

School Improvement Plan

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

| Data Components | Areas of Strengths | Areas of Concern |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Student Achievement | <p><i>*Revised on January 11, 2016 per DPI feedback.</i></p> <p>2013-2014 Data School Wide Composite EOG: 41. 3% (Growth of 19.4% from 2012-2013)</p> <p>2014-2015 School Wide Composite EOG: 41.5%</p> <p>Science As a school, we grew 1.9% points with a score of 43% in 2014-2015 school year.</p> <p>2012-2013 Sub Group Data</p> <p>Reading LEP students exceeded their expected proficiency level by 2 percentage points.</p> <p>Math LEP students exceeded their expected proficiency level by 3.1 percentage points. Economically disadvantaged exceeded proficiency level by 1.9 percentage points. White students exceeded their expected proficiency level by 6.5 percentage points. African American students exceeded their expected proficiency level by 5.1 percentage points.</p> <p>2013-2014 Sub-Group Data</p> <p>Math LEP students exceeded their proficiency level by 6.8 percentage points.</p> | <p>2012-2013 Data School Wide Composite EOG: 29.1%</p> <p>Reading K-2 not meeting benchmark before going on to 3rd grade. 7.5% of 3rd students were proficient on BOG. (9 students)</p> <p>5 out of 6 subgroups are not meeting expected proficiency.(African American, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, SWD) Achievement gap stayed the same from 2011-2012 to 2013, with 15.4 and 15.5.</p> <p>Math School wide student achievement gap went up from 13.3 to 25.5 White students performed similar to previous years, while their peers (Black, Hispanic, Multi-Racial) did not perform at the same level of proficiency. SWD and Hispanic students did not meet expected growth target.</p> <p>2013-2014 Sub-Group Data</p> <p>Reading Black students did not meet the AMO target by 9.4 percentage points. White students did not meet the AMO target by 12.8 percentage points. Economically disadvantaged students did not meet the AMO target by 6.1 percentage points. LEP students did not meet AMO target by 1.0 percentage points. SWD did not meet AMO target by 11.6 percentage points.</p> <p>Math Black students did not meet the AMO target by 6.4 percentage points. Hispanic students did not meet the AMO target by 4.9 percentage points. White students did not meet the AMO target by 8.4 percentage points. SWD did not meet the AMO target by 11.2 percentage points.</p> <p>2014-2015</p> <p>Reading Black students did not meet the AMO target by 16.0 percentage points. Hispanic students did not meet the AMO target by 16.4 percentage points. White students did not meet the AMO target 12.1 percentage points. Economically disadvantaged did not meet the AMO target by 18.4 percentage points. SWD did not meet the AMO target by 25.0 percentage points.</p> <p>Math Black students did not meet the AMO target by 18.1 percentage points. Hispanic students did not meet the AMO target by 10.7 percentage points. White students did not meet the AMO target by 3.6 percentage points. ED students did not meet the AMO target by 11.3 percentage points.</p> <p>EOG 2014-2015 Math EOG 2014-2015: 41.1% Reading EOG 2014-2015: 40.4% (Our composite score dropped 2 percentage points)</p> |
| Instructional Practices/Strategies | <p>Reading -Small Class Sizes -K-1 Progress Monitoring</p> <p>Math -Use of manipulatives -Some staff are using math talk effectively -Use of CFA and Summative</p> | <p>Reading -Instructional practices inconsistent from classroom to classroom. -Lack of differentiated instruction in the classrooms. -Lack of vertical alignment. -K-5 Foundational Skills -Core Instruction -Common Core Implementation</p> <p>Math -Lack of understanding for implementing small group differentiated instruction -Using C-Mapp as the primary resource -Lack of planning -Lack of pre-testing -Lack of technology professional development -Lack of knowledge of implementing math interventions</p> |

