students in K-5 were at 92% proficient. In 2015/16, there was a 1% increase from Q1 to Q2. <p>Benchmark Assessment Data Grades 2-5</p> <p>ELA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, 4th grade was at or above 88% on Q2 and Q3 Benchmark assessments. In 2014-2015, 5th grade proficiency increased by 4% from Q2 to Q3. In 2014/15, 2nd grade averaged 85% proficiency in Q2-Q4. In 2014/15, 3rd Grade Case 21 Proficiency was consistent with EOG data. On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 3rd grade averaged 83% proficient. On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 5th grade averaged 81% proficient. On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 2nd - 5th grade student scores averaged at 79% proficiency which is 15% above the Central Regional average. <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, SSA students in grades 2-5 had 100% proficiency in Quarters 1-4. In 2014-2015, 4th grade students had an average score of 80% in Quarters 1-3. On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 3rd grade averaged 82% proficient. On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 100% of SSA students were proficient in grades K- 4. <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 5th grade averaged 83% proficient on the Human Body standards. On the 2015/16 Midyear Case 21, 5th grade students scored 78% proficient overall. <p>mCLASS Data 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 80% of students K-5 show proficiency on fluency measures on BOY, MOY, and EOY benchmarks in 2014-2015. There was an 8% increase from BOY to EOY on DIBELS measures. At the EOY, 89% of K-5 students were at or above Benchmark goals in DIBELS with an increase of 8% at the BOY. TRC (comprehension) levels increased from BOY to EOY in Kindergarten by 21%. In 2nd grade TRCs increased by 11%. <p>mCLASS Data 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the BOY, 84% of K-5 students had a green composite score showing proficiency in DIBELS measures. At the MOY, 87% of K-5 students had a green composite score showing proficiency in DIBELS measures. At the EOY, 63% of K-3 students had a blue or green proficient TRC score which is 15% above K-3 students in WCPSS. At the MOY, 53% of K-3 students had a blue or green proficient TRC score which is 5% above K-3 students in WCPSS. K-5 student scores increased by 3% in DIBELS MOY measures from BOY. In K-5, DORF retell scores increased by 15% from BOY to MOY. In K-5, DORF retell scores increased in all grades from BOY to MOY. 	<p>AMO DATA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, from 2012/13 (4%) to 2014/15 (17%) there was a 13% increase in the number of students performing at levels 1 and 2. Overall, from 2012/13 (95%) to 2014/15 (83%) there was a 12% decrease in the number of students performing at levels 4 and 5 (College and Career Ready). Overall, from 2012/13 (85%) to 2014/15 (82%) there was a 3% decrease in white females students performing at levels 4 and 5 (College and Career Ready). <p>Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, from 2012/13 (86%) to 2014/15 (84%) there was a 2% decrease in white females students performing at levels 4 and 5 (College and Career Ready). Overall, from 2012/13 (95%) to 2014/15 (89%) there was a 6% decrease in students performing at levels 4 and 5 in reading (College and Career Ready). EDS students did not meet proficiency for three consecutive years from 2012/13 to 2014/15 Black students did not meet AMO goals in 2014-2015. <p>Math</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, from 2012/13 (84%) to 2014/15 (77%) there was a 7% decrease in white females students performing at levels 4 and 5 (College and Career Ready). Overall, from 2012/13 (27%) to 2014/15 (24%) there was a 3% decrease in black female students performing at levels 4 and 5 in math (College and Career Ready). Overall, from 2012/13 (12%) to 2014/15 (5%) there was a 6% decrease in the number of SWD performing at levels 4 and 5 in math (College and Career Ready). Black students and EDS students did not meet proficiency from 2012/13 to 2014/15. EDS students missed the AMO proficiency target proficiency by 26.3% in 2014-2015. <p>End of Grade Test Data</p> <p>English Language Arts (ELA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, Grades 3-5 had a 72% overall average dropping by 4% from 2013-2014. From 2013-2014 to 2014-2015, black students dropped 6% in proficiency. From 2013-2014 to 2014-2015, white students dropped 6% in proficiency. In 2014-2015, 3rd grade students were at 75% proficiency. When following the same cohort of students from 3rd (2013/14) to 4th grade (2014/15) there was an approximate 1% drop in proficiency. When following the same cohort of students from 4th (2013/14) to 5th grade (2014/15) there was a 1.3% drop in proficiency. In 2014/15, students with a level 4 and 5 proficiency level dropped by 13%. <p>Mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2016-2017 Did not meet growth. When following the same cohort of students from 3rd (2013/14) to 4th grade (2014/15) there was a 3% drop in proficiency. When following the same cohort of students from 4th (2013/14) to 5th grade (2014/15) there was a 3% drop in proficiency. In 2014-2015, only 73% of students were proficient on the EOG scoring at a level 3, 4, and 5. Only 67% of students scored a level 4 or 5 in 2014-2015. <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2014-2016 shows a decline. 