WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016

Data Components	Areas of Strengths	Areas of Concern
Student Achievement	**<u>School-wide Averages MClass TRC Scores (2014-2015):</u>** **BOY assessments indicate that our school wide baseline percentages are better than in 2013-2014 (EOY).** **Far Below Target: 41% to 47%** **Below Target: 16.3% to 13%** **On Target: 24% to 23%** **Above Target: 18.2% to 17%** **As measured by TRC scores Kindergarten students far below grade level decreased from 63% to 42%. Students above target increased from 4% to 27%** **As measured by TRC scores 1st grade students on target increased from 14% to 23%** **As measured by TRC scores 2nd grade students above target increased from 6% to 9%. Below grade level students decreased from 33% to 7%.** **As measured by TRC scores 3rd grade students above target increased from 17% to 29%. Students far below grade level decreased from 33% to 30%** **As measured by TRC scores 4th grade students below grade level decreased from 16% to 13%. Students on target increased from 14% to 19%.** **School-wide Averages mCLASS Composite Scores (2014-2015):** **Far Below Target 34% to 31%** **Below Target 19% to 20%** **On Target 47% to 49%** **As measured by composite scores Kindergarten students far below grade level decreased from 47% to 14%. Students on target increased from 33% to 63%** **As measured by composite scores 3rd grade students below grade level decreased from 20% to 16%.** **As measured by composite scores 4th grade students far below grade llevel decreased from 30% to 26%.** **School-wide Averages MClass Composite Scores (2013-2014):** Far Below Target 39% to 24.3% Below Target 21.8% to 18.2% On Target 39% to 57.5% As measured by composite scores Kindergarten students far below grade level decreased from 57% to 14%. Students on grade level increased from 24% to 65%. As measured by composite scores 1st grade students far below grade level decreased from 47% to 34%, below grade level students decreased from 24% to 18%, on grade level students increased from 29% to 48%. As measured by composite scores 4th grade students far below grade level decreased from 18% to 13%, below grade level students decreased from 24% to 14%, on grade level students increased from 29% to 48%. As measured by composite scores 5th grade students far below grade level decreased from 26% to 23%, below grade level students decreased from 37% to 22%, on grade level students increased from 37% to 55%. **School-Wide Averages MClass TRC Scores (2013-2014)** Far Below Target 42.5% to 36.6% + On Target 21.8% to 29.5% + • As measured by TRC scores Kindergarten students far below grade level decreased from 78% to 49%. Students above target increased from 1% to 21% • As measured by TRC scores 1st grade students far below grade level decreased from 40% to 38%. • As measured by TRC scores 2nd grade students far below grade level decreased from 34% to 30%. Students below target decreased from 29% to 12%. Students on target increased from 17% to 38% • As measured by TRC scores 3rd grade students far below grade level decreased from 41% to 30%. Students below target decreased from 23% to 19%. Students on target increased from 23% to 26%. Students above target increased from 13% to 25% • As measured by TRC scores 5th grade students far below grade level decreased from 42.5% to 36.6%. Students below grade level decreased from 18% to 7%. Students on target increased from 20% to 56%. **School-Wide Averages mCLASS Composite Scores (2012-2013):** Far Below Target 37% to 26% Below Target 19% to 21% On Target 44% to 53% As measured by composite scores Kindergarten students far below target decreased from 37% to 10%. Students on target increased from 46% to 74%. As measured by composite scores 1st grade students far below target decreased from 31% to 21%. Students on target increased from 52% to 64%. As measured by composite scores 2nd grade students far below target decreased from 21% to 16% As measured by composite scores 4th grade students far below target decreased from 39% to 28% As measured by composite scores 5th grade students far below target decreased from 33% to 26% **School-Wide Averages mCLASS TRC Scores (2012-2013):** Far Below Target 46% to 31% Below Target 16% to 18% On Target 18% to 32% Above Target 20% to 19% As measured by TRC scores Kindergarten students far below target decreased from 79% to 40%. Students above target increased from 2% to 19% As measured by TRC scores 1st grade students far below target decreased from 32% to 22% As measured by TRC scores 2nd grade students far below target decreased from 37% to 30%. Students above target increased from 10% to 15% As measured by TRC scores 3rd grade students far below target decreased from 53% to 25%. Students above target increased from 12% to 35% As measured by TRC scores 4th grade students far below target decreased from 36% to 29% **<u>As evidenced by AMO Status Report: (2013-2014)</u>** •African American students and Students with Disabilities met AMO Targets in **Reading**. •African American, Limited English Proficiency, and Students with Disabilities made their AMO Targets in **Math**. **<u>EOG ('13-'14) compared to EOG ('14-'15)</u>** Students increased Reading scores from 19.2 % proficiency to 21.2% proficiency. **<u>EOG ('12-'13) compared to EOG ('13-14)</u>** 4th grade EOG ('12-'13) **Reading** – 34.3% proficiency / 5th grade ('13-'14) 37.6% proficiency 4th grade EOG ('12-'13) **Math** – 30.8%/5th grade ('13-'14) 42.3% proficiency **BOG ('14-'15) to EOG ('14-'15)** 3rd graders improved proficiency from 10.2% proficient to 37% proficient on the EOG. **<u>BOG ('13-'14) to EOG ('13-'14)</u>** 3rd graders improved proficiency from 9% overall on the BOG to 27% proficiency on the EOG **<u>EOG Compared to Case 21 Data (projected proficiency)</u>** Case 21 5th Grade '13-'14 projected proficiency in **Reading** 28.4% 5th grade '13-'14 EOG proficiency 38% Case 21 4th Grade '13-14 projected proficiency in **Reading** 9.55% 4th grade '13-'14 EOG proficiency 23% Case 21 4th Grade '13-14 projected proficiency in **Math** 17.6% 4th grade '13-'14 EOG proficiency 30.7% Case 21 5th Grade ('13-'14) projected proficiency in **Math** 40.45% 5th grade proficiency EOG 42.3% **<u>As evidenced Case 21 Data:</u>** 2nd grade students increased their average percentage correct on Case 21 ELA from 47.3% in Q2 to 57.3% in Q4 2nd grade students increased their average percentage correct on Case 21 Math from 61% in Q2 to 64.4% in Q4	***In the 2016-2018 SIP planning year, we will add the K-1 Math Summative Data. (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)*** **<u>As evidenced by mClass Reading benchmark assessments:</u>** **School-wide Average mCLASS Compositte Scores (2014-2015):** **As measured by composite scores 2nd grade students far below grade level increased from 27% to 40%. Students on target decreased from 59% to 45%** **School-wide Averages mCLASS TRC Scores (2014-2015):** **Far Below Grade Level increased from 42% to 47%** **As measured by TRC scores 1st grade students far below grade level increased from 43% to 53%. Students above target decreased from 26% to 7%** **As measured by TRC scores 2nd grade students far below grade level increased from 42% to 71%.** **As measured by TRC scores 4th grade students far below grade level increased from 31% to 42%** **As measured by TRC scores 5th grade students far below grade level increased from 37% to 45%** **School-wide Averages MClass Composite Scores (2013-2014):** As measured by composite scores Kindergarten students below target (yellow) level increased from 19% to 21 %. As measured by composite scores 2nd grade students far below target increased from 18% to 24%. Students below target increased from 14% to 15%. Students on grade level decreased from 68% to 61%. **School-Wide Averages MClass TRC Scores (2013-2014)** Below Target increased from 17.8% to 18.3%% Above Target decreased from 17.8% 15.5% As measured by TRC scores Kindergarten students below target increased from 2% to 17% and students on target decreased from 19% to 13% As measured by TRC scores 1st grade students below target increased from 12% to 29%. Students on target decreased from 29% to 22%. Students above target decreased from 19% to 11% As measured by TRC scores 4th grade students far below target increased from 24% to 36%. Students below target increased from 23% to 26%. Students on target decreased from 23% to 22%. Students above target decreased from 30% to 16%. As measured by TRC scores 5th grade students above target decreased from 24% to 0%. **School-Wide Averages mCLASS TRC Scores (2012-2013):** As measured by TRC scores 1st grade students below target increased from 15% to 32% As measured by TRC scores 4th grade students above target decreased from 36% to 29% **As evidenced by AMO Status Report(2014-2015):** We did not meet targets in 4 of 4 subgroups in Reading: All students, African American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged. We did not meet targets in 4 of 4 subgroups in Math: All students, African American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged. **<u>As evidenced by AMO Status Report(2013-2014):</u>** We did not meet target in 4 of 10 subgroups in the area Reading : All student, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and Limited English Proficient We did not meet target in 3 out of 10 subgroups in the area of Math: All students, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged **<u>EOG ('13-14) compared to EOG ('14-15)</u>** Math scores decreased from 31.2% passing to 22.9% passing. 4th grade EOG ('13-'14) Reading 39% proficient to 5th grade EOG ('14-'15) 17% proficient. 4th grade EOG ('13-'14) Math- 29% proficient to 5th ('14-'15) 28% proficient **<u>EOG ('12-'13) compared to EOG ('13-14)</u>** 3rd grade EOG ('12-'13) Reading - 28% proficiency/ 4th grade ('13-'14) 22.4% proficiency 3rd grade EOG ('12-'13) Math – 28% proficiency/4th grade ('13-'14) 22.4% proficiency **EOG ('13-14) compared to EOG ('14-15)** Math scores decreased from 31.2% passing to 22.9% passing. 4th grade EOG ('13-'14) Reading 39% proficient to 5th grade EOG ('14-'15) 17% proficient. 4th grade EOG ('13-'14) Math- 29% proficient to 5th ('14-'15) 28% proficient ***EOG ('12-'13) compared to EOG ('13-14)*** ***5th grade Science EOG increased from 20% ('12-'13) to 38% ('13-'14)*** ***EOG ('13-14) compared to EOG ('14-15)*** ***Science scores decreased from 38% passing to 29% passing.*** ***(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)*** **<u>EOG Compared to Case 21 Data (projected proficiency)</u>** Case 21 5th Grade '14-'15 projected proficiency in **Reading** 28.2% 5th grade '14-'15 EOG proficiency 17% Case 21 4th Grade '14-'15 projected proficiency in **Reading** 37.9% 4th grade '14-'15 EOG proficiency 39% Case 21 4th Grade '14-'15 projected proficiency in **Math** 39.4% 4th grade '14-'15 EOG proficiency 29% Case 21 5th Grade ('14-'15 projected proficiency in **Math** 17.9% 5th grade '14-'15 proficiency EOG 28% **<u>As evidenced Case 21 Data (2014-2015):</u>** 2nd grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 ELA from 28.9% in Q2 to 24% in Q4 2nd grade students increased their average percentage correct on Case 21 Math from 24.7% in Q2 to 30.9% in Q4 **<u>As evidenced Case 21 Data:</u>** 3rd grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 ELA from 43% in Q1 to 42.3% in Q3 3rd grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 Math from 49.1% in Q1 to 44.8% in Q3 4th grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 ELA from 48.3% in Q1 to 47.8% in Q3 4th grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 Math from 55.5% in Q1 to 37.4% in Q3 5th grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 ELA from 64.4% in Q1 to 56.7% in Q3 5th grade students decreased their average percentage correct on Case 21 Math from 57.1% in Q1 to 38.7% in Q3

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016

Data Components	Areas of Strengths	Areas of Concern
Instructional Practices/Strategies	As evidenced by the TWC survey and Staff Surveys conducted within the school: • 100% of teachers report that their lessons are aligned with Common Core Standards. • 95.3% of teachers report that they work regularly in PLTs to develop and align instructional practices and use data to inform their instruction • 83% + teachers report that they are encouraged to try new things to improve instruction and that provided supports like coaches within the school help improve their instructional practices. • 70% of staff surveyed report that they have implemented STEM lessons successfully in their classrooms. • 80% + of staff surveyed reported that they are comfortable creating STEM lessons to support Literacy and Science independently • 67% if staff surveyed reported that they were comfortable creating STEM lessons to support Math instruction independently • K-2 teachers and support staff have been trained in Letterland/Letterlands Intervention and the program has been fully implemented in these grades. • SiOP is used at Hodge Road and teachers regularly participate in coaching cycles. • 80% of staff reported that they know SIOP very well or fairly well when surveyed • 69% of staff report that they use SIOP often or always in their classrooms • A master schedule is utilized and includes designated intervention blocks to insure that students are not pulled out of class during core instruction. • Teachers are implementing a Literacy Framework this year to align Margarita Calderon's work with the Daily Cafe. • Teachers are also incorporating Academic Language into their lesson plans.	As evidenced by TWC survey 2014 and staff surveys/observations conducted by various teams (MTSS and SIOP): • 31% or fewer teachers feel that state and local assessment data accurately gauges a student's understanding of standards. • Only 28% of teachers surveyed feel that state assessment data is available in time to impact instructional practices and only 48% feel that this data is useful in improving instruction • 31% of staff reported that they used SIOP never or sometimes in their classrooms • SIOP walk through data indicates that teachers are not posting and reviewing content and language objectives with students on a regular basis • SIOP walk through data indicated that teachers needed to work on building background and emphasizing key vocabulary. • SIOP walk through data also indicated deficits in the utilization of strategies to promote higher order thinking skills. • Staff indicated on the SIOP staff survey that they are least comfortable with the comprehesive input and the review/assessment components of SIOP • Teachers report that the needs of majority of their students are not being met by core instruction that closely follows the lesson formats found on CMAPP • On a scale of 1-10 teachers at HRES give the lessons found on CMAPP a score of 5 and find that they do not meet the needs of our students without a lot of differentiation • Teachers report that they would like to have systematic writing program • Teachers need additional professional development in Math Discourse

Data Components	Areas of Strengths	Areas of Concern
Staff and Student Demographics	***In the 2016-2018 SIP plan year, we will consider analyzing demographics specific to Hodge Road Elementary and changes that have occurred to our student population that may affect student achievement. No changes needed at this time. (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)*** **Wake Schools Community Data** **WCPSS F/R Average** **The district Free and Reduced Average is 37%** **Wake County Demographics according to Census Bureau (2013)** **Total Population 929,214** **White- 61.8%** **Black- 20.5%** **Hispanic- 9.8%** **Asian- 5.6%** **Two or more Races- 1.8%** **Some Other Race- 0.3%** **American Indian/Alaskan Native- 0.2%** **Native/Hawaiin/Other Pacific Islander- 0%** **Hodge Road Spanish Dual Language Immersion Magnet** **Ethnic Data** **Hispanic- 63.7%** **Non-Hispanic- 36.2** **Race** **White- .07%** **Black- 24.3%** **Asian- .01%** **Two or more races- .03%** **Suspensions (2014-2015)** **2 OF 640 had short term suspensions .005%** **Number of Incidents by Sub-Group** **2014-2015** **Black- 57** **Hispanic 28** **White- 7** **Other 0** **2013-2014** **Black 47** **Hispanic 23** **White 21** **Other 1** **2012-2013** **Black 32** **Hispanic 30** **White 7** **Other 3** ***2014-2015 Promotion/Retentions*** ***Promotions 610, Retentions 19 (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)*** **Teacher Data** **100% of teachers are fully licensed and highly qualified** **15 Teachers have Advanced Degrees** **3.5 Teachers are National Board Certified** **K-2 Literacy Coach** **K-5 Math Coach- 50%** **Academic Language Coach- 50%** **MTSS Coach- 50%** **STEM Coach-100%** **Graduation Coach- 50%** **Instructional Resource Teacher- 100%** **Teacher Demographics** **White- 70%** **Black- 19%** **Latino- 1.0%** **Number of years of experience** **0-3: 6** **4-10:23** **10+:25** **Teacher Turnover Rate- 19.1%**	As evidenced by Demographics by School per WCPSS Databases and Dashboard and Oasis: • 78.5% Free and Reduced Lunch • 39.2% LEP • 63.7% of families are Hispanic/Latino • Transient Population

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016

Data Components	Areas of Strengths	Areas of Concern
Perception	• As evidenced by 2014 TWC: • 70% of teachers feel that they have time avaiable to collaborate with colleagues • 93% of teachers feel that they have adequate workspace and they feel that the environments of the classrooms support teaching and learning. • 90.7% of teachers provide parents/guardians with useful information about student learning • 100% of the staff feel that the school environment is safe. • 93% + staff members believe that students understand expectations for conduct and follow the rules of conduct throughout the school environment. • 86% of teachers feel that they are recognized as educational experts and agree that they are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles. * 88.1% of teachers report that school leadership facilitates using data to improve student learning. * 90% + teachers report that professional develpment enhances their ability to improve student learning and that teachers are encouraged to reflect on their own practice. * 100% of staff feel that the curriculum taught in this school is aligned with Common Core Standards. * 95.3% of teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices. * Overall 87.5% of staff feel that Hodge Road is a good place to work and learn!!	***In 2016-2018 SIP Planning process, we will create a climate goal based on the results from the Spring 2016 TWC Survey.(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)*** As reflected in the 2014 TWC survey: • Only 22% of teachers feel that efforts are made to minimize the amount of routine paperwork that they are expected to complete • Only 39% of teachers report that they feel that they have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students • 48.8% of teachers do not feel they have sufficient access to instructional technology • Only 12.8% of staff feel that parents/guardians are influential decision makers in the school. • Fewer than 39% of staff feel that parents and cummunity support teachers and the school in efforts to improve student success. • 59.5% of staff felt that school administrators consistently enforce rules for student conduct. • Only 36% of staff felt that PD was differentiated to meet the individual needs of teachers and indicate that PD is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers. • 47.4% of staff indicate that follow up is provided from professional development. • Less than 32% of staff feel that state assessment data is available in time to impact instruction and accurately gauge student's understanding of standards PTA has been re-established, but is still in the process of growing its membership among families and the community. •
Program	**STEM Night (May 2014)** - Provided an opportunity for students to explore a variety of STEM activities provided by staff and community voluteers. Take home materials were provided and community participates provided discount coupons to families. Has been scheduled for (May 2016) **Meet the teacher night and Open House** are held in July and August to welcome families and provide important information to families, including the sharing of the Parent Involvement Policy **PTA** has been reinstitued and sactioned by the national organization **ESL - School Wide Parent Conferences** (September 2014) provide parents with an opportunity to meet with teachers to discuss student progress. Interpreter services are provided by volunteers, school staff and WCPSS funds. This is also a time to involve families in our celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month **PTA Fall into Reading/Fall Festival** (October) - PTA membership opportunity, provide parents with dinner opportunity, Fall Book Fair, games and activities for children, free books. **PAC Night Fall 2014** (November) - Focus on Strengthening Relationships with your Child through Reading and Math. Seventy-two families in attendance. Interpreters and childcare provided. WCPSS parent academy activities focusing on "How parents can support literacy at home using their own language" was well attended. Four PAC Nights have been scheduldled for the 2015-2016 school year. **Parent Academ**y- Three parent academy nights have been planned for 2015-2016 school year. Sessions are to help parents with how to help their child with homework, reading, and how to have effective parent conferences. Students in grades 4 and 5 are given the opportunity to participate in after school clubs (**Computer Science Club and STEM Club**) Students in grades 4 and 5 will participate in the **Science Olympiad** for the second year. Success Maker is provided to students in grades three and four (25 licenses) ExC-ELL Professional Development provided to all certified staff	**As evidenced by PTA and PAC events:** Many parents are unable to attend PTA and PAC night activities because of transportation or work conflicts PTA meetings are difficult because of language barriers and there is often a shortage of people (volunteers/school staff) to provide effective interpreting services during these events PTA involvement and membership is difficult for families because of issues with finances, transportation, language barriers, childcare and work conflicts **<u>As evidenced by Spanish Conference Night:</u>** • Multiple nights required to complete conferences due to large Spanish-speaking population. • WCPSS is now only providing 4 interpreters for any given event; interpreters must be provided internally or through outside organizations. **As evidenced by student participation in afterschool clubs or off campus** activities: It is often difficult for our students to participate in afterschool or off campus activities where transportation is not provided

Priority Concerns	**Root Causes** (with evidence)	**Solution**s
Data collected from 2014-15 EOG indicates that 21.2% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient, which is 46.8% below WCPSS average. As evidenced by Demographics by School per WCPSS Dashboard:Hodge Road's percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students is 78.5% which is 41.5% higher than the WCPSS average. Hodge Road's has 39.2% LEP students as compared to the district average of .08%. ***Only 22% of teachers feel that efforts have been made to reduce paperwork***. ***(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)***	The majority of our students come from homes where English is not the primary language and in many cases parents have very little formal education. The student's level of language aquistion and vocabulary deficits make it diffcult for them to access Common Core Standards at the same pace as their English speaking peers. Instructional time has decreased due to mandated assessments and progress monitoring expectations for students who are below benchmark. CMAPP pacing guides move through standards to quickly for ELLs and struggling learners but teachers feel pressured to teach all standards that will be assessed. Teachers need support and time to adjust their core instruction to the needs of the majority of their students and to collaborate with support staff to meet our students where they are. Research on aquistion of language indicates that written expression is the last skill to develop for ELLs and systematic instruction across the curriculum is necessary to accelerate the development of these skills. Many teachers feel unprepared to teach these skills effectively with the time, materials and resources that they have been provided	Direct Instruction of using graphic organizers and question stems to write and respond to text read. More direct instruction and modeling in written expression Focus on data driven consistent small group instruction for all students on all levels Strengthening Planning and PLT work to fidelity Provide ongoing coaching, training, and modeling for teachers. Scheduling changes to maximize Core Instruction Time and encourage push in support when it can be done (Master Schedule) Support and Programs to help increase language development/acquisition at the Core instructional level (Professional Development, Coaching, Follow-up training and support, School-wide change of mindset) ***Efforts have been made to minimize routine paper work that is under site based control. (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)***

Priority Concerns	**Root Causes** (with evidence)	**Solution**s
Data collected from 2014-2015 EOG indicates that our students are not meeting expected growth targets in Reading and Math. Reading Subgroup Targets by June 2016: • All Students 21.2% to 42.4% • Economically Disadvantaged 19.7% to 39.4% • Black 26% to 52% • Hispanic 16.4% to 32.8% Math Subgroup Targets by June 2016: • All Students 22.9% to 45.8% • Economically Disadvantaged 21.6% to 43.2% • Black 24.7% to 49.4% • Hispanic 20.5% to 41%	The majority of our students come from homes where English is not the primary language and in many cases parents have very little formal education. The student's level of language acquisition and vocabulary deficits make it difficult for them to access Common Core Standards at the same pace as their English speaking peers. Teachers are becoming familiar with Common Core and the different models used to work through the problem solving process. Teachers are still struggling with teaching the amount of content in the allotted time period. CMAPP lessons are lengthy and require much more time for ELLs and struggling students which leaves teachers feeling like they are always either rushing through skills or trying to catch up with the pacing guide. Multiple choice assessments provide data but do not always allow teachers to truly look at the students work and determine the root of the difficulty for the student	Math Foundations Training Math Discourse Training Math Coach and IRT are working with teachers on the structures of a math lesson and the best utilization of time. ExC-ELL Training Teachers will create common assessments that enable them to look at student work and determine the point of intervention needed to build skills and concepts. Direct and Modeled Instruction Strengthening Planning and PLT work to fidelity Provide ongoing coaching, training, and modeling for teachers. Support and Programs to help increase language development/acquisition at the Core instructional level (Vocabulary and Academic Language Training)

Data Summary
Describe your conclusions

• PLT Teams will meet bi-weekly to analyze data to drive instructional plans and to monitor the academic progress of their subgroups.
• Intervention support staff will collaborative bi-monthly with the Core teacher to review and determine best service for students.
• The school administrative team will meet bi-monthly to analyze walk-through, Benchmark, mClass, etc. data, and monitor the implementation of school-wide initiatives.
• The administration team will meet with coaches bi-monthly to reflect on their work, coaching cycles, and develop next steps.
• The School Improvement Committees meet bi-monthly to review progress toward goals.
• The School Improvement Team meets quarterly to review progress toward goals.
• Administration meets monthly with the Area Superintendent's Instructional Coordination Team to evaluate instructional Excellence, Data Analysis, Instructional Planning, and Professional Capacity.

ELA: Based on the data cited above, Hodge Road Elementary will begin utilizing classroom written expression strategies, will focus on using mClass and RBT question stems, and graphic organizers(Thinking Maps) to address below proficiency performance on written responses in MClass and in all content areas. School wide professional development will be held and the school will move to implement the 7-Step Vocabulary instruction that has been proven effective in accelerating English language acquisition and academic success in ELLs and struggling students through the work of Margarita Calderon and others. Certified teachers have participated in Professional Development with Calderon and implementation of her Reading in Content Areas.Certified staff will have professional development on Writing with Margarita Calderon during the 2015-2016 school year. Instructional plans will be developed through collaborative literacy teams, which include Core, Literacy, and ESL staff, focused on academic growth for all students. We will provide ongoing professional development to meet the needs of all teachers, incorporating Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy, being a STEM school, and fully utilizing mCLASS including progress monitoring, analyzing, and using data.

MATH: Based on the data sited above, Hodge Road will implement a daily math schedule that includes: Problem of the Day, Math Talk, Depth of Knowledge questioning, data driven and rigorous common core instruction and 30 minutes of intervention. Teachers will utilize PLTs to monitor the effectiveness of interventions, classroom instruction and make changes as needed. We will continue working toward full implementation of STEM across all classrooms and content areas through the use of coaching cycles, training and collaboration. We will continue rigorous Common Core instruction, increase intervention support, plan with classroom teachers, and provide ongoing coaching/modeling which will improve our students’ scores across quarters, as evidenced by CASE 21 to reflect spiraling Common Core standards. We will provide ongoing professional development to meet the needs of all teachers.

Please see our goals, key process and action steps to see our vision of improvement to impact growth and school performance grade.

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Membership of School Improvement Team

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
Principal:	Debra Pearce
Date:	Oct - 2015

SIP Team Members

	Name	School Based Job Title
1	Allyn Arrowood	Other
2	Chris Coby	Assistant Principal
3	Debra Pearce	Principal
4	Eveline Muela	Teacher
5	Krystal Eakes	Teacher
6	Mandy Stevenson	Teacher
7	Nancy Barringer	Teacher
8	Nicole Kovach	School Improvement Chair
9	Raven Banner	Other
10	Sarah Mailhot	Teacher
11	Sarah Pate	Teacher
12	Sherry Harris	Teacher
13	Teresa Reed	Parent
14	Vanessa Behnke	Teacher

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
Date:	Jul - 2014

Mission Statement:

Hodge Road is committed to teach every student in a rigorous, collaborative and nurturing environment to ensure academic achievement.

Vision Statement:

We envision a rigorous professional learning community, in which a child’s needs are identified through the use of ongoing data analysis, ensuring consistent growth. Our school community will foster a collaborative, safe, and positive environment that models relationship-building and supports cultural uniqueness.

Value Statement:

We believe that collaboration between all stakeholders in a child's education is valuable and necessary.

We believe that academic growth is achieved by nuturing the "whole child" and addressing the academic, emotional, social and physical needs of our students.

We believe in setting high expectations for student achievement and fostering the development of 21st century skills.

We believe in celebrating our school's diversity and encourage an understanding of different cultures.

We believe in providing differentiated instruction in order to accommodate the student's individual learning style and educational needs.

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
LEA:	Wake County (920)

School Goal	*By **June 2016, all student subgroup**s in grades 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance.* We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVAAS in grades K-5. **(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**
Goal Manager	School Testing Coordinator, Administrator, SIP chair
Strategic Objective	Learning and Teaching
State Board of Education Goal	Globally Competitive Students
Data Justification for Goal Based on Comprehensive Needs Assessment	EOG ELA results indicates that only 30% of all students in grades 3-5 at Hodge Road are proficient, which is 27.2% below the district. Only the Black subgroup met their annual growth target. Averages indicate that our Hispanic/Latino subgroup and our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup are performing at similar levels (35.9% and 35.8%) and our LEP students are well below that mark (18.5%).

1 Key Process	All K-5 teachers will implement and utilize the *Seven Steps of Vocabulary* instruction that have been identified through the research of Margarita Calderon and others as being effective in helping ELLs and struggling students in accelerating their English learning and academic success.
Process Manager	Administrators, Trained coaches, IRT
Completion Date	Jun - 2016
Restrainers	Availability of funds for PD Time for training and instruction Time for planning Availability of trained coaches
Resources	School wide comprehensive professional development List of Tier 1, 2 and 3 words that address language, literacy and content objectives Available reading materials in both English and Spanish Coaching cycles and training of peer coaches Monitoring of implementation for fidelity
Measurable Process Check(s)	The ***principal, assistant principa**l, IRT, and instructional coaches and teachers* will reflect quarterly on walkthrough data using the ***7-Step*** observation protocol and mClass data during weekly PLTs to monitor and determine the impact of the Seven Step Vocabulary strategy on student achievement. **(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**

1 Action Step	All teachers and administrators will participate in a comprehensive professional development institute and follow up activities coaching/***co-teaching*** to address the implementation of effective vocabulary instruction.**(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**
Timeline	From 1/2015 To 6/2016

2 Action Step	ExC-ELL coaches will provide follow-up classroom visits, refreshers and miniworkshops throughout the school year to provide additional support.
Timeline	From 1/2015 To 6/2016
3 Action Step	School level coaches and administrtors will learn the observation protocol through shadowing of ExC-ELL coaches and additional training opportunities in order to conduct walk throughs, participate in teacher learning communities and provide effective feedback to staff with regards to vocabulary instruction and student work usage.
Timeline	From 1/2015 To 6/2016
4 Action Step	Coaches and administrators will use the observation protocol during classroom visits throughout the school year to monitor implementation to fidelity.
Timeline	From 1/2015 To 6/2016

2 Key Process	All teachers will effectively use current data to make decisions regarding intervention, core instruction and best service across MTSS (Tier I, Tier II and Tier III) to address the needs of our students.
Process Manager	Grade Chairs, MTSS Committee Chair
Completion Date	Jun - 2016
Restrainers	Training on talk tool form Current SST process Time for collaboration between stakeholders
Resources	PLT agendas PLT data talk tool forms Intervention plans SST documentation
Measurable Process Check(s)	The staff will analyze mClass data BOY, MOY, EOY; Quarterly **(1st, 2nd, & 3rd quarters)** Case 21 Projected Proficiency; Common Assessment and Reflection Data during their weekly PLT's to examine the impact of our instruction program. **(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**

1 Action Step	All teachers will meet weekly with their PLT to analyze common assessments and plan any needed changes to core instruction. Meeting agendas and minutes will be posted to the shared folder. ***Teachers will meet on ESM days each quarter to analyze mClass, Case 21 and report card data. (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)***
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2016

3	**Key Process**	Teachers will teach and utilize explicit strategies to improve written expression and comprehension responses across the curriculum.
	Process Manager	IRT,School Based Coaches/Administrators, Grade Chairs
	Completion Date	Jun - 2016
	Restrainers	Funds and time for professional development Time for collaborative and team planning Materials to use for differiated instruction
	Resources	mClass question stems RBT question stems PD - Thinking Maps and Write from the Beginning Program materials CMAPP Support staff/coaches
	Measurable Process Check(s)	***PLT teams will analyze mClass data BOY, MOY, EOY;common assessment data bi-monthly during weekly PLTs, and quarterly lesson plan checks will be conducted by administration to examine the impact of written comprehension instruction. (REVISED: per DPI feedback received December 1, 2015)***
	1 Action Step	Literacy teachers, IRT, AIG teacher, ESL teachers and Special programs staff will provide **professional development on ESM days** and mini workshops during staff meetings to introduce and model strategies for the use of mClass, RBT question stems, and graphic organizers ***(Thinking Maps)*** during core instruction.**(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**
	Timeline	From 12/2014 To 6/2016
	2 Action Step	All teachers will use MClass written comprehension prompts and RBT question stems provided by the IRT during reading instruction and use the WCPSS rubrics (CMAPP) to analyse writing.
	Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2015
	3 Action Step	A Literacy Walktrough Team comprised of teachers, coaches and administrators will conduct quarterly walkthroughs utilizing a walkthrough data collection tool.
	Timeline	From 1/2015 To 6/2015
4	**Key Process**	Teachers will unpack the English Language Arts Common Core Standards and determine access points for student learning.

Process Manager	MTSS Committees, IRT, Literacy Coach, Grade Chair
Completion Date	Jun - 2016
Restrainers	Time to unpack Time to analyze and plan Collaborative planning with support staff to develop plans for differentiation and intervention
Resources	CMAPP Collaborative and grade level planning time mClass and other assessment data Level books and other materials for differentiated instruction
Measurable Process Check(s)	PLTs will examine mClass data BOY, MOY, EOY ; Quarterly ***(1st, 2nd, & 3rd quarters)*** Case 21 Projected Proficiency; and Common Assessment data during their weekly PLTs to determine the impact of instruction on student achievement.***(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)***

1 Action Step	Time will be provided for teachers to unpack the standards (half day planning, PLTs and collaborative planning sessions with support staff
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2016
2 Action Step	Teachers will analyze the standards to determine what is being asked, what the student needs to do and what prerequisite skills are needed for students to access the standard.
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2015

5 Key Process	All certified staff will participate in a book study (Mindset) to increase knowledge of how developing a growth mindset connects to student learning and increased student achievement.
Process Manager	Principal, IRT
Completion Date	Jun - 2016
Restrainers	Time
Resources	IRT Mindset Books
Measurable Process Check(s)	The ***principal, assistant principal, IRT*** will analyze pre- and post survey data on the completion of the book study to determine the impact of the book study on teacher's growth mindset.**(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**

1 Action Step	Certified staff will complete a pre and post survey.
Timeline	From 12/2015 To 6/2015

2 Action Step	Time will be provided for professional development centered on the book study.
Timeline	From 12/2015 To 6/2016

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
LEA:	Wake County (920)

School Goal	**By *June* 2016, *All student subgroups in grades 3-5 will meet their Math AMO targets as measured by EOG performance*. (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**
Goal Manager	School Testing Coordinator
Strategic Objective	Learning and Teaching
State Board of Education Goal	21st Century Students
Data Justification for Goal Based on Comprehensive Needs Assessment	EOG Math results indicates that only 22.9% of all students in grades 3-5 at Hodge Road met their growth targets. ***None of our subgroups met their growth targets (Blacks, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged) (Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)***

1 Key Process	All teachers will plan and implement a daily math schedule that includes: • 15 minutes for a Problem of the Day that incorporates Math Discourse and Depth of Knowledge Question Stems. • 30 minutes of data-driven small group interventions or acceleration groups • 45 minutes of **planned**, core instruction utilizing the WCPSS resources to include Depth of Knowledge questioning and Math Discourse
Process Manager	Grade Chairs, Math Coach, Administrators, IRT
Completion Date	Jun - 2016
Restrainers	Training and support for teachers Time for collaboration and planning
Resources	Problem of the Day materials DoK question stem materials CMAPP Math data Math coach
Measurable Process Check(s)	Teachers in grades 3-5 will use Quarterly **(1st, 2nd, & 3rd quarters)** Case 21 Projected Proficiency,Common Assessments," **Math Look For"walkthrough** data, and ***Number Knowledge Test data (Kindergarten)*** to determine the impact of a well-planned structured math block on student achievement.**(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**

1 Action Step	All teachers will be trained to use the Collaborative Planning Tool.
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 7/2015

2 Action Step	All teachers will be trained by ***June 2016*** on Depth of Knowledge questioning, Math ***Discourse***, THINK, and Go Solve graphic organizers in order to implement these instructional practices with fidelity. **(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**
Timeline	From 12/2014 To 6/2016

3 Action Step	Teachers will use the school wide PLT data talk tool bi-weekly to drive data analysis, intervention decisions, and instructional implementation of ***MTSS*** (Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3) across all grade-levels. **(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2016

2 Key Process	Hodge Road Elementary will increase its implementation of STEM across all classrooms and academic disciplines by implementing the following STEM schedule: • 2014-2015 All certified staff will complete 2 or more full STEM cycles this academic year in order to enhance students' 21st century learning expectations. • 2015-2016 All certified staff will complete 3 or more full STEM cycles this academic year in order to enhance students' 21st century learning expectations. • 2016-2017 All certified staff will complete a minimum of a quarterly STEM cycle this academic year in order to enhance students' 21st century learning expectations.
Process Manager	STEM Coordinator
Completion Date	Jun - 2017
Restrainers	Time for planning and implementation Availablity of resources
Resources	STEM Coordinator Training and tools for implementations Grade level common planning opportunities Technology resources
Measurable Process Check(s)	Teachers will analyze Case 21 Math & Science Projected Proficiency quarterly ***(1st, 2nd, & 3rd quarters)*** to determine the impact of Stem Cycles on student achievement in Math & Science**(Revised : per DPI Feedback received December 1, 2015)**.

1 Action Step	Hodge Road Elementary will host an annual STEM event in order to increase student, family, and community understanding of the STEM process and in order to showcase STEM activities completed at the school each year.
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2017

2 Action Step	All certified staff will post photographic/written evidence of each completed STEM cycle on the shared folder.
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2017
3 Action Step	Per Goal 1, all teachers will plan and integrate STEM vocabulary instruction during math and science lessons.
Timeline	From 7/2014 To 6/2017

Date	May - 2014
Waiver Requested	
No waiver is requested	
How will this waiver impact school improvement?	
None	
Please indicate the type of waiver:	Local
Please indicate the policy to be waived	n/a

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2014-2015

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:	Supporting Data:
Thinking Maps	Grade K-5 Teachers	By 2016, All students in grades 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance, with a focus on the Hispanic/Latino subgroup, LEP students and the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. We will also meet of exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVAAS in grades K-5.	Reading data indicates that only 19.2% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient, which is 34.9% below district. We did not meet target in 5 of 6 subgroups in the area Reading: All student, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient & Students with Disabilities. The Hispanic (45.7%, 50.1%, 55.9%) and Free & Reduced Lunch (65.2%, 71.1%, 79.8%) populations are increasing significantly each year; although there was a decrease in the Limited English Proficient subgroup in 2010-11, it increased even more 2011-12. When School of Choice became options, our Black and White subgroups decreased while our Free and Reduced Lunch population increased.
Go SOLVE - Graphic Organizers for Math	Math Teachers Gr. 3-5	By 2016, All students in grades 3-5 will meet their Math AMO targets as measured by EOG performance, with a focus on the Hispanic/Latino subgroup, the LEP subgroup and the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. K-2 students will meet growth targets as measured by end of year summative assessments or Case 21 (2nd grade).	In Math, 31.1% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient on EOG test, which is 23.2% below the district. We did not meet target in 4 out of 6 subgroups in the area of Math: All students, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient & Students with Disabilities. LEP students and Students with Disabilities scored significantly lower than other subgroups.
Effective Vocabulary Instruction - Margarita Caldron	All staff	By 2016, All students in grades 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance, with a focus on the Hispanic/Latino subgroup, LEP students and the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup. We will also meet of exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVAAS in grades K-5.	Reading data indicates that only 19.2% of students in grades 3-5 are proficient, which is 34.9% below district. We did not meet target in 5 of 6 subgroups in the area Reading: All student, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, Limited English Proficient & Students with Disabilities. The Hispanic (45.7%, 50.1%, 55.9%) and Free & Reduced Lunch (65.2%, 71.1%, 79.8%) populations are increasing significantly each year; although there was a decrease in the Limited English Proficient subgroup in 2010-11, it increased even more 2011-12. When School of Choice became options, our Black and White subgroups decreased while our Free and Reduced Lunch population increased.

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2015-2016

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:	Supporting Data:
Writing w/ Margarita Calderon	All certified staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grades3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVAAS in grades K-5.	TWC and staff surveys indicted that teachers need additional support with written comprehension.
Math Collaboration	Classroom teachers and any staff that teaches mathematics	By 2016, all student subgroups in grades 3-5 will meet their Math AMO targets as measured by EOG performance.	EOG math data indicates that 31% of students were proficient on the EOG.
Math Discourse	All certified staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grades 3-5 will meet their Math AMO targets as measured by EOG performance.	31% of all students were proficient on the Math EOG, Walkthrough data indicates that math discourse is an area of need.
Data Analysis	Certified staff	All teachers will effectively use current data to make decisions regarding intervention, core instruction and best service across MTSS (Tier I, Tier II and Tier III) to address the needs of our students.	Staff survey indicates that teachers need support with data analysis.
PLT Refresh	All certified staff	All teachers will effectively use current data to make decisions regarding intervention, core instruction and best service across MTSS (Tier I, Tier II and Tier III) to address the needs of our students.	Survey indicates that teachers need support with PLTs.
Co-Teaching	Certified Staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grads 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVASS in grades K-5.	TWC and staff survey data indicates that teachers need support with content and meeting the needs of various subgroups.
Thinking Maps	All staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grads 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVASS in grades K-5.	mClass data indicates that students need support with Written Expression

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2015-2016

Development Activities for

Topic:	Participants:	Goal Supported:	Supporting Data:
Maximizing Instructional Time during Guided Reading	All certified staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grads 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVASS in grades K-5.	21.2% of students were proficient on the Reading EOG.
Academic Language	All certified staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grads 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVASS in grades K-5.	21.2% of students were proficient on the Reading EOG.
ExC-ELL Vocabulary and Reading Refresh, ELA Framework	All certified staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grads 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVASS in grades K-5.	21.2% of all students were proficient on the Reading EOG
ExC-ELL Reading Comprehension (Margarita Calderon)	All certified staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grads 3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVASS in grades K-5.	Percent Proficient by Subgroup in Reading • All Students 21.2% • Black Students 26% • Hispanic Students 20.5% • Economically Disadvantaged 21.5
Mindset	All Staff	By 2016, all student subgroups in grades3-5 will meet their Reading AMO targets as measured by EOG performance. We will also meet or exceed growth in Reading as measured by EVAAS in grades K-5.	PLT feedback and staff surveys indicate that teachers need to be exposed to the Growth Mindset.

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit	At BOY (update at MOY and EOY): Administer all grade level specific mCLASS (LNF, FSF, PSF, NWF, DORF, DAZE, TRC) assessments and perform digging deeper assessments to include: -PAST -Early Names Test -Names Test -High Frequency Word List (K-2, update quarterly) Record notes and additional data for each student on the Ranking Forms. Along with classroom teachers and other support personnel (ESL, school psychologist, CCR, etc) Interventionist for each grade level collaborate using most current data and select best service. If any one student, not being seen by an Interventionist, through out the quarter shows no growth or regresses significantly, any additional data needed is collected and every effort is made to meet that students' needs either by the Interventionist or the classroom teacher. Students participating in a strategic intervention group are exited once they have met benchmark or individualized short term goal and no longer need intervention to maintain progress. This decision is made by a team including the Interventionist and classroom teachers. Students participating in an intensive intervention group could be exited once they have met benchmark over an extended period of time (2 or more quarters) and no longer need intervention to maintain progress. This decision is made by a team including the Interventionist and classroom teachers.	Short term math intervention groups are chosen and progress monitored based on classroom common assessments and informal assessments.	

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2014-2015

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Intervention Structure	45 minute protected intervention time 5 days a week in which the Intervention teacher is centrally located in a grade level classroom and students are pulled in a small group within the class. ESL and CCR also serve students at this time. Intensive groups are seen a minimum of 3 days a week while strategic groups are seen a minimum of 2 days a week. Groups with higher needs may be seen 5 days a week while groups with lower needs may be seen less in order to accommodate the large amount of students below benchmark.	Protected intervention time provided 5 days a week for 30 minutes. Interventionist pull to a central location and see a small group based on current, specific math need.	
Instruction	Students served in an intervention group receive teacher modeled direct instruction ("I do") on specific skills/common core standards through out each intervention session. Students are actively engaged in practicing skills taught. Groups are interactive such as the students respond to and receive feedback from each other and the intervention teacher ("We do"). Students are then provided time to practice independently ("You do"). Intervention groups will have no more than 6 students. Our lesson focus is based on the assessments reflected on the ranking forms as well as digging deeper assessment data. Ongoing collaboartion with classoom teachers as well as progress monitoring data guides daily focus and activities. Intervention lesson format may focus on one area or several areas of need such as interactive writing, decoding, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension practice to include oral response, multiple choice questions, written response and/or application activities.	Group size is no more than 6 students. Our lesson focus is based on assessments and collaboration with classroom teacher. Intervention lesson format includes concept development with manipulatives, skill building, vocabulary and/or application of skill according to the assessment of the skill for which the group was formed.	

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Assessment and Progress Monitoring	The following will be used to assess student achievement: -mCLASS -Early Names/Names Test -PAST -High Frequency Word List -Grade level common asessments -Informal Assessments such as informal running records and written reading journal responses Progress monitoring includes but is not limited to mCLASS as determined based on student need. Formal benchmarking assessments are administered quarterly and/or at BOY, MOY, and EOY. Intensive students are progress monitored at least every 10 days while strategic students are progress monitored at least every 20 days in their most foundational skill by either the classroom teacher or other support person administering intervention.	Student's progress is assessed through classroom common assessments as well as informal assessments done frequently within the group setting.	
Curriculum/Resources	Curriculum/Resources used to make instructional decisions are: -CCSS -CMAPP -Next STEPS to Literacy Instruction -Letterland -Comprehension Strategies Kit -Fast Track -mClass activities -Benchmark books and fluency cards -leveled text -Fountas and Pinnel Phonics books, -Websites: Florida Center for Reading Research, Reading A-Z, Readworks -Words Their Way and Reading and Writing Words	Curriculum/Resources used to make instructional decisions are: -CCSS -CMAPP *-Touch Math* *-Envisions Math Diagnosis and Intervention System* *-THINK and GoSolve structures/organizers* *-CASE 21* *-Math Expressions*	

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit	**What data will be used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal behavior expectations?** mClass measures (LNF, FSF, PSF, NWF, DORF, DAZE, TRC, Composite), Case 21, Digging Deeper Assessment-PAST, Names, Early Names, High Frequency Word Lists, EOG, KEA, KIA, Common Assessments, Letterland **What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for academics or behavior?** • Enter: All students who are performing below grade level and/or are not making progress as measured by universal screenings and progress monitoring assessments. • Exit: All students who demonstrate an accelerated rate of growth and/or demonstrate proficiency at benchmark may have a change in instructional delivery **What frequency, structures, and processes will be utilized to identify students exhibiting a need for academic or behavior intervention throughout the year?** • Identification of students exhibiting a need for reading intervention is completed at least once a quarter within grade level PLTs, Tier II Progress Monitoring reports, and collaboration between all staff **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?** • The team will look at rates of improvement from data listed above at least quarterly	**What data will used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal behavior expectations?** • Case 21 • Common Assessments • Summative assessments **What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for behavior?** • We have not established criteria for entry or exit • SIP Team and MTSS Tier I Team are addressing this issue **What frequency, structure, and processes will be utilized to identify students exhibiting a need for math intervention throughout the year?** • Frequency - Decided by Grade Level PLTs, but at least monthly • Structure - Within Grade Level PLTs • Processes - TIPS Problem Solving Model **How will your team determine the effectiveness of this plan, as evidence by at least 70% of served students responding to interventions based on Rate of Improvement and/or transitioning toward Core benchmarks?** • Unknown: SIP Team and MTSS Tier I Team are addressing this issue	**What data will used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not meeting universal behavior expectations?** • • Discipline Referral data from SIRS **What is the threshold at which student will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for behavior?** • Enter: Three or more office referrals within a semester • Exit: After participation in strategic or intensive intervention **What frequency, structure, and processes will be utilized to identify students exhibiting a need for behavior intervention throughout the year?** • Frequency: Attendance Team meets monthly; Student Services PLT meets twice monthly • Structure: Attendance Team and Student Services Team PLT meetings • Processes: Analysis of attendance and behavioral data **How will your team determine the effectiveness of this plan, as evidence by at least 70% of served students responding to interventions based on Rate of Improvement and/or transitioning toward Core benchmarks?** • Discipline referral data • Attendance data

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2015-2016

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Intervention Structure	**What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark or universal behavior expectations?** • Structures for strategic and intensive intervention services will be determined in collaboration between professionals and based on specific student need. • Intensive intervention services should include 3-5 days of service delivery; strategic intervention services should include 2-4 days of service delivery. **• If the specific area of need is a whole class need (>=60%), the need is addressed via Core instruction.** **How does your master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to Core?** • Push-in, small group, during literacy block during rotations only • Whole class strategic interventions may be delivered during Core instruction	**What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark expectations?** • Structures for strategic and intensive intervention services will be determined in collaboration between professionals, and based on specific student need. **How does your master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to Core?** **• 30 minutes per grade level set aside for intervention**	**What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark expectations?** • Structures for strategic and intensive intervention services will be determined in collaboration between professionals, and based on specific student need. **How does your master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to Core?** • Teachers have provided Student Services Team appropriate time frames within the school day for behavioral pull-out interventions

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2015-2016

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Instruction	**What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?** • Digging deepers assessment will be administered • Grade level PLTs will develop common assessments, discuss instructional focuses, and collaborate with other school professionals as needed **What is the intervention lesson format(s) for academics or behavior?** • Lesson format will be determined based on student need but may include 5-Step Lesson Plan, mClass recommended lessons, etc • K-2 phonic interventions will follow Letterland (Intensive = Letterland Intensive Strand; Strategic = Letterland Small Group) **How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?** • How: Intervention Team will need to develop/find a fidelity check/process • Who: TBD	**What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?** • Grade level PLTs will develop common assessments, discuss instructional focuses, and collaborate with other school professionals as needed **What is the intervention lesson format(s) for academics or behavior?** • Lesson format will be determined based on student need and research based strategies. **How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?** • How: Intervention Team will need to develop/find a fidelity check/process • Who: TBD	**What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?** • Student Services Team develop interventions based off of ASCA National Standards as part of the National Model Plan **What is the intervention lesson format(s) for academics or behavior?** • Lesson format will be determined based on student need and research based strategies, including 1:1 and/or small group interventions **How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?** • How: Intervention Team will need to develop/find a fidelity check/process • Who: TBD

WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School:	Hodge Road ES
Plan Year	2014-2016
School Year:	2015-2016

	Reading	Math	Behavior
Assessment and Progress Monitoring	**What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?** • mClass Progress Monitoring • Common Assessments • Formative Assessments • Letterland Assessments • Progress monitoring data from assessments targeted to the specific skill of need **How does the data guide your instruction?** • Identify, continue, and update target learning focus. **How often will you progress monitor?** • At a minimum of every 10 instructional days. **What is the process for analyzing the data and making data based decisions?** • Grade level PLTs analyze progress monitoring data at least once a quarter via grade PLT work. • Collaborative conversations during Grade Level PLT meetings regarding ROI will be conducted in order to adjust frequency, intensity, group delivery, and/or duration of the intervention.	**What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?** • Progress monitoring tools related to the targeted skill **How does the data guide your instruction?** • Identify, continue, and update target learning focus. **How often will you progress monitor?** • TBD **What is the process for analyzing the data and making data based decisions?** • TBD	**What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?** • Pre/Post assessments **How does the data guide your instruction?** • Identify, continue, and update target learning focus. **How often will you progress monitor?** • Pre and post intervention **What is the process for analyzing the data and making data based decisions?** • Student Services Team analyzes the data and, using the TIPS model, makes decisions on intervention changes.
Curriculum/Resources	**What evidence based materials and resources will be used to support the academic or behavior strategic interventions?** • Materials and resources available via Intervention Services' spreadsheets of Elementary Literacy Interventions and Progress Monitoring Tools • Literacy Coaches	**What evidence based materials and resources will be used to support the academic or behavior strategic interventions?** • Materials and resources available via Intervention Services' spreadsheets of Elementary Math Interventions and Progress Monitoring Tools • Math Coach	**What evidence based materials and resources will be used to support the academic or behavior strategic interventions?** • Materials and resources available via Intervention Services' spreadsheets of Elementary Behavior Interventions and Progress Monitoring Tools • PBIS Coach • Project Enlightenment • School Counselor • School Psychologist • School Social Worker