School Vision and Mission Statements for Oakwood Elementary

Vision:

Oakwood Elementary School's Mission is to nurture an environment that respects individual differences, promotes high achievement, and encourages each member of the school community to be active, life-long learners.

Mission:

It is our vision that all students will be successful at Oakwood Elementary.

LEA or Charter Name/Number: Caswell County Schools - 170
School Name/Number: Oakwood Elementary School
School Address: 274 Oakwood Drive, PO Box 640, Yanceyville, NC 27379
Plan Year(s): 2015-2016
Date prepared:

Principal Signature: _____ _____ Date

Local Board Approval Signature: _____ _____ Date

School Improvement Team Membership

From GS §115C-105.27: "The principal of each school, representatives of the assistant principals, instructional personnel, instructional support personnel, and teacher assistants assigned to the school building, and parents of children enrolled in the school shall constitute a school improvement team to develop a school improvement plan to improve student performance. Representatives of the assistant principals, instructional personnel, instructional support personnel, and teacher assistants shall be elected by their respective groups by secret ballot....Parents serving on school improvement teams shall reflect the racial and socioeconomic composition of the students enrolled in that school and shall not be members of the building-level staff."

Committee Position*	Name	Committee Position*	Name
Principal	David Scott		
Guidance Counselor	Andrew Craig		
Reading Specialist	Helen Moore		
K-2 Representative	Kim Doran		
K-2 Representative	Megan Donovant		
3-5 Representative	Lakia Crutchfield		
3-5 Representative	Lauryn Thomas		
EC Representative	Rachel Goots		
TA Representative	Janice Sadler		
Parent Representative	Cherilyn Standfield		
Parent Representative	Katherine Irby		

* Add to list as needed. Each group may have more than one representative.

School Data and Summary Analysis

Use data identified on the Data Sources tab (or from other sources) as the basis for understanding the school and identifying priority areas for improvement.

Guiding Questions: Review school data and consider a variety of perspectives including overall school/student performance, sub-group performance, attendance, teacher satisfaction, instructional practice (from walk-throughs/observations), and student learning (also from walk-throughs/observations as well as data).

1. What does the analysis tell you about your schools strengths?

A strength of our school is our determination to continue to advocate our students. We look for opportunities to go above and beyond what their parents and guardians are doing for them. We want our students to feel as though Oakwood is a second secure and loving home for them. We work extensively with parents at our monthly Focus meetings, at which parental involvement continues to impress us. Our teachers come to school every day to inspire children, and our students have outstanding attendance.

Oakwood Elementary places an emphasis on student reading ability. We heavily favor Reading time in the daily schedule and include daily opportunities for extended small group instruction in Reading with certified teachers and tutors. Extra emphasis in 2014-2015 was placed on reading and writing across the curriculum.

(The letters A-K are used in the next paragraph to separate data sources. These sources are then broken out further after the paragraph.)

The School Improvement Team looked first and foremost at [A] Spring EOG testing data and then analyzed the data from these secondary sources: [B] mCLASS/DIBELS data (for analysis of readers on grade level); [C] CASE21 benchmark assessments (for analysis of proficiency by CCSS at different intervals throughout the year); [D] daily attendance in PowerSchool (to correlate absenteeism and student performance); [E] teacher turnover; [F] student discipline logs (for correlation between subgroup suspensions and proficiency on state tests); [G] parent participation records; [H] professional development offerings and staff participation; [I] general demographics of students as available in PowerSchool; [J] EVAAS data (for analysis of both student and teacher performance and growth); and [K] community demographics.

A. Spring EOG Testing: Percentages shown are for Grade Level Proficiency

	2012 -2013		2013 - 2014		2014 - 2015	
	Oakwood	State Avg.	Oakwood	State Avg.	Oakwood	State Avg.
ELA	31.8	43.9	45.5	56.3	36.9	56.3
Math	29.4	42.3	41.9	51	32.4	52.2

Even though the proficiency percentages show a downturn in our progress, Oakwood had several teachers in testing grades who made expected growth, and the outlook for 2015-2016 is promising.