2014-15 was the first year Science growth was not met. The percentage of fifth grade students passing the EOG Science test in 2014-2015 was 71%. Only 65% of students were at a level 4 or level 5 proficiency in 2014-2015. <p>Report Card Data</p> <p>ELA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, an average of 26 % of students were not proficient on ELA standards in 5th grade. In 2015/16, 23% of 5th grade students were not proficient in Q2. In 2015/16, the school average dropped 2% from Q1 (90%) to Q2 (88%). <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, an average of 27 % of students were not proficient on Math standards in 3rd grade. In 2015/16, 31% of 3rd grade students were not proficient in Q2. <p>Benchmark Assessment Data Grades 2-5</p> <p>ELA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, there was a 6% drop in 2nd Grade scores between the 2nd and 3rd quarters. In 2014/15, there was a 3% drop in 3rd Grade scores between the 2nd and 3rd quarters. In 2014/15, there was a 4% drop in 4th Grade scores between the 2nd and 3rd quarters. In 2014/15, 3rd Graders were at 78% proficiency in Q2 and Q3. In 2014/15, 5th Graders were at 73% proficiency in Q2 and Q3. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, the school average was 79%, below the 80% goal. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, 25% of 2nd grade students were not proficient. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, 24% of 4th grade students were not proficient. <p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014/15, 72% of 2-5 students were proficient in Quarter 1-3. In 2014/15, 72% of 3rd graders were proficient in Quarters 1-3. In 2014/15, 64% of 5th graders were proficient in Quarters 1-3. In 2014/15, 65% of 2-5 students were proficient in Q3 dropping 13% from 78% in Q2. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, the school average was 67%, below the 80% goal. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, 38% of 2nd grade students were not proficient. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, 35% of 4th grade students were not proficient. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, 39% of 5th grade students were not proficient. <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014/15, 65% of 5th grade students were proficient in Quarters 1-3. Only 55% of students were proficient in Q2 and 60% of students were proficient in Q3 in 2014/15. On 2015/16 Mid-year Benchmark, the school average was 78%, below the 80% goal. <p>mCLASS 3 Year Trend Data (2013/14 - 2015/16)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, from 2013/14 (40%) to 2015/16 (37%), 37% of K-3 students did not meet BOY Benchmark on the TRC which means only 63% of K-3 students were reading on benchmark. Overall, from 2013/14 (39%) to 2015/16 (47%) there was an 8% increase in the number of K-3 students not meeting MOY TRC benchmark goals. Overall, from 2013/14 (16%) to 2014/15 (29%) there was a 13% increase in the number of K-3 students not meeting EOY TRC benchmark goals. From 2013/14 (61%) to 2015/16 (53%) 3rd Grade MOY TRC scores have decreased by 8%. TRC data is correlated to EOG proficiency in ELA. <p>mCLASS Data 2014-2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRC (comprehension) results show that approximately 34% of our students were not at benchmark at the BOY. 33% of students were not meeting benchmark goals of comprehension at the MOY. 28% of students were not at EOY benchmark goals. TRC (comprehension) levels dropped from BOY to MOY in grades 1 & 3 for 2014-2015 school year. Only 54% of K students were on benchmark at the EOY. Only 62% of 1st grade students were on benchmark at the EOY. 15% of first grade students who were on benchmark at the BOY (77%) were not at benchmark at the EOY (62%). <p>mCLASS Data 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37% of K-3 students did not meet BOY benchmark goals on the TRC. 46% of K-3 students did not meet MOY benchmark goals on the TRC. K students dropped from 37% of students meeting benchmark on BOY TRC, to 25% of students meeting benchmark goals on MOY TRC. 1st grade students dropped from 67% of students meeting benchmark on BOY TRC, to 51% of students meeting benchmark goals on MOY TRC. 2nd grade students dropped from 62% of students meeting benchmark on BOY TRC, to 61% of students meeting benchmark goals on MOY TRC. 3rd grade students dropped from 86% of students meeting benchmark on BOY TRC, to 71% of students meeting benchmark goals on MOY TRC. In K-3, there was a 9% decrease of students meeting TRC benchmark goals from BOY (63%) to MOY (54%).