School Improvement Plan

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

| Data Components | Areas of Strengths | Areas of Concern | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|--|--|------------------|-----------------|-------|------------------|--------------|------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|------------------|-----------------|-------|------------------|--------------|------------------|-------|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|----|----|---|----|---|---|----|--|
| Staff and Student Demographics | <p>Wake Schools' Community Data WCPSS F/R Average The district Free and Reduced Average is 37%.</p> <p>Wake County Demographics, according to US 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/Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander- 0%</p> <p>Wilburn Elementary Demographic School Data</p> <table><tr><th colspan="12">**WILBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 5-Year Demographic Trend Data</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>African American</th><th>American Indian</th><th>Asian</th><th>Hispanic /Latino</th><th>Multi-Racial</th><th>Pacific Islander</th><th>White</th><th>Unidentified Ethnicity</th><th>LEP</th><th>SWD</th><th>AIG</th></tr><tr><td>2011-2012</td><td>288/633 45.5%</td><td>3/633 0.5%</td><td>32/633 5.1%</td><td>146/633 23.1%</td><td>37/633 5.8%</td><td>1/633 0.2%</td><td>104/633 16.4%</td><td>22/633 3.4%</td><td>101/633 16.0%</td><td>78/633 12.3%</td><td>22/633 3.5%</td></tr><tr><td>2012-2013</td><td>367/811 45.3%</td><td>4/811 0.5%</td><td>44/811 5.4%</td><td>228/811 28.1%</td><td>40/811 5.0%</td><td>1/811 0.1%</td><td>127/811 15.7%</td><td>0/811 0%</td><td>160/811 20.0%</td><td>107/811 13.2%</td><td>13/811 2.0%</td></tr><tr><td>2013-2014</td><td>335/750 45.7%</td><td>3/750 0.4%</td><td>47/750 6.3%</td><td>206/750 27.5%</td><td>36/750 4.8%</td><td>0/750 0%</td><td>123/750 16.4%</td><td>0/750 0%</td><td>137/750 18.3%</td><td>92/750 12.3%</td><td>16/750 2.1%</td></tr><tr><td>2014-2015</td><td>319/735 43.4%</td><td>3/735 0.4%</td><td>46/735 6.3%</td><td>240/735 32.7%</td><td>32/735 4.4%</td><td>1/735 0.1%</td><td>94/735 12.8%</td><td>0/735 0%</td><td>156/735 21.2%</td><td>77/735 10.5%</td><td>12/7.5 1.7%</td></tr><tr><td>2015-2016</td><td>296/702 42.2%</td><td>3/702 0.4%</td><td>36/702 9.0%</td><td>247/702 35.2%</td><td>36/702 9.0%</td><td>1/702 0.1%</td><td>83/702 11.8%</td><td>0/702 0%</td><td>144/702 20.5%</td><td>76/702 10.8%</td><td>10/702 1.4%</td></tr></table> <p>Ethnicity Data Hispanic 35.23% Non-Hispanic 64.76%</p> <p>Race Multi-6.6% American Indian-6.4% Asian-5.2% Black-44.1% Pacific Islander-0.40% White-37.3%</p> <p>Teacher Data 100% Highly Qualified Turnover went from 85% to 12% K-2 Literacy Coach 3-5 Math Coach Grade Level Instructional Coaches Academic Language Coach Full-time Instructional Resource TeacherFree/Reduced Lunch 74.31%</p> <p>Teacher Demographic 65% White 30% Black 5% Latino</p> <p>**WILBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 3-Year Demographic Trend Data-Incident By Sub-Group</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>African American</th><th>American Indian</th><th>Asian</th><th>Hispanic /Latino</th><th>Multi-Racial</th><th>Pacific Islander</th><th>White</th></tr><tr><td>2012-2013</td><td>27</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>6</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>2013-2014</td><td>33</td><td>8</td><td>1</td><td>9</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>2014-2015</td><td>32</td><td>12</td><td>1</td><td>18</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>16</td></tr></table> | **WILBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 5-Year Demographic Trend Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | African American | American Indian | Asian | Hispanic /Latino | Multi-Racial | Pacific Islander | White | Unidentified Ethnicity | LEP | SWD | AIG | 2011-2012 | 288/633 45.5% | 3/633 0.5% | 32/633 5.1% | 146/633 23.1% | 37/633 5.8% | 1/633 0.2% | 104/633 16.4% | 22/633 3.4% | 101/633 16.0% | 78/633 12.3% | 22/633 3.5% | 2012-2013 | 367/811 45.3% | 4/811 0.5% | 44/811 5.4% | 228/811 28.1% | 40/811 5.0% | 1/811 0.1% | 127/811 15.7% | 0/811 0% | 160/811 20.0% | 107/811 13.2% | 13/811 2.0% | 2013-2014 | 335/750 45.7% | 3/750 0.4% | 47/750 6.3% | 206/750 27.5% | 36/750 4.8% | 0/750 0% | 123/750 16.4% | 0/750 0% | 137/750 18.3% | 92/750 12.3% | 16/750 2.1% | 2014-2015 | 319/735 43.4% | 3/735 0.4% | 46/735 6.3% | 240/735 32.7% | 32/735 4.4% | 1/735 0.1% | 94/735 12.8% | 0/735 0% | 156/735 21.2% | 77/735 10.5% | 12/7.5 1.7% | 2015-2016 | 296/702 42.2% | 3/702 0.4% | 36/702 9.0% | 247/702 35.2% | 36/702 9.0% | 1/702 0.1% | 83/702 11.8% | 0/702 0% | 144/702 20.5% | 76/702 10.8% | 10/702 1.4% | | African American | American Indian | Asian | Hispanic /Latino | Multi-Racial | Pacific Islander | White | 2012-2013 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2013-2014 | 33 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2014-2015 | 32 | 12 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 16 | <p>Transient population</p> <p>665 out of 735 students missed at least one day 598 out of 735 students had at least one unexcused absence. (82% of students)</p> |
| | **WILBURN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 5-Year Demographic Trend Data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | African American | American Indian | Asian | Hispanic /Latino | Multi-Racial | Pacific Islander | White | Unidentified Ethnicity | LEP | SWD | AIG | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2011-2012 | 288/633 45.5% | 3/633 0.5% | 32/633 5.1% | 146/633 23.1% | 37/633 5.8% | 1/633 0.2% | 104/633 16.4% | 22/633 3.4% | 101/633 16.0% | 78/633 12.3% | 22/633 3.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2012-2013 | 367/811 45.3% | 4/811 0.5% | 44/811 5.4% | 228/811 28.1% | 40/811 5.0% | 1/811 0.1% | 127/811 15.7% | 0/811 0% | 160/811 20.0% | 107/811 13.2% | 13/811 2.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2013-2014 | 335/750 45.7% | 3/750 0.4% | 47/750 6.3% | 206/750 27.5% | 36/750 4.8% | 0/750 0% | 123/750 16.4% | 0/750 0% | 137/750 18.3% | 92/750 12.3% | 16/750 2.1% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2014-2015 | 319/735 43.4% | 3/735 0.4% | 46/735 6.3% | 240/735 32.7% | 32/735 4.4% | 1/735 0.1% | 94/735 12.8% | 0/735 0% | 156/735 21.2% | 77/735 10.5% | 12/7.5 1.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2015-2016 | 296/702 42.2% | 3/702 0.4% | 36/702 9.0% | 247/702 35.2% | 36/702 9.0% | 1/702 0.1% | 83/702 11.8% | 0/702 0% | 144/702 20.5% | 76/702 10.8% | 10/702 1.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | African American | American Indian | Asian | Hispanic /Latino | Multi-Racial | Pacific Islander | White | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2012-2013 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2013-2014 | 33 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 32 | 12 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