B. mCLASS Data: Number represents the percentage of students in grades K-3 in each category in 2014-2015

	Composite			TRC Proficiency		
	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
Well-below benchmark	30	24	18	43	27	38
Below benchmark	19	14	17	18	38	21
At (or above) benchmark	51	62	65	39	35	41

In both the Composite and TRC components of mCLASS, Oakwood showed growth overall in 2014-2015.

C. CASE21 Benchmark Data: Percentages shown are the projected proficiency for each grade/subject

	2013-2014			2014-2015		
	1st BM	2nd BM	Post	1st BM	2nd BM	Post
3rd Gr. Reading	55%	42%	65%	41%	33%	34%
3rd Gr. Math	49%	38%	50%	41%	27%	40%
4th Gr. Reading	43%	63%	65%	58%	67%	54%
4th Gr. Math	69%	45%	54%	77%	52%	50%
5th Gr. Reading	45%	32%	37%	49%	48%	58%
5th Gr. Math	38%	33%	34%	57%	58%	48%

D. Attendance:

	SY 2013-2014 (180 days)	SY 2014-2015 (178 days)	SY 2015-2016 (74 days)
Grades Pre-K and K	80.66%	92.03%	92.97%
Grades 1, 2, and 3	79.91%	95.41%	95.18%
Grades 4 and 5	88.24%	93.18%	93.76%
Grand Total	82.56%	94.08%	94.24%

E. Teacher Turnover: Analysis of six-year span where 2010-2011 is "Year 1" and 2015-2016 is "Year 6"

Discounting Art, Media, Music, and PE classes, we have 28 positions that require a licensed staff member. These 28 positions include the principal (1), Pre-K instructors (2), Guidance counselor (1), Reading specialists/Curriculum coaches (2), EC teachers (4), and classroom teachers, three in each grade level in grades K-5 (18). In the table below, "Internal Reassignments" represents teachers changing positions within the school; "Less than 3 years" represents teachers (or any certified staff member) who has been in his current position for less than 3 full years; "Stabilized Positions" represents someone who has been in the position for at least 3 full years at the start of the school year. In some instances, the totals indicate more than 28 positions. One position was eliminated after 2011-2012. In other cases, there were multiple incidents of turnover in the same position.

	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016
New Hires	2	1	8	5	10	6
Internal Reassignments	0	1	6	2	2	3
Less than 3 years	5	6	0	11	9	10
Stabilized Positions	22	21	14	11	7	9

F. Student Discipline: SY 2014-2015 is was our first year for tracking and detailing the discipline logs for analysis.

During the 2014-2015 school year, there were 134 office referrals, which resulted in a total of 34 days of in-school suspension (ISS) and 134 days of out-of-school suspension (OSS). By grade-level, the 3rd-grade class had the highest number of incidents (45), followed by 5th-grade (36) and 4th-grade (35). Black students accounted for 108 office referrals; white students accounted for 23. Male students accounted for 103 and female students accounted for 31 office referrals.

G. Parent Participation Records

We analyzed the times and dates of parent events in an effort to increase the number of offerings from last year to this year. Our goal is to have at least one parent event per month during which parents can gain insight on how best to help reinforce classroom learning at home.

H. Professional Development Offerings and Staff Participation

In addition to county-wide offerings for Reading Foundations and pacing guide development, Oakwood offered professional development through Learning Focused. Learning Focused provided an online platform for teachers to complete a variety of modules that pertained to their classrooms. School-wide, 30 of 32 full-time teachers participated in a Learning Focused module.