School Improvement Plan

School:	Olds ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Data Components	Strengths (data trend statements)	Concerns (data trend statements)
Process Data	<p>Math Walkthrough Internal Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% instruction is aligned with CCSS. In 2014/15 44% more students are focused on conceptual understanding as compared to 2012-2013. There was a 32% increase in technology use from 2012/13 to 2014/15. In 2014/15, 75% of students were solving appropriate math tasks that allow for various solutions as compared to 2012/13 and 2013/14. <p>mClass Fidelity Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2015/2016, 100 % of K-5 Grade Levels improved in Progress Monitoring for DIBELS. In Q3 of 2015/16, there was an overall 38% decrease in Red students for TRC. 4 out of 6 grade levels (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th) were progress monitoring students in red and yellow with at least 80% fidelity in DIBELS in 2014/15. 1st Grade increased the percentage of TRC progress monitoring for students in red by 73% from 2013/14 to 2014/15. From 2013/14 to 2104/15, 1st Grade increased the percentage of DIBELS progress monitoring by 63% of students in red and 100% of students in yellow. From 2013/14 to 2104/15, 3rd Grade increased the percentage of DIBELS progress monitoring by 50% of students in red. From 2013/14 to 2104/15, 5th Grade increased the percentage of DIBELS progress monitoring by 80% of students in red and 50% of students in yellow. <p>EOG Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014/15, overall Reading percent proficient on the EOG is 80% which is 13% higher than the WCPSS average. In 2014/15, overall Math percent proficient on EOG is 73% which is 4% higher than the WCPSS average. <p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015, 88% of teachers feel that the faculty and staff have a shared vision. 	<p>Math Walkthrough Internal Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2014-2015 63% of instruction was teacher driven. In 2015-2016, 88 % of math instruction has been teacher driven. There was a 5% decrease in the number of students reasoning, thinking, and providing answers from 2013/14 to 2015/16. In 2015/16, 0% of students were engaged in math discourse and student led math discussions. In 2015/16, 0% of students were using mathematical models as evidence of problem solutions (drawings, manipulative, symbols, gestures) <p>mClass Fidelity Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Q3 of 2015/16 Kindergarten has not progress monitored any students in red or yellow in TRC since MOY. In Q3 of 2015/16, there are students in every grade red who have not been progress monitored in TRC since the middle of the year. Kindergarten had a decrease of 20% in the number of students being progress monitored in red, and an 11% decrease of students being progress monitored in yellow from 2013/2014. (DIBELS) In 2014/15, 9% of students needing intensive interventions (red) in DIBELS did not receive progress monitoring. In 2014/15, 19% of students needing interventions (yellow) in DIBELS did not receive progress monitoring. In 2014/15, 20% of K-3 students well below benchmark (red) in TRC did not receive progress monitoring. In 2014/2015, 3 out of 4 grade levels decreased (K:25%, 2nd:40%,3rd: 3%) the percentage of students being progress monitored on TRC. In 2013/14, 0% of 5th graders in red or yellow in DIBELS measured did not receive any progress monitoring. In 2013/14, only 20% of students in red received progress monitoring for DIBELS and 0% of students in yellow received progress monitoring. In 2013/14, only 27% of 1st graders in red in TRC measures received progress monitoring. In 2014/15, 25% of Kindergarten students in red TRC measures did not receive progress monitoring. In 2014/15, 40% of 2nd graders in red TRC measures did not receive progress monitoring. In 2014/15, 24% of 3rd graders in red TRC did not receive progress monitoring <p>Data Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, 2014/15 report card data shows that students are at a higher level of proficiency than benchmark, mCLASS, and EOG data in both ELA and Math.