School Improvement Plan

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

| Data Components | Areas of Strengths | Areas of Concern |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Perception | <p>New Building Consistent Interpreters at events/meetings Partnership with Community Alliance Partnering with St. Augustine TWC Survey Strengths:</p> <p>Time 2.1d was at 38.7% which was a 23.1% increase from 2012. Professional Development 8.1L was at 81.4% which was a 9.5% increase from 2012.</p> | <p>Lack of PTA Lack of communication from the classroom to parents/school to parents Lack of access to technology/transitioning from paper to electronic (communication from building to family) Not enough grade level events for parent education Off-Site Parent Night Lack of structure for volunteers/Communication TAP perceived as something additional More information attached to work that goes home</p> <p>TWC Survey Top Priority Areas:</p> <p>Managing Student Conduct 5.1e was at 53.3%, which was a -27.9% drop from 2012. School Leadership 7.1d was at 51.7%, which was a -13.9% drop from 2012. Community Support 4.1c was at 68.3% which was -6.7% drop from 2012.</p> |
| Program | <p>Achieve 3000: Differentiated for student reading level/adjusts accordingly M-Class: Increased implementation of M-Class Interventions/Progress Monitoring/Increased level of confidence with M-Class Case 21: Increased use of Case 21 to flex group</p> | <p>Achieve 3000: Time and amount of technology/No identified program like Achieve 3000 for K-1 Progress Monitoring w/Fidelity/Not using interventions and resources Case 21: Fidelity of using for instruction and intervention No intervention research based program for math like Achieve 3000</p> |

| Priority Concerns | Root Causes (with evidence) | Solutions |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Reading</p> <p>Subgroups of Black, Hispanic, White, Economically Disadvantaged, and SWD students are not meeting expected growth targets in reading.</p> <p>Subgroup Targets by 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 17.5% to 36.7% • ED 29.7% to 50% • White 48.1% to 69.5% • Black 23.6% to 47.8 % • Hispanic 28.6% to 50.1% • SWD 10.0% to 39% <p>2013-2014: 43.2% of Wilburn students are proficient in reading. 2014-2015: 40.4% of Wilburn students are proficient in reading.</p> | <p>Lack of cultural training in teachers, as evidenced by interaction with teachers, students, and parents.</p> <p>Lack of small group instruction, as evidenced by the NC Evaluation Tool and Walk Throughs</p> <p>Lack of understanding of how to use data to drive instruction, based on weekly PLT meetings with support.</p> <p>Students are lacking literacy foundational skills based on M-Class data.</p> | <p>Mindset PD</p> <p>Increasing the number of coaches and supporting teachers with content and instructional best practices.</p> <p>Use of TAP best practices to support instruction.</p> <p>PLT focus with weekly rotations of reading, math, and science.</p> <p>Continuation of support for M-Class, Progress Monitoring, and Guided Reading.</p> <p>Academic language support</p> <p>Bi-monthly collaboration for unpacking standards.</p> |

School Improvement Plan

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

| Priority Concerns | Root Causes (with evidence) | Solutions |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Math</p> <p>In math, students in the LEP, Economically Disadvantaged, White, Black, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups did meet their AMO target.</p> <p>Subgroup Target by 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 32.5% to 42.3% • ED 31.1% to 49.3% • White 50.0% to 67.6% • Black 23.6% to 45.6% • Hispanic 34.5% to 52.8% • SWD 10.0% to 38.8% <p>2013-2014: Math Proficiency 43.3%</p> <p>2014-2015: Math Proficiency 41.1%</p> | <p>Lack of cultural training in teachers as evidenced through observation of interaction with students.</p> <p>Lack of small group instruction as evidenced through walk through data, formal and informal observations through NCEES, math walk through data, and lesson plans.</p> <p>Lack of content knowledge and skills to drill down to the root cause as evidenced through walk throughs, informal and formal observations through NCEES, walk through data and lesson plans.</p> | <p>PD in Mindset and Small group instruction</p> <p>PD from math coach on content/Discussion and Collaboration on understanding content through PLTs and Collaboration Days.</p> <p>Support from grade level coaches.</p> <p>After school tutoring twice weekly</p> |

Data Summary

Describe your conclusions

A comprehensive look at our data indicates we should continue coaching to support our teachers and offer professional development to increase core content knowledge.

Our goals, key process and action steps outline our vision for improvement to impact growth and school performance grade.

School Improvement Plan

Membership of School Improvement Team

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| Principal: | Ms. Lutashia Dove |
| Date: | Jul - 2014 |

SIP Team Members

| | Name | School Based Job Title |
|----|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Alba Salvaggio | Instructional Support Personnel |
| 2 | Ashley Haines | Teacher |
| 3 | Cindy Levinson | Teacher |
| 4 | Deborah Murphy | Teacher |
| 5 | Emily Edmonds | Teacher |
| 6 | Jamillah Simpson | Teacher |
| 7 | Jasmine Barcelona | Teacher |
| 8 | Julie Bays | Other |
| 9 | Kristie Curry | School Improvement Chair |
| 10 | Lutashia Dove | Principal |
| 11 | Megan Lingenheld | Teacher |
| 12 | Michael Coysh | Teacher |
| 13 | Michelle Ehrhart | Teacher |
| 14 | Quantina Sides | Teacher |
| 15 | Scott Gaitan | Assistant Principal |
| 16 | Stacy Goode | School Improvement Chair |
| 17 | Tabitha Barnekow | Teacher |
| 18 | Valeisha Harrison | Instructional Support Personnel |

School Improvement Plan**Mission, Vision and Value Statements**

| | |
|------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| Date: | Apr - 2014 |

Mission Statement:

Wilburn exists to empower all learners to become responsible citizens in our world.