I. Student Demographics in Testing Grades: (Based on data available in 2014-2015 Internal Ready Review; combines grades 3 - 5)

ALL	MALE	FEMALE	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE	EDS	SWD	AIG
176	91	85	100	9	63	111	28	18

J. EVAAS Data: Aggregate Index Values for 2014 and 2015

Reading	2014	-0.14
Reading	2015	-1.16

Math	2014	0.94
Math	2015	-1.41

K. Community Demographics

Oakwood Elementary School primarily serves the students who live in the town of Yanceyville. According to the most recent statistics, the population of Yanceyville has declined by 3.7% since 2000, and the estimated average income has also declined. In the 2000, the estimated average income was approximately $20,000; in 2013, the estimated average income was $14,383/year, which is roughly one-third of the state average of $45,906/year. The racial breakdown of Yanceyville is as follows: 54% Black, 38% White, and 3% Hispanic. This breakdown parallels the population of Oakwood: 61% Black, 31% White, and 4% Hispanic. According to census information for the residents of 25 years of age or older, 63% are high school graduates, 5% have a Bachelor's degree (or higher), and 10% are unemployed.

2. What does the analysis tell you about your schools gaps or opportunities for improvement?

When analyzing the EOG results and looking at gaps between black students and white students and girls and boys, there are significant gaps to address. In fourth grade Reading, for instance, white males had a 70% proficiency rate while their black counterparts had a 21% proficiency rate. In 4th grade Math, the gap was even greater: 80% proficiency for white males and 7% for black males. In 3rd grade Reading and 3rd grade Math, our female students heavily outperformed our male students. In 4th grade, our girls outperformed our boys decidedly. Student subgroups are explained in more detail below.

Oakwood currently has 381 students enrolled, 174 of which will be in EOG tested classes. Of those 174 students, 11% are SWD and 64% are black or African-American. These two subgroups in particular have not achieved high levels of proficiency in recent years. When looking at all EOG subjects from 2014-2015, our black students had a proficiency percentage of 33% while our white students had 45% proficiency. Our SWD subgroup had only 17% proficiency. These same subgroups [black and students with disabilities] had 39% and 13% proficiency (respectively) on all EOG tests in 2013-2014.

Regarding common assessments...In the 2-3 years prior to 2014-2015, Oakwood's teachers developed common assessments to be given throughout the year. These assessments were multiple choice assessments, were given summatively, and did not truly measure a student's depth of knowledge. Furthermore, the teacher-made assessments did not evolve over the last 3 years. They do not match the rigor of the EOG tests and therefore they do not accurately measure the students' depth of knowledge. In short, these assessments were not great tools, and the data that they yielded was misleading. Our students were then not fully prepared for the EOG tests.

Regarding teacher turnover... As stated in question 1, item E, Oakwood has had its share of teacher and administrative turnover. On a positive note, seven of the nine new hires from 2014-2015 have stayed on, which will eventually stabilize some of the positions that have had highest turnover.

Attendance and discipline correlated with academic success... We had fewer than ten students in EOG testing grades who exceed 15 unexcused absences. One of those students passed both EOG tests, and all of the others failed both of their tests. There was also a correlation between office referrals and student proficiency: students who had multiple suspensions overwhelmingly did not pass their EOG tests; however, there did not appear to be enough passing scores on the other side of the matter to make the case that students who did not have suspensions did pass the test. Presumably, frustration with learning tasks manifested as a discipline problem and classroom disturbance. That the suspensions prevented a student from earning proficiency does not seem likely.

3. What data is missing, and how will you go about collecting this information for future use?

A great challenge is to track a cohort's ability on a given CCSS. For instance, to see how a subset of second-graders performed on a particular math standard in 2013-2014 and how those same students performed on the same standard in third grade in 2014-2015. Is the information available? Yes. Is there time for 3rd-grade teachers to disaggregate data that is a year old? No. There is barely enough time for 3rd-grade teachers to get familiar with their own data. Moreover, the EOG score sheets do not give teachers feedback on how individual students performed on those standards at the end of the year.

In 2015-2016, the MTSS Team at Oakwood is going to track and graphically display student proficiency on specific standards in an attempt to identify systemic weaknesses in our approach to those standards. We are migrating away from traditional scoring methods and towards standards-based assessments so that we can better analyze student performance by standard. The MTSS Team will also be collecting information about which research-based strategies are most effective in the instruction of those standards. This, we hope, will allow us to hone in on the strategies that have the most effectiveness for our students. The next step, then, is to make sure that new teachers quickly adopt those strategies.