Staff and Student Demographics	<p>Demographic Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our percentage of special ed students decreased by 3% from 2013/14 to 2014/15. No new nodes of students have been added since 2012. In 2014/15 26% of students are in special education. In 2012/13 - 2014/15 100% of teachers are highly qualified. In 2014/15 Teachers with Master's degrees stayed consistent at 44%. In 2014/15 the number of National Board Certified teachers increased to 21%. In 2014/15, 20% of staff are Beginning Teachers. Every BT has a mentor and is involved in 3 Cycles of Assistance. In 2014/15, 20% of our student population is African American. In 2014/15 16% of staff members are African American, 1% of staff is Hispanic, and 1% of our staff is Asian. In 2014/15 there was an average of 23 students per class. From 2012/13 - 2014/15 100% of K-1 Teachers have teacher assistants. In 2014/15, the average class size was smaller than 2013/14. In 2014/15, 61% of staff had 10 or more years of teaching. 	<p>Demographic Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our percentage of special ed students increased (at least 7%) from 2012/13 to 2014/15 school year. Enrollment increased from 300 in 2013/14 to 350 in 2014/15 but the number of teachers did not increase. Free and reduced lunch rates have increased From 2013/14 to 2014/15 by 9%. Teacher turnover rates have increased 7% from 2012/13 to 2014/15. From 2013/14 to 2014/15 our staff does not include African American males. In 2014/15, 7% of students are Hispanic and 1% students are Asian which means we lack diversity. In 2014/15, the average class size was 23 which is higher than Wake County and the state of North Carolina averages. From 2012/13 - 21014/15 there has been a teacher turnover rates have increased. From 2012/13 - 2014/15, there has been a low percentage of male staff.
Perception	<p>Teacher Working Conditions Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between 2013/14 and 2014/15 TWC surveys, despite staff turnover, 100% of Teachers feel that overall, our school is a good place to work and learn. Between 2013/14 and 2014/15 TWC surveys, despite staff turnover, 100% of Teachers feel that overall, our school is safe. Between 2013/14 and 2014/15 TWC surveys, despite staff turnover, 100% of teachers agree that school leadership supports data-based decision-making. <p>Student Survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In both the 2012/13 and 2013/14 surveys, an average of 99% of students respectively felt that their teachers encouraged them. Between 2012/13-2013/14, student enjoyment of all core subjects increased by 18% from 48% to 66%. From 2012/13 to 2013/14, the percentage of students who feel classwork is interesting increased 6% from 89% to 95%. In all surveys from 2012/13 to 2014/15, an average of 89% of students stated that they could "talk to their teacher/adult at my school when they have a problem". 	<p>Teacher Working Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2013/14, 77% of teachers who stated they spent a lot of time addressing discipline. In 2014/15, 34% of teachers who stated they spent a lot of time addressing discipline. <p>Student Surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From 2012/13 47% of students respectively felt that bullying is a problem at school. From 2013/14 56% of students respectively felt that bullying is a problem at school. From 2013/14 to 2014/15, the same cohort of students had a 32% drop in rating the school good or excellent. (From 77% in 2013/14 to 45% in 2014/15). From 2013/14 to 2014/15, the same cohort of students had a 27% drop in stating that they "feel safe" at school. (From 93% in 2013/14 to 70% in 2014/15).