Vision Statement:

Wilburn Elementary is an educational community that provides a technology rich environment that through the use of best practices, will foster cooperative and resourceful learners who will become productive leaders and thinkers.

Value Statement:

At Wilburn we value:

- Showing respect for self and others
- Consistency in our actions
- The belief that ALL children can learn
- Modeling integrity
- High academic and social expectations
- Owning our actions
- Trust and honesty within each other
- Bringing a positive, optimistic, outlook everyday
- The potential within all stakeholders
- Exhibiting kindness and compassion for others
- Collaboration
- Professionalism

School Improvement Plan
Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| School Goal | | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60.7% or greater in Reading as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade ELA Test. |
| Goal Manager | | Tabitha Barnekow |
| Strategic Objective | | Learning and Teaching |
| State Board of Education Goal | | Globally Competitive Students |
| Data Justification for Goal Based on Comprehensive Needs Assessment | | <p>Students scored on 2013-2014 EOG Reading tests as follows:</p> <p>Subgroup Targets by 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 17.5% to 36.7% • ED 29.7% to 50% • White 48.1% to 69.5% • Black 23.6% to 47.8 % • Hispanic 28.6% to 50.1% • SWD 10.0% to 39% <p>Overall: 43.2% of Wilburn students are proficient in reading.</p> |
| 1 | Key Process | All instructional staff will participate in professional development on literacy best practices to strengthen core instruction. |
| | Process Manager | Jasmine Barcelona |
| | Completion Date | Jun - 2016 |
| | Restrainers | <p>Schedule</p> <p>Cost of professional development</p> |
| | Resources | <p>Leadership Team</p> <p>School Improvement Team</p> <p>WCPSS</p> <p>DPI</p> <p>We wish to utilize DPI flexibility with funds transfer.</p> <p>Literacy Committee</p> <p>Quarterly PD and Differentiation Survey</p> <p>Quarterly Walk Through Survey and Form</p> |
| | Measurable Process Check(s) | <p>1. Literacy committee will evaluate the effectiveness of the professional development by sending out a quarterly survey to determine implementation.</p> <p>2. Literacy committee will monitor instructional effectiveness using a school designed walk-thru tool on a monthly basis.</p> |
| | 1 Action Step | **Focused ELA intervention time, daily to meet the needs of students based off of DIBELS composite data, TRC, and ELA standards. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|----------|------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | Action Step | Differentiated professional development in literacy instruction, guided reading vs. strategy groups and progress monitoring. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2015 |
| | 3 Action Step | K-5 teachers and IA training in literacy best practices, including writing. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| | 4 Action Step | Literacy committee will survey through the year to determine literacy and differentiation needs. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| | 5 Action Step | Literacy committee and coaches will present walk through data quarterly and train staff to use data to adjust instruction. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 2 | 6 Action Step | Plan PAC night for parents to share literacy best practices |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 9/2015 |
| | Key Process | PLTs will review and analyze benchmark data. |
| | Process Manager | Jasmine Barcelona |
| | Completion Date | Jun - 2016 |
| | Restrainers | Time Schedule |
| | Resources | Grade level chairs Leadership Team PLT coordinator Administration WCPSS PLT support Data Committee Data Response Structures |
| | Measurable Process Check(s) | 1. PLTs will evaluate comprehensive literacy data bi-weekly to effectively plan small group instruction. 2. Data Team will evaluate whole school literacy data on an ongoing basis to identify strengths in instruction and areas of growth |
| | 1 Action Step | Administration meets monthly with the Area Superintendents Instructional Coordination Team to evaluate Instructional Excellence, Data Analysis, Instructional Planning, and Professional Capacity. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|----------|--------------------|---|
| 2 | Action Step | The School Improvement Team meets quarterly to review progress towards **TWC goals. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |
| 3 | Action Step | Utilize district resources to assist with providing professional development in disaggregating data. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 4 | Action Step | Leadership team will collect and present benchmark and progress monitoring data to guide PLT discussions. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 5 | Action Step | Develop a PLT schedule that incorporates all stakeholders and allows for appropriate collaboration |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 10/2015 |
| 6 | Action Step | Vertical Alignment meetings |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 7 | Action Step | Utilize Pensieve Notebook on a monthly basis within PLT conversations |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|--|--------------------|--|
| School Goal | | By June 2016, 80% of the staff will agree that Wilburn Elementary School is a good place to work and learn based on the 2016 TWC Survey. |
| Goal Manager | | Megan Lingenheld, Megan Ethridge |
| Strategic Objective | | Learning and Teaching |
| State Board of Education Goal | | 21st Century Professionals |
| Data Justification for Goal Based on Comprehensive Needs Assessment | | <p>Based on the data we have gathered 68% of the staff has a growth mind set.</p> <p>Based on the data we have gathered 32% of the staff has a fixed mind set.</p> <p>Based on the data we have gathered from the TWC, 5.1e Managing Student Conduct was a priority area with a score of 53.3%.</p> <p>Based on the question, Is Wilburn a good place to work and learn?, Wilburn scored at a 63.8%.</p> |
| 1 | Key Process | Wilburn school community will provide Professional Development for all staff in Mindset and Effective Teacher Framework. |
| Process Manager | | Emily Edmonds |
| Completion Date | | Jun - 2016 |
| Restrainers | | Teacher turnover Subjective survey Schedule |
| Resources | | Professional Development Book study Administration PLT's Leadership Team DPI professional development Mindset Survey and Rubric Pulse Committee Effective Teacher Framework Grade Level Chairs Character Education Plan Healthy Active Children Policy (K-8) |