We are also looking for a way to match our strongest teachers with our weakest students during remediation blocks. With such high turnover, it is difficult to distinguish low student performance from low teacher performance, as there isn't a lengthy history to support either case. In the current year, we will use benchmark testing data to make calls regarding which teachers have had the most success with a given standard, and we will have those teachers lead the remediation for the standards on which they were most successful. Part of the missing data--or data that was not fully utilized, perhaps--is the early identification of students who are going to be on the bubble, just as likely to score a 2 as they are to score a 3. This student information must be determined, acted upon, and monitored as the year progresses.

4. Based upon the analysis conducted, what 3-5 top priorities emerge for the school? Cite relevant evidence from your analysis to support these priorities.

Priority 1: Improve reading scores and instruction through small group instruction, interventions, and vocabulary acquisition in grades K-5. In the past several years, there has been a lopsided emphasis put on the upper-grades, which continues to perpetuate the problem when our students are low-performing when they reach third grade. (NC Ready Reviews for last 3 years); (Case21 Benchmarks over last three years indicate Oakwood's second-graders are not experiencing growth through the year)

Priority 2: Improve math scores and instruction through increased use of interactive technology and hands-on/minds-on lessons. (Case21 scores indicate that 3rd-graders, 4th-graders, and 5th-graders were all markedly low in "Measurement and Data" and "Fractions.")

Priority 3: Students who are reaching proficiency are not exceeding it. We need to increase support for students for whom 4s and 5s should be the expectation. Another way of viewing this data (from the NC Ready Review) is to see that our scoring distribution indicates a ceiling (of sorts)--some of our students scoring at level 2 cannot seem to break the proficiency line and our level 4 students aren't growing into level 5s. To me, this indicates that our expectations are set too low, that we are in essence pitching to the middle of plate for our low-achieving and high-achieving students alike and not providing what either subset truly needs.

Priority 4: Achievement gaps for students with low-SES--Understanding our demographics, we have a large percentage of students each year that is behind grade level at the start of the year, whether upon entrance in kindergarten or in later grades. Eric Jensen's work in "Teaching with Poverty in Mind" and in "Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind" addresses correlations between low-SES and student achievement. Jensen's research reflects some of what we see in our students' achievement, and his books identify some strategies that will be put into practice or fine tuned during this school year and successive years.

Priority Goal 1 and Associated Strategies

Plan/Do

Area for improvement and supporting data:

The instruction and remediation of Reading skills (Ready Review data, mCLASS: Reading 3D data, CASE21 benchmark assessment data)

School Goal 1:	To increase the percentage of students who earn a score of proficient or better on the EOG tests by 13 percentage points each of the next 3 years. Oakwood's students were 36.9% proficient in 2014-2015 on Reading EOGs. Our goal for 2015-2016 is 50% proficiency and then 63% proficiency in 2016-2017 and 76% proficiency in 2017-2018.
Supports this district goal:	

Target:	50% grade-level proficiency in EOG Reading in 2015-2016; 63% GLP in 2016-2017; 76% GLP in 2017-2018
Indicator:	Benchmark exams and ultimately spring EOG tests
Milestone date:	6/1/2016

Goal 1 Improvement Strategies – Identify research-based strategies whenever possible.