Priority Concerns/Problem Statement	Root Causes/Hypothesis (ICEL)	Solutions (evidence based)
<p>• TRC decline: Based on mCLASS TRC (Text Reading Comprehension) data trends from 2013/14 to 2015/16, there is an increase in the number of K-3 students NOT meeting MOY (from 39% to 47%) and EOY (from 16% to 29%) benchmark goals.</p>	<p>• Schedule for literacy block is choppy.</p> <p>• Balanced literacy program not carried with fidelity in all grades.</p> <p>• Interventions and Progress Monitoring were not administered/recorded with fidelity.</p>	<p>• SIP Goal 1: Key Process 1/Key Process 2/Key Process 3</p> <p>• Working toward balanced literacy programs school wide, continuous research based reading comprehension strategy instruction, and closer data monitoring in PLT's.</p>

School Improvement Plan

School:	Olds ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

Priority Concerns/Problem Statement	Root Causes/Hypothesis (ICEL)	Solutions (evidence based)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 4 and 5 student proficiency drop :Based on overall EOG AMO performance data from 2012/13 to 2014/15, there is a 12% decrease in the number of College and Career Ready Students (Levels 4 and 5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interventions have mainly been focused on students performing at Level 1 and 2. • Need for differentiation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Goal 1/Key Process 1, 2, and 3 of 2016-2018 SIP • Creating a balanced literacy program with a differentiation focus through guided reading. • Reading comprehension instruction in all content areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDS have not met proficiency: Based on the Math and Reading EOG EDS students did not meet proficiency for three consecutive years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interventions and Progress Monitoring need more fidelity across all grades. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1 Key Process 3 in the 2016-2018 SIP • Create more effective work in Professional Learning Teams (PLT's) to monitor student growth in Reading and Writing.

Data Summary

Describe your conclusions

The Olds Elementary 2016-2018 SIP is based upon the data trends found and comprehensively analyzed within the CNA. The data indicates that our priority concerns are to focus on supporting all subgroups of students in improving reading comprehension. To address these priority concerns and to help students make growth in reading we will continue to improve our reading comprehension strategy instruction, create and implement K-5 balanced literacy programs, and work in Professional Learning Teams to closely monitor student progress in reading and writing. In order to improve school climate, we will update PBIS school protocols and create K-5 Character Education programs.

School:	Olds ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
Principal:	Dr. Mary Anne Wheeler
Date:	Aug - 2017

SIP Team Members

Name	School Based Job Title
1 Anne Dyke	Instructional Support Personnel
2 Ashley Bunn	Teacher
3 Billie Satterwhite	Instructional Support Personnel
4 Brian Anderson	Teacher
5 Brittney Lara	Teacher
6 Carroll Lowell	Instructional Support Personnel
7 Claudia Dalessio-Skare	Teacher
8 Danielle Hill	Teacher
9 Dr. Karen Attwood	Other
10 Dr. Mary Anne Wheeler	Principal
11 Elizabeth Thompson	Teacher
12 Erica Condry	Assistant Principal
13 Janice Lu	Teacher
14 Jay Huffman	Instructional Support Personnel
15 Karen Russell	Instructional Support Personnel
16 Kathleen Bennett	Teacher
17 Lauren Ruiz	Instructional Support Personnel
18 Leanne Stradling	Teacher
19 Leigh Anne Brann	Teacher
20 Lisa Overby	Instructional Support Personnel
21 Magara Boisvert	Teacher
22 Marlene Mazzola	Instructional Support Personnel
23 Melissa Ellisen	School Improvement Chair
24 Micia Dove	Teacher
25 Mrs. Bebee	Parent
26 Rayshawn Lockhart	Teacher
27 Sarita Shaw	School Improvement Chair
28 Suzanne Wilson	Teacher
29 Virginia Young	Teacher
30 Zebetta King	Instructional Support Personnel

School:	Olds ES
Plan Year	2016-2018
Date:	Apr - 2012

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

We will educate, nurture, and challenge every child to be a responsible and productive student who is prepared for the future.

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

- - Expect and promote excellence using data driven practices.
 - Teach the Common Core State Standards and North Carolina Essential Standards in interactive, project-based learning environments.
 - Teach 21st century communication, collaboration, critical thinking, problem-solving, and project management skills.
 - Teach and follow the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) program.
 - Foster global student learning and awareness of diversity.
 - Use stake holder feedback and Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) methodology to improve school systems.

School Goal		
By June 2018, 100% of all student subgroups will demonstrate growth in reading as measured by mCLASS Text Reading Comprehension (TRC), mCLASS DIBELS measures, and Progress Monitoring Pathways of Progress Growth Charts.		
Goal Manager	Strategic Objective	State Board of Education Goal
Dr. Wheeler	Learning and Teaching	21st Century Students
Resources		
We wish to utilize DPI flexibility with funds transfer.		

Key Process
<p>1. Teachers will implement a K-5 comprehensive balanced literacy program to promote student growth in reading and writing.</p> <p>Tier Tier 1 / Core Instruction</p> <p>Process Manager K-5 Teacher</p> <p>Measurable Process Check(s)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WCPSS Benchmark Assessment, mCLASS, WCPSS Writing Rubrics, Read to Achieve Student Data, and Report Card data will be tracked to determine instructional effectiveness. 2. Every quarter, the administrative team will report walk-through data using the in-house walk-through tool in order to track use of reading comprehension strategies. 3. Each quarter students will be given a student survey to share their understanding of reading comprehension strategies. 4. Teacher Balanced Literacy Needs Assessment Surveys will be conducted each Quarter in order to track progress, needs, and reflections on balanced literacy.

Action Step(s)
<p>1. The Administrative Team with staff input will develop a schedule for K-5 teachers that includes daily implementation of a balanced literacy block.</p> <p>Timeline From 7/2016 To 8/2016</p> <p>2. K-5 Teachers will design instruction and assessments using the structure of balanced literacy, which includes read aloud, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, writing, and word study.</p> <p>Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018</p> <p>3. The IRT will coordinate on-going and differentiated professional development in balanced literacy for all K-5 Teachers.</p> <p>Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018</p>

4. The IRT and Literacy Coach will coordinate parent information sessions on balanced literacy components and strategies to help students at home.

Timeline From 9/2016 To 4/2018

5. Teachers will use the balanced literacy block to help provide interventions and progress monitoring to students based on data.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

6. The Media Specialist will manage a leveled book room to support a balanced literacy program.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 12/2016

Key Process

2. Teachers will teach students how to use research-based reading comprehension strategies to comprehend text.

Tier

Tier 1 / Core Instruction

Process Manager

K-5 Teacher

Measurable Process Check(s)

1. WCPSS Benchmark Assessment, mCLASS, WCPSS Writing Rubrics, Read to Achieve Student Data, and Report Card data will be tracked to determine instructional effectiveness.
2. Every quarter, the administrative team will report walk through data using the in-house walk through tool in order to track use of reading comprehension strategies.

Action Step(s)

1. Teachers will model and help students use reading comprehension strategies in all content areas including ELA, math, science, social studies, and special areas.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

2. Teachers will instruct students how to identify and use both narrative and informational **text structures** to comprehend, learn, and remember content.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

3. Teachers will develop discussions questions that require students to think deeply about the text to include mCLASS question stems in grade level meetings.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

4. Teachers will establish an engaging environment that motivates students by allowing reading choices and the opportunity to learn by collaborating with peers to discuss the use of reading comprehension strategies.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

Key Process

3. Teachers and Administration will work in Professional Learning Teams (PLT's) to monitor student growth in reading and writing.

Tier

Tier 1 / Core Instruction

Process Manager

K-5 Teacher

Measurable Process Check(s)

1. Grade level formative and summative data such as WCPSS Benchmark Assessment, mCLASS, WCPSS Writing Rubrics, Read to Achieve Student Data, and Report Card data will be tracked to determine instructional effectiveness.
2. Every quarter, the administrative team will report walk-through data using the in-house walk-through tool in order to track use of reading comprehension strategies.
3. PLT documentation that includes agendas, minutes, assessment data, and common formative assessment data.

Action Step(s)

1. PLT's will collect and analyze mCLASS TRC/DIBELS/Progress Monitoring to determine student instructional needs and areas of growth.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

2. Administration, PLT's and Support Staff will create, collect, and analyze grade level common assessment data to determine next steps for instruction.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

3. PLT's will maintain ongoing PLT records of agendas, minutes, and student data.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

School Goal		
By June 2018, the overall health and safety and general climate of Olds Elementary will be at or above 90% satisfaction level as measured by Climate (student, teacher, and parent) Surveys and Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) Referral Data.		
Goal Manager	Strategic Objective	State Board of Education Goal
Erica Condry	Learning and Teaching	Healthy Responsible Students
Resources		
Healthy Active Children Policy (K-8) Duty Free Lunch and Planning Safe and Orderly Schools Plan		

Key Process
<p>1. Update Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) Protocols.</p> <p>Tier Tier 1 / Core Instruction</p> <p>Process Manager K-5 Teacher</p> <p>Measurable Process Check(s) Teacher Working Conditions Student, K-5 Progress Report Student Conduct and Work Habits, Student and Parent Feedback</p>

Action Step(s)
<p>1. The PBIS Team will review and revise school wide protocols with staff input.</p> <p>Timeline From 8/2016 To 12/2016</p> <p>2. All staff will implement revised PBIS protocols.</p> <p>Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018</p> <p>3. PBIS Team and Administration will check fidelity and effectiveness of revised protocols each quarter and make necessary revisions.</p> <p>Timeline From 8/2014 To 6/2018</p>

Key Process
<p>2. Teachers with support from the School Counselor will plan for and incorporate a K-5 Character Education Program.</p>

School: Olds ES

Plan Year 2016-2018

LEA: Wake County (920)

Tier

None

Process Manager

K-5 Teacher

Measurable Process Check(s)

1. Teacher Working Conditions Student
2. K-5 Progress Report Student Conduct and Work Habits
3. Student and Parent Feedback

Action Step(s)

1. Administration and K-5 Teachers will create time in class schedules to conduct classroom meetings.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2018

2. K-5 Teachers/Staff will use CMAPP Resources and the WCPSS Teaching Character Education Expectations found on Blackboard/Canvas to enhance Character Education Program.

Timeline From 8/2016 To 6/2017

School:	Olds ES
Plan Year	2016-2018

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

School Improvement Plan
Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

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

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:
Balanced Literacy	Teachers Administrators	Goal 1
Classroom Meeting Structures	Teachers Administrators	Goal 2
Multiple Tiered Support Systems (MTSS)	Teachers Administrators	Goal 1 Goal 2
PLT Best Practices Refresher	Teachers Administrations	Goal 1 Goal 2
Growth Mindset in the Classroom	Teachers Administration	Goal 2
Understanding PBIS Protocols	Teachers Administrators	Goal 2
Text Structure Instructional Practices	Teachers Adminstration	Goal 1
Reading Comprehension in the Content Areas	Teachers Adminstration	Goal 1 Goal 2
Using a Leveled Book Room for Guided Reading	Teachers Administrators	Goal 1

School Improvement Plan
Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

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

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:
Understanding by Design: A Focus on Comprehension	Teachers Administrators	Goal 1
Professional Learning Teams: Data Driven Dialogue	Teachers Administrators	Goal 1 Goal 2
Culturally Responsive Morning Meetings	Teachers Administration	Goal 2
Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)	Teachers Administrators	Goal 1 Goal 2
Understanding PBIS Protocols	Teachers Administrators	Goal 2
Using Equity Audits in the Classroom	Teachers Administration	Goal 1 Goal 2

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Olds 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 need additional data points: K-3: mCLASS data 4-5: EOG below 4, ELA Report Card grades below a 3 (administer mCLASS assessments) Threshold for Entry into the Problem Solving Cycle: students demonstrating a need in two or more measures (excluding composite, strategic or intensive). Team refers to WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart to guide decisions. Also, review students who received a level 1 on 3rd Grade BOG. Exit: Reference WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart as well as gaining mutual agreement of all stakeholders. PLTs will meet with their case managers the first meeting of the month and additional times as needed for Kid Talk. Intervention Team will meet twice times a month 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 K-1: Number Knowledge Test 1-5: Report Card, EOY math summative or EOG Threshold for Entry into the Problem Solving Cycle: K reference WCPSS Using NKT to Make Data-Based Decisions. 1-5: Students who are below a level 3 on Report Cards and Common Formative Assessments Exit: Reference WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart as well as gaining mutual agreement of all stakeholders. PLTs will meet with their case managers the first meeting of the month and additional times as needed for Kid Talk. Intervention Team will meet twice times a month 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 (where applicable) NKT scores in Oasis. 1-5:common formative assessments</p>	<p>Core: Excel spreadsheet is maintained that includes major and minor referrals. Behavior form for majors and minors is completed by teachers/staff. Suspensions are being tracked in SIRs. Threshold for Entry into the Problem Solving Cycle: <u>(Must show need in at least 2 data points)</u> Strategic: -at least 3 Minor Referrals -at least 2 Major Referrals -data from classroom behavior flowchart Or if student is suspended 2 times Intensive: Student is not meeting goals or responding to interventions outlined in the Tier 2 plan. Tier 2 plan has been reviewed for fidelity of implementation. EXIT: Plan to gradually decrease intensity, frequency, and/or duration of intervention. Continue to monitor success within Core. Reference WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart as well as gaining mutual agreement of all stakeholders. 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 the first meeting of the month and additional times as needed for Kid Talk. Intervention Team will meet twice times a month 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 use TFI data to evaluate the effectiveness of the behavior structures outlined in the intervention matrix. Quarterly, the Intervention Team will review overall behavior intervention plan data to determine effectiveness of plans.</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

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

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Intervention Structure	<p>Students in need of strategic support will receive intervention 2 to 4 days a week for 10-20 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 10 - 30 minutes per session with no more than 3 in a group.</p> <p>Interventions will be delivered during:the core reading block the students will receive whole group instruction, small group instruction, and intervention instruction (core plus intervention) or during the built in intervention time.</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:the built in intervention time.</p>	<p>Strategic Options: Check-In, Check-Out Small Social/Emotional Groups Brief Prevent-Teach-Respond planning framework Walking groups</p> <p>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</p> <p>Structure: Core + Intensive interventions will vary by frequency and duration based on student need and responsiveness Interventions will be delivered during lunch, transitions, arrival, dismissal and non-instructional times. Team will ensure that students are receiving core academic and behavior instruction in addition to interventions.</p>
Instruction	<p>All stakeholders will be informed of instructional decisions & planning by the PLT notes.</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-5: All intervention will be delivered with explicit direct instruction.</p> <p>Intervention Team will provide a spreadsheet for teachers to document attendance of students receiving interventions and response.</p>	<p>All stakeholders will be informed of instructional decisions & planning by the PLT notes.</p> <p>Assessing Math concepts diagnostic assessments will be administered for Kindergarten & 1st grades as outlined by the WCPSS</p> <p>K & 1st grade where applicable will follow lessons from Kathy Richardson's <u>Assessing Math Concepts</u></p> <p>K-5: All intervention will be delivered with explicit direct instruction.</p> <p>Intervention Team will provide a spreadsheet for teachers to document attendance of students receiving interventions and response.</p>	<p>All stakeholders will be informed of instructional decisions & planning by the PLT notes.</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 Intervention Team will keep a documented spreadsheet of students receiving interventions. 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 2-3 times a year.</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

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

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Assessment and Progress Monitoring	<p>Reference EASi Progress Monitoring Master List spreadsheet Duration, frequency & intensity will be adjusted based on progress monitoring data points and following the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart Every 20 days for Strategic Need Every 10 days for Intensive Need 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>Reference EASi Progress Monitoring Master List spreadsheet. Duration, frequency & intensity will be adjusted based on progress monitoring data points and following the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart Progress monitor every 3 to 4 weeks 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. Intensive: Progress monitoring based upon entry/exit criteria will be documented in Easi and targets will be outlined in Tier III Behavior intervention plan. Duration, frequency & intensity will be adjusted based on progress monitoring data points and following the WCPSS Tiered Support Flowchart Review behavior plan every 4 to 6 weeks and plan should contain at least weekly data points 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 3-5 Word Work: Recipe for Reading K-5: The Reading Strategies Book EASi Interventions Master List spreadsheet EASi Progress Monitoring Master List spreadsheet</p>	<p>K/1 (where applicable): WCPSS Strategic Interventions to Support K-2 Mathematics document & Linking AMC Instruction document for intensive students Assessing Math Concepts book EASi Interventions Master List spreadsheet EASi Progress Monitoring Master List spreadsheet</p>	<p>Core: PBIS Systems and Structures Morning Meeting/Morning Meeting Book Behavior Flowchart Strategic: Check In Check Out Check-N-Connect Anxiety Workbook (school counselors K-12) Second Step, Steps to Respect CMAPP curriculum (small groups) Teachers Encyclopedia of Behavior Management Kelso's Choice Intensive: PTR-Prevent, Teach, Reinforce Framework Behavior Intervention Plans</p>

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

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

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