| Measurable Process Check(s) | | 1. Pulse committee will analyze results of leadership survey quarterly. 2. Administration will check in with grade level chairs monthly. |
| 1 Action Step | | The School Improvement Team meets quarterly to review progress towards goals. |
| Timeline | | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| | 2 Action Step | Administration meets monthly with the Area Superintendents Instructional Coordination Team to evaluate Instructional Excellence, Data Analysis, Instructional Planning, and Professional Capacity. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |
| | 3 Action Step | Implement schedule for grade level/administration monthly meeting. |
| | Timeline | From 6/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 2 Key Process | Wilburn school community will provide opportunities to build staff relationships and student's academic and social success. | |
| | Process Manager | Cynthia Levinson |
| | Completion Date | Jun - 2016 |
| | Restrainers | Time Schedule Funding Mindset |
| | Resources | School Improvement Team Outside professional development Leadership team Administration WCPSS Grade Level Chairs Pulse Committee Wilburn Community Duty Free Lunch and Planning Safe and Orderly Schools Plan Alliance Volunteers Quarterly PBIS Survey Climate Survey |
| | Measurable Process Check(s) | The SIT will evaluate climate surveys quarterly to determine effectiveness of team building activities. |
| | 1 Action Step | Grade levels present a team building activity at each staff meeting that the whole staff will participate in |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| | 2 Action Step | Pulse committee will develop a monthly social event for staff members. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| School Goal | | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 59.7% or greater in Math as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade Math Test. |
| Goal Manager | | Michelle Ehrhart |
| Strategic Objective | | Learning and Teaching |
| State Board of Education Goal | | Globally Competitive Students |
| Data Justification for Goal Based on Comprehensive Needs Assessment | | <p>Based on the data we have gathered, students scored on the Math EOG 2013-2014 as follows</p> <p>Subgroup Target by 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 32.5% to 42.3% • ED 31.1% to 49.3% • White 50.0% to 67.6% • Black 23.6% to 45.6% • Hispanic 34.5% to 52.8% • SWD 10.0% to 38.8% <p>The overall math proficiency is 43.3%</p> |
| 1 | Key Process | All teachers will attend Professional Development (school based & district) on Math Standards to meet the needs of the teachers and their individual understanding of the curriculum. |
| | Process Manager | Ashley Haines |
| | Completion Date | Jun - 2016 |
| | Restrainers | Time Assessments |
| | Resources | 3-5 Math Coach District Provided training Instructional Leadership team Weekly PLTs |
| | Measurable Process Check(s) | <p>1. PLTs will review Common Formative and Summative Assessment data to determine and guide effectiveness of instruction on a monthly basis</p> <p>2. Math Coach will use a non-evaluative walk-thru tool to identify areas of strength and areas of growth within classroom instruction on a bi-monthly basis.</p> |
| | 1 Action Step | The School Improvement Team meets quarterly to review progress towards goals. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |
| | 2 Action Step | Administration meets monthly with the Area Superintendents Instructional Coordination Team to evaluate Instructional Excellence, Data Analysis, Instructional Planning, and Professional Capacity. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|----------|--------------------|--|
| 3 | Action Step | Coaches will provide training on developing Common Formative Assessments and Summative Assessments. |
| | Timeline | From 5/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 4 | Action Step | Teachers will peer observe highly effective teachers in the Mathematical subject area to see efficient ways of teaching the Math Standards. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 5 | Action Step | PLT's will collaborate and plan differentiated Math instruction and Common Formative and Summative Assessments to meet needs of all students in subgroups. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 6 | Action Step | School staff will provide on-site professional development during early release day(s) or at other times as needed. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |
| 7 | Action Step | Math coach will provide classroom support for grades 3-5. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2015 |
| 8 | Action Step | Plan Math PAC night for parents to share best practices and strategies. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2014 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|--|------------------------|---|
| School Goal | | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60% or greater in Science as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade Science Test. |
| Goal Manager | | Anne Sheehan |
| Strategic Objective | | Learning and Teaching |
| State Board of Education Goal | | Globally Competitive Students |
| Data Justification for Goal Based on Comprehensive Needs Assessment | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 43% proficiency on Science EOG 2014-2015, only a 1.9% gain from the previous school year |
| 1 | Key Process | Teachers will participate in vertical PLTs to discuss vertical alignment of science units. |
| | Process Manager | Jillian Honan |
| | Completion Date | Jun - 2016 |
| | Restrainers | Time Scheduling around tracks to have all teachers in Meeting with both grade levels above and below |
| | Resources | WCPSS Science Wiki Coaches Science PD Science Unpacking Documents and Timelines K-12 Science Documents |
| Measurable Process Check(s) | | Grade level teams will collect and analyze Science summative data for the grade level. The Science Committee will collect and analyze Science Summative data for the school. |
| | 1 Action Step | Provide academic language support for teachers to utilize core vocabulary in questioning and presentation of lesson. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |
| | 2 Action Step | Unpack science standards to determine the common threads K-5. |
| | Timeline | From 9/2015 To 6/2016 |
| | 3 Action Step | The School Improvement Team meets quarterly to review progress towards goals. |
| | Timeline | From 6/2015 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan

Summary of Goals, Key Processes and Action Steps

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| LEA: | Wake County (920) |

| | | |
|----------|--------------------|--|
| 4 | Action Step | Administration meets monthly with the Area Superintendents Instructional Coordination Team to evaluate Instructional Excellence, Data Analysis, Instructional Planning, and Professional Capacity. |
| | Timeline | From 7/2015 To 6/2016 |
| 5 | Action Step | Science Night with NC State |
| | Timeline | From 8/2015 To 6/2016 |
| 6 | Action Step | Set up schedule for vertical PLT of grade levels for the school year. |
| | Timeline | From 9/2015 To 6/2016 |

School Improvement Plan**Waiver Request****School:** Wilburn ES**Plan Year** 2014-2016

| | |
|--|------------|
| Date | Jul - 2014 |
| Waiver Requested | |
| No waiver is requested at this time. | |
| 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: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2014-2015 |

Development Activities for

| Topic: | Participants: | Goal Supported: | Supporting Data: |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Literacy Best Practices | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60.7% or greater in Reading as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade ELA Test. | Subgroup Targets by 2016: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 17.5% to 36.7% • ED 29.7% to 50% • White 48.1% to 69.5% • Black 23.6% to 47.8 % • Hispanic 28.6% to 50.1% • SWD 10.0% to 39% Overall: 32.6% of Wilburn students are proficient in reading. |
| Math Common Core/Best Practices in Math | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 59.7% or greater in Math as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade Math Test. | Subgroup Target by 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 32.5% to 42.3% • ED 31.1% to 49.3% • White 50.0% to 67.6% • Black 23.6% to 45.6% • Hispanic 34.5% to 52.8% • SWD 10.0% to 38.8% The overall math proficiency is 34.8%. |
| Diversity | All Wilburn Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of Wilburn staff will have a Growth Mindset as measured by the Mindset survey. | Based on the data we have gathered 68% of the staff has a growth mind set. Based on the data we have gathered 32% of the staff has a fixed mind set. |
| Crucial Conversations | All Wilburn Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of Wilburn staff will have a Growth Mindset as measured by the Mindset survey. | Based on the data we have gathered 68% of the staff has a growth mind set. Based on the data we have gathered 32% of the staff has a fixed mind set. |

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2014-2015 |

Development Activities for

| Topic: | Participants: | Goal Supported: | Supporting Data: |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Mindset | All Wilburn Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 100% of Wilburn staff will have a Growth Mindset as measured by the Mindset survey. | <p>Based on the data we have gathered 68% of the staff has a growth mind set.</p> <p>Based on the data we have gathered 32% of the staff has a fixed mind set.</p> |
| Differentiation and Small Group Instruction | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60.7% or greater in Reading as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade ELA Test. | <p>Subgroup Targets by 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEP 17.5% to 36.7% • ED 29.7% to 50% • White 48.1% to 69.5% • Black 23.6% to 47.8 % • Hispanic 28.6% to 50.1% • SWD 10.0% to 39% <p>Overall: 32.6% of Wilburn students are proficient in reading.</p> |

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2015-2016 |

Development Activities for

| Topic: | Participants: | Goal Supported: | Supporting Data: |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Science Professional Development-Vertical Planning and Alignment | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60% or greater in Science as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade Science Test. | Based on the data we are at 43% proficiency, with a small growth from 2014-2015 school year of 1.9%. |
| Literacy Best Practices, including writing | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60.7% or greater in Reading as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade ELA test. | 2014-2015 EOG ELA Overall Proficiency: 40% |
| Differentiation and Small Group Instruction | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 60.7% or greater in Reading as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade ELA test. | 2014-2015 ELA EOG Data: 40.4%, Math 41.1% |

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2015-2016 |

Development Activities for

| Topic: | Participants: | Goal Supported: | Supporting Data: |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Mindset/Diversity | All Wilburn Staff | By June 2016, 80% of the staff will agree that Wilburn Elementary School is a good place to work and learn based on the 2016 TWC Survey. | <p>Based on our 2014 Mindset Survey Data, 68% of staff have a growth mindset.</p> <p>3rd Quarter 2015 Leadership Survey Data:</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easily accessible to teachers- 51.2% see a need for improvement • Provides opportunities for staff input on important decisions- 48.7% see a need for improvement • Maintains open and effective lines of communication with staff- 48.8% see a need for improvement <p>TWC Survey Top Priority Areas:</p> <p>Managing Student Conduct 5.1e was at 53.3%, which was a -27.9% drop from 2012.</p> <p>School Leadership 7.1d was at 51.7%, which was a -13.9% drop from 2012.</p> <p>Community Support 4.1c was at 68.3% which was -6.7% drop from 2012.</p> |

School Improvement Plan

Summary Sheet of Professional Development Activities

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2015-2016 |

Development Activities for

| Topic: | Participants: | Goal Supported: | Supporting Data: |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Math Common Core/Best Practices in Math | Pre-K through 5th Instructional Staff | By the end of the 2015-2016 school year all students will meet or exceed the Federal AMO targets, with a whole school composite score of 59.7% or greater in Math as measured by the North Carolina End of Grade Math Test. | 2014-2015 EOG Math Data: 41.1% |