Strategy 1:	**Students in K-3 will have at least 2 hours per week of small group reading instruction in addition to their regular English Language Arts class time.**	
	Action steps:	
	1. Assess students at BOY to ascertain TRC score and DIBELS Composite score.	**5. Students who are below and far below grade level will be tracked by the MTSS team at monthly meetings.**
	2. Group students for small "Lit Groups". These groups will take into consideration student deficits in DIBELS as well as the current TRC scores.	**6. Teachers will notify parents when students are below and/or far below grade level. Notification will be either a documented phone conference, a letter, or a conference with the parent.**
	3. Teachers, Reading Specialists, and Teacher Assistants will instruct Lit Groups.	**7. Reading Specialist will report on the students who are "far below" grade level.**
	4. After each 3 week period, teachers will regroup students according to TRC and composite data.	**8. Interventions for students who remain far below will be reviewed approximately every 4 weeks by the MTSS team, which may change the prescribed strategy at that review point.**
Strategy 2:	**Implementation of SuccessMaker Lab and expansion of FUNdations instruction as remediation efforts.**	
	Action steps:	
	1. Train a team of SuccessMaker leaders.	**5. Train all teachers and reading specialists serving grades K-2 in FUNdations.**
	2. Develop an implementation plan for all students to be using SuccessMaker by October.	**6. As students present difficulties, administer either the CORE assessment or the Ganske assessment to pinpoint which skills are deficient.**
	3. Monitor SuccessMaker usage and progress quarterly at MTSS meetings.	**7. According to individual student needs, students will either receive a "double dose" of FUNdations (3 - 5 times per week) or they will be added to the case load of one of the reading specialists. The reading specialists will use either Reading Mastery, Reading Recovery, or SRA as the intervention strategy.**
	4. Adjust daily schedule to accommodate student and class needs at mid-year.	**8. As students are added to the reading specialists' case loads, the classroom teacher will notify the parent and the reading specialist will open a line of communication with the parent. At each MTSS monthly meeting, the MTSS team will review the progress of students who are working with the Reading Specialists and make a recommendation on how to adjust this intervention.**

Strategy 3:	Early identification and early interventions for students who enter a grade and are below grade level.	
	Action steps:	
	1. According to the division testing window, all students in grades K-3 will participate in the BOY DIBELS assessments. These results, along with EOY data from the previous year, will be reviewed by the principal, the teachers, and the reading specialists.	5. Based on the results of the 1st and 2nd benchmark assessments, teachers and the principal will identify student focus groups (consisting of 6-10 students) who had commonalities in their areas of non-proficiency. The tutors will work in a remediation setting with these students outside of the regular, core instructional setting. This will apply to students in grades 3 - 5.
	2. EOG results from 2014-15 will also be reviewed to identify students who did not meet proficiency. These students' needs will be assessed by their teachers, the principal, and the reading specialist to determine the most appropriate course of action for serving these students.	6. For students in lower grade levels, similar group remediation settings will be facilitated by regrouping these students among the classroom teachers for targeted remediation strategies following end of the 2nd and 3rd nine week grading periods.
	3. The reading specialists will share the work load: our part-time RS will serve students in grades K, 1, and 5; our full-time RS will serve students in grades 2, 3, and 4. The reading specialists will have a weekly schedule on file in the principal's office and will also keep a record of which students were served on which dates throughout the year. The reading specialists will deploy multiple strategies, to include Reading Mastery, Reading Recovery, and SRA. Students in the 3-4 Transition class will be a priority leading up to the RTA exam at the end of October.	7. After the 2nd benchmark assessment and after the MOY DIBELS window, members of the School Improvement Team will review the interventions that have been in play and evaluate the effectiveness of those interventions. The School Improvement Team will adjust, as necessary, the Master Schedule to maximize resources (tutors, Reading Specialists, access to technology, etc.)
	4. When data--from mCLASS or from standards-based common assessments--becomes available, teachers will discuss emerging students' needs at weekly PLC meetings with the principal. Students who are demonstrating the need for supplemental or intensive interventions will work with paid tutors during the school day, as needs and budgetary constraints dictate. We have budgeted for tutors to begin to work with students from November through the end of May/start of June.	

Plan/Do

Professional development - Identify the professional development required to successfully implement the strategies above.

Staff person or group	Course name/title	Course provider	Date completed
All K - 5 Teachers and Reading Specialists	Reading Foundations	NC SIP Trainers	Yearly, in the spring
Teachers in K - 2	FUNdations	Elementary Education Director	Mid-August 2015
SuccessMaker Implementation Team	SuccessMaker	Pearson / Elementary Education Director / SM Implementation Team	ongoing

How will we fund these strategies and associated professional development?

Funding source 1: Local district funds

Funding amount: $0

Total initiative funding: **$0**

Review frequency: Quarterly

Assigned implementation team: MTSS Team, Reading Specialist, Principal, SuccessMaker Team Leaders, Elementary Education Director

Check

What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?