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

School Year: 2014-2015

| | Reading | Math | Behavior |
|---|--|--|----------|
| Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New students arriving throughout the school year and demonstrate a need as evidenced by the outlined above assessments will be discussed at PLTs • Data used to determine student need will include the following: mClass, benchmark data, EOG, digging deeper assessments, report cards, and any anecdotal notes from Pensieve. • Students will exit intervention when benchmark is achieved and maintained as evidenced by progress monitoring data points, digging deeper, and and/or formative assessment data as well as mutual agreement of all stakeholders, including teachers, administration and parents • Ranking forms will be completed for each class • Ranking forms will be updated quarterly during PLTs according to report cards, common assessments, benchmark assessment, and progress monitoring data • A best service meeting is held by Intervention teachers with classroom, ESL, CCR teachers and all other stakeholders to determine which service will best meet students' needs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following data will be evaluated to determine student need: summative assessments, teacher observations, report card, special services, CASE 21, EOGs • Ranking forms will be completed for each class • Students are ranked by multiple criteria points which are determined through the use of grade level specific Ranking form and rubrics • Ranking forms will be updated quarterly during PLTs according to report cards, common assessments, benchmark assessment, and progress monitoring data • A best service meeting is held by Intervention teachers with classroom, ESL, CCR teachers and all other stakeholders to determine which service will best meet students' needs. • Students will enter into intensive math intervention defined by grade level rubrics • Students will exit intervention when benchmark is achieved and maintained as evidenced by progress monitoring data points, digging deeper, and and/or formative assessment data as well as mutual agreement of all stakeholders, including teachers, administration and parents | |
| Intervention Structure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom teachers will provide strategic services within core classroom 10-20 minutes a day 2-4 days a week. • Classroom strategy groups 5-15 minutes 1-3 times per week • Target: 1st Grade students who need intense intervention will receive services 10 minutes 4-5 times a week. • Target: 4th Grade students who need intense intervention will receive services 20 minutes 3-5 times a week | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom teachers will provide strategic services within core classroom 10-20 minutes a day 2-4 days a week. • Target: 1st Grade students who need intense intervention will receive services 10 minutes 3-5 times a week. • Target: 4th Grade students who need intense intervention will receive services 20 minutes 3-5 times a week | |

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

School Year: 2014-2015

| | Reading | Math | Behavior |
|---|--|---|----------|
| Instruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on need, students will be identified as intensive or strategic and will be serve in small groups of 4-6 students Intervention formats will be explicit instruction based on student need and guided by assessment data, collaboration and anecdotal notes from teachers' Pensieve notebooks Focus on intervention lessons will discussed during PLTs ensuring skills are generalized across setting to address grade level expectations on students' levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on need, students will be identified as intensive or strategic and will be served in small groups of 4-6 students during a shared teaching model Intervention formats will be explicit instruction based on student need and guided by assessment data, collaboration and anecdotal notes Focus of intervention lessons will be discussed at PLTs ensuring skills are based and evidenced on students' levels | |
| Assessment and Progress Monitoring | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mClass benchmark WCPSS Digging Deeper Common Formative Assessments Report Card MAP CASE 21 EOG mClass progress monitoring following WCPSS steps to effective progress monitoring with DIBELS next Students will be monitored by teacher providing most intensive intervention Students in the RED will be monitored every 10 school days and students in the YELLOW will be progress monitored every 20 school days Student Data Notebooks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K-1 summative Assessments MAP Common Formative Assessments Report Cards CASE 21 EOG Math Journals Students will be monitored by teacher providing most intensive intervention Students will be monitored monthly using Anecdotal Records Student Data Notebooks | |
| Curriculum/Resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mClass DIBELS FCRR Benchmark Assessments Fast Track Wild Cats Leveled Books C-MAPP Lucy Caulkins Writing Curriculum iReady | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C-MAPP Word Wall Math Expressions Differentiated Task Cards CFAs Alignments Lessons iReady Math Journals | |

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

School: Wilburn ES

Plan Year 2014-2016

School Year: 2015-2016

| | Reading | Math | Behavior |
|---|--|--|---|
| Data Decision Process for Entry and Exit | <p>What data will be used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal behavior expectations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M-Class Data • Digging Deeper Assessments • Report Card Data • Guided Reading Anecdotal Notes • EOG Data • Case 21 • Common Summative Data • Achieve 3000 <p>What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for academics or behavior?</p> <p>Strategic Threshold</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level II on report card • Strategic level TRC • Strategic level composite • Strategic level on one or more DIBELS measures • Level II Common Summative <p>Intensive Threshold</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level I report card • Level I Common Summative • Intensive/Strategic TRC • Intensive/Strategic DIBELS composite • Intensive level on one or more DIBELS measures • Student summary report shows historical pattern of strategic and intensive measures • Level I or II on EOG data <p>Exit Threshold</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress Monitoring-3 data points on or above benchmark /digging deeper assessments • Common Formative Assessment-3 data points on or above <p>What frequency, structures, and processes will be utilized to identify students exhibiting a need for academic intervention throughout the year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing, weekly PLTs • New students arriving throughout the year that demonstrate needs as outlined above will be discussed at PLTs and documented in PLT minutes • Kid Talk embedded in PLT <p>How will your team determine the effectiveness of this plan, as evidenced by at least 70% of served students responding to interventions based on the rate of improvement and/or transitioning towards Core benchmarks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DIBELS Effectiveness Formula (DEF) Report (dig deeper that remained in red to determine if they met the rate of improvement) • Report Card and Summative Data | <p>What data will be used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal math expectations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case 21 • Summative and Formative Assessments • Tenmarks <p>What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for academics or behavior?</p> <p>Entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 or 1 on EOG/Case 21 • Level 2 or 1 on Summative and Formative Assessments • Level 2 or 1 on report cards <p>Exit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three data points at level 3 or 3/4 on EOG/Case 21 <p>What frequency, structures, and processes will be utilized to identify students exhibiting a need for academic or behavior intervention throughout the year?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly PLTs focused on math • Kid talk • New students coming in throughout the year will be added to PLT agenda <p>How will your team determine the effectiveness of this plan, as evidenced by at least 70% of served students responding to interventions based on the rate of improvement and/or transitioning towards Core benchmarks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report Card • Summative Data • Case 21 Data • Intervention notes and progress monitoring data | <p>What data will be used to determine criteria to identify the students who are not achieving at benchmark or meeting universal behavioral expectations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will report major incidents immediately to the administration team. • Teachers will submit minor incident report by the end of the school day to the grade level PBIS chair. • The PBIS team and/or school counselor will enter minor referrals into SIRS by Friday and grade level will have a common understanding and common language about what minor data is entered. • The administration team will enter major referrals into SIRS by Friday and grade level will have a common understanding and common language about what major data is entered. <p>Other data to consider: Attendance Data Walk through observations Care Plans</p> <p>What is the threshold at which students will enter and/or exit strategic and/or intensive interventions for behavior?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entering Strategic Intervention Classroom Level: There is a repetition of trends in behavior in 2-3 settings that results in 3 minors per quarter. • Entering Intensive Intervention Outside of Classroom: During implementation of classroom level intervention, the student receives more than 3 minors and/or major referral. • Exiting: Student meets benchmark. |
| | | | |

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2015-2016 |

| | Reading | Math | Behavior |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Intervention Structure | <p>What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 minute intervention block delivered by core teachers and other support staff (5 days a week) <p>How does your master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to Core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level intervention time (30 minutes) • Daily 5 Structure | <p>What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark or universal behavior expectation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 minute intervention time embedded in the math block • After-School Tutoring for Grades 3-5 <p>How does your master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to Core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level 30 minute intervention block embedded in math block | <p>What will be the strategic and intensive structures for delivering services to students who are not meeting benchmark or universal behavior expectation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic intervention can be delivered through the CORE. • Classroom-based interventions will be delivered throughout the day by CORE teachers. • More intense interventions like Social Skills instruction will be delivered during the day outside of core during the intervention time. <p>How does the master schedule allow for delivery of strategic and intensive intervention in addition to core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The master schedule has been designed to allow time for flexible grouping to occur for strategic and intensive intervention. |
| Instruction | <p>What structures in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly common grade level planning • Quarterly Collaborations • Instructional Coaches, IRT, and Administration facilitate and participate in weekly common grade level planning meetings <p>What is the intervention lesson format for reading?</p> <p>All lesson formats will be direct and explicit instruction based on student need and guided by assessment data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gradual release: I do, we do, you do • Lessons can include components of guided reading, word work, written comprehension <p>How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kid talk during PLTs • Progress Monitoring Data • PEP | <p>What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to the core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly math planning • Monthly math unpacking of standards <p>What is the intervention lesson format for math?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct instruction with targeted skill manipulatives • Gradual Release Model • Small Group <p>How will you know the interventions have been implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level teams discuss data at monthly PLT meetings w/Kid Talk | <p>What structures are in place to ensure that instructional decisions and planning are aligned to core?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School wide-expectations are developed and taught. • Weekly during PLT w/Kid Talk • Kid Talk Defined: • Discuss students with Tier II/Tier III plans and any outliers. • Assign teacher to certain PLT days and come prepared with Kid Talk form (See Google Drive) • Once a quarter during SIP meetings, whole school and grade level data is reviewed. <p>What is the intervention format for behavior?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons exist to teach school-wide expectations and reteach them. <p>How will you know the intervention implemented with fidelity? Who will ensure fidelity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders involved in the planning of interventions and identified staff to carry out instruction. • The intervention team will consistently monitor how effective intervention is and how. • Grade levels and support staff may serve the role of monitoring. |

School Improvement Plan

Intervention Planning Matrix

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| School: | Wilburn ES |
| Plan Year | 2014-2016 |
| School Year: | 2015-2016 |

| | Reading | Math | Behavior |
|---|--|--|---|
| Assessment and Progress Monitoring | <p>What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress monitoring in M-Class system Monitoring progress through digging deeper assessments or common formative assessment <p>How does data guide your instruction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusting focus, groups, intensity, duration <p>How often will you progress monitor?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensive=every 10 days of instruction Strategic=every 20 days of instruction Daily anecdotal notes <p>What is the process for analyzing the data and making data based decisions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLT discussions Intervention team ICE Days Grade Level Planning | <p>What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summative and Formative Data Score 21 assessments Report Card grades <p>How does data guide our instruction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusting focus, groups, intensity, duration <p>How often will you progress monitor?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 or 20 days based on strategic or intensive need <p>What is the process for analyzing the data and making data based decisions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PLT discussions Intervention team | <p>What data will be used to assess the student's responsiveness to intervention?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behavior comments from 4th quarter Number of minor and major referrals <p>How does the data guide your instruction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on data reviewed, the frequency or duration of the intervention will be increased, faded, or modified. <p>How often will you progress monitor?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress monitoring will occur at least monthly, with the possibility of occurring more frequently. <p>What is the process for analyzing the data and making data based decisions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative conversations will be conducted to discuss students' progress and consider adjustment of frequency, duration, intensity, group size, and delivery. After 10 consistent days parent conference, and data collection... |
| Curriculum/Resources | <p>What evidence based materials and resources will be used to support the academic strategic interventions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letterland (K-2) Recipe for Reading (3-5) Words Their Way Now What Tools (M-Class System) FCRR Read-Write-Think | <p>What evidence based material and resources will be used to support the academic strategic interventions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> C-Mapp Quantile Teacher Assistant Website EASI Recommended Interventions Achieve the CORE RTI in the Math Classroom Go Solve Intervention Central | <p>What evidence based materials and resources will be used to support the behavior strategic interventions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PBIS Committee and Resources Check In/Check Out Sheets STARS Mentoring Program |