Regarding the Lit Group strategy: Teachers will review progress monitoring data as a way to analyze effectiveness of the Lit Groups; additionally, the teachers will report to the principal on the progress and fluidity of the process for regrouping students when new data is available. The MTSS team will also receive and review reports pertaining to the number of students who are at, below, and far below grade level in grades K-3. These reports will be entered into the minutes of the MTSS meetings in which they were reviewed.

Regarding SuccessMaker: Quarterly reports for each teacher in grades K-5 will be reviewed by the principal, the MTSS team, and the Elementary Education Director. These reports will show statistics on usage, proficiency, mastery, and overall progress towards skill attainment measured in grade-level gain throughout the year.

Regarding FUNdations: Teachers will administer FUNdations assessments at regular intervals. Students receiving a "double dose" of FUNdations instruction should eventually begin to close the achievement gap between themselves and their on-grade-level peers.

Regarding Reading Specialists and Tutors: The Reading Specialists will provide pre-assessment, post-assessment, and attendance (dates of service) data for the students they serve. Additionally, as students complete the pre-assessments, the reading specialists will add documentation to the MTSS files of the strategies to be deployed for each student who receives these services. These strategies will be recorded within the course of the MTSS meeting every 4 weeks.

Check

How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)

Each of the aforementioned strategies has a direct tie to DIBELS data, benchmark testing data, standards-based common assessment data, and TRC level. Any one of those data sources can be used to determine student growth in an area where there is an identified deficit. For a grade-level view of the progress or for the school-wide view of the progress, we will be reviewing student performance on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd benchmark assessments for reading in grades 3-5. For grades K-2, the data that will determine progress towards a goal will come from mCLASS data primarily. Obviously, students in grades K-2 will not contribute positively or negatively to our EOG scores this year. Therefore, the effectiveness of these strategies cannot be truly finalized until each of the lower grade levels reaches third grade. We can and will, however, monitor and adjust the strategies to the best of our ability until that point.

What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?

Early indicators show that our current 3rd-grade students are starting from a better place than last year's third-graders. This, at least in some part, can be attributed to an adjustment made in last year's schedule to provide more time for students to read to adults.

Act

Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?

If, after analyzing the data that is available in February, we find that our students' progress is stagnate or minimal, we investigate other approaches that have proven successful for populations with similar demographics. If we find that one approach in particular seems to be yielding better results than another approach, we will make sure that our resources gravitate towards the successful practices. To make any changes prior to seeing the results of the second benchmark exam, however, would be to make a knee-jerk reaction based on too few data points.

Priority Goal 2 and Associated Strategies

Plan/Do

Area for improvement and supporting data:
Student performance and instruction on Math End-of-Grade tests in grades 3, 4, and 5.

School Goal 2:	To increase the percentage of students who earn a score of proficient or better on the Math EOG tests by 13 percentage points each of the next 3 years. Oakwood's students were 32.4% proficient in 2014-2015 on Math EOGs. Our goal for 2015-2016 is 45% proficiency and then 58% in 2016-2017 and 71% in 2017-2018.
Supports this district goal:	

Target:	45% of students will earn grade level proficiency in 2015-16; 58% GLP in 2016-2017; 71% GLP in 2017-2018
Indicator:	Progress towards goal--CASE21 benchmark assessments; ultimate measure of success--spring EOG tests
Milestone date:	Early June 2016

Goal 2 Improvement Strategies – Identify research-based strategies whenever possible.

Strategy 1: Implementation of SuccessMaker as an intervention strategy for all students in grades K-5 mathematics.

Action steps:

1. Train a team of SuccessMaker leaders who will, in turn, train the rest of the staff on how to use SuccessMaker to reinforce instruction and monitor student progress.
2. Develop an implementation plan for all students to be using SuccessMaker by October.
3. Monitor SuccessMaker usage and progress quarterly at MTSS meetings.
4. Adjust daily schedule to accommodate student and class needs at mid-year.
5. Based on the results of benchmark assessments, teachers will use SuccessMaker to create and assign targeted practice for areas in which individual students are experiencing difficulty.
6. For students who are not experiencing growth comparable to their peers, teachers will provide a record of student activity--usage and accuracy reports--to the parent(s)/guardian(s) of the student.

Strategy 2: Focused remediation for students who do not earn proficiency on standards-based common assessments.

Action steps:

1. Teachers will deliver (through formative assessments) a set number of standards-based common assessments each nine-week period. The number of assessments was established by a district team over the summer.
2. Teachers will report instructional strategies for each standard at grade-level PLC meetings. These reports are then to be compiled by the MTSS team twice per quarter.
3. Students who do not earn a proficient score will be grouped for remediation on that standard. These students will receive a second round of research-based instruction (following the Marzano research). The second round of instruction will differ from the first.
4. After remediation, students will be given the opportunity to improve their score on an assessment for the standard for which they received additional instruction.
5. If a student continues to perform below proficiency, the iterative process will continue: assess, remediate, reassess. Additional rounds of remediation will be facilitated by certified tutors during non-core instructional times during the school day.
6. Parents will be notified at interim report dates (or more often) regarding their child's performance on the common assessments and on the most recent CASE21 benchmark assessments.

Plan/Do

Strategy 3: **Deliberate use of hands-on strategies and interactive technology.**

Action steps:

1. Teachers will review available data--previous years' benchmark assessment results and current year common assessment data--to determine which standards have been historically problematic for their students. In the absence of benchmark data, teachers will review previous year's grade-level math assessments.
2. Teachers will use both North Carolina and Georgia Common Core pacing guides to identify hands-on and interactive technology resources that pertain to the most challenging/most problematic standards for their students.
3. Teachers will use math manipulatives to contextualize concepts. For instance, measurement and data lessons will include activities that require students to take and use measurements rather than relying on worksheets and teacher lectures.
4. As teachers identify student needs for high priority standards, they will be able to identify classroom kits that will be purchased for their students.
5. Teachers will frequently refer to NC Wiki pages and other online archives for interactive technology lessons. To support these lessons, teachers will be able to sign up to use either of the computer labs to deliver technology-based instruction.
6. At least one faculty meeting per semester will include a SMARTBoard user community component during which selected members of the staff will be asked to share lessons that have been highly interactive and successful in their math classes.

Professional development - Identify the professional development required to successfully implement the strategies above.

Staff person or group	Course name/title	Course provider	Date completed
SuccessMaker Team Leaders	SuccessMaker training	Pearson / Elementary Education Director / SuccessMaker Team Leaders (for in-house professional development)	ongoing
All core teachers, K-5	District-wide grade-level PLC	Elementary Education Director	Fall 2015, Spring 2016

How will we fund these strategies and associated professional development?

Funding source 1: Select a funding source

Funding amount: $0

Total initiative funding: **$0**

Review frequency: Quarterly

Assigned implementation team: MTSS Team, SuccessMaker Team Leaders, Principal, Elementary Education Director

Check

What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?

Regarding SuccessMaker: SuccessMaker tracks user performance in a variety of ways. The teachers at Oakwood will be responsible for pulling reports on each student every three weeks. One of the reporting elements will be reported during the MTSS meetings. According to Pearson and our implementation team, our overall growth per student should represent a full year's worth of skill mastery by June.

Regarding Focused Remediation: We believe that timely--early--intervention will be essential in our effort to increase proficiency. Using available benchmark data and data from standards-based common assessments, teachers will be able to pinpoint skill and concept deficiencies and address them promptly. We know that we have a school-wide weakness with Measurements and Data as well as with Fractions. Rather than taking a one-shot remedial approach in these areas, students who have shown difficulty with these concepts will have regular contact with certified tutors who will be taking a more comprehensive approach to remediating these concepts. This remediation will cause students and tutors to work together weekly and to continue to build upon these essential concepts. Tutors will meet with students during the school day but will not pull students from Reading or Math instruction. The progress of the students in these remediation groups will be monitored through standards-based assessments and benchmark assessments. Their progress should also be evident in the SuccessMaker data.

Check

How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)

Progress towards the goal will be determined by looking at student performance on district-wide standards-based formative assessments, which will be delivered throughout the school year. We already have an idea of which students have historically struggled with math; students in grades 3, 4, and 5 have benchmark and/or EOG data from the previous year(s). The principal, along with the teachers and the MTSS team, will monitor the progress of students who have been below proficiency on at least one EOG math test. These students' proficiency on the aforementioned common assessments should be telling. When the first and second benchmark assessments results are available, the teachers will disaggregate data to show whether students receiving remediation throughout the school year are making gains compared to the previous year(s). Students who longer need the supplemental/intensive remediation offered with the tutors will be allowed to discontinue the remediation. Their exit, however, will be contingent upon demonstrating proficiency on a benchmark exam in those targeted areas.

	What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?
	In lieu of a diagnostic screener for Math skills, like what is available for reading through mCLASS, our teachers have a much more hands-on task to determine where a student's deficiencies lie in math. Therefore, when a student is selected for remediation, the teachers and tutors and the principal all work together to provide a plan for how to address each student's needs. When we determine the underlying deficiency to be a skill that was not mastered in a previous grade, we are giving the tutors (and the students) the opportunity to scale back the skill as far as necessary. When the deficiency is traced back over multiple years, we are asking teachers and tutors to make their own assessment tools to track student progress. These assessment tools are not standardized and they do not necessary apply to every student in the remediation group, as Student's A and B may have diverse needs. So, the "data" is informal in most cases, and the teachers and tutors speak about the students in terms of "making progress" and "not making progress." We have been able to see, albeit very early in process, that the students in the remediation sites are engaged and are making progress. How that correlates to application on a grade-level assessment remains to be seen.
Act	**Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?**
	As with the Reading goal, we will evaluate the effectiveness of our interventions after the next round of benchmark testing. Based on the 2014-2015 benchmark results, there was a significant dropoff in the proficiency percentage in grades 3 and 4 between the first and second benchmark assessment. (First benchmark: 3rd grade, 41%; 4th grade, 77%, 5th grade, 57%. Second benchmark: 3rd grade, 27%; 4th grade, 52%; 5th grade, 58%). In 2015-2016, our first benchmark scores are slightly below the 2014-2015 scores; however, we have a more comprehensive plan in place this year to prevent "proficient" scores from back-sliding into non-proficiency. Additionally, communication between third-grade teachers and second-grade teachers about the content of the first benchmark will benefit next year's third-graders, as the second-grade teachers should be able to introduce third-grade concepts by the end of the year.

Priority Goal 3 and Associated Strategies

Plan/Do

Area for improvement and supporting data:
Increasing the total number of Level 5 scores school-wide. (There were only 11 level 5 scores last year).

School Goal 3:	In 2014-2015, out of 406 EOG tests taken, Oakwood students earned a total of 11 Level 5 scores, which represents a score distribution of 3%. Our goal is to increase the percentage of level 5 scores on EOG tests by five percentage points to an 8% score distribution, which means totaling approximately 32 Level 5 scores, in the first year. For each successive year, our goal is to increase by 3% each of the two years after that. (Our goals for 2016-2017 would be 11% of the total scores will be Level 5 scores, and in 2017-2018, the goal will be for 14% of the total scores to be Level 5 scores.)
Supports this district goal:	
Target:	To increase the percentage of level 5 test scores from 3% to 8% of all scores reported on EOG tests [Reading, Math, and Science] in 2015-16. This marks an increase in the total count of Level 5 scores from 11 in 2014-2015 to approximately 32 in 2015-2016.
Indicator:	The spring EOG results (NC Ready Review) will be the indicator.
Milestone date:	Early June 2016

Goal 3 Improvement Strategies – Identify research-based strategies whenever possible.

Strategy 1:	**Increased support and participation in AIG services.**	
	Action steps:	
	1. Secure PETS materials to be used in K-2 classrooms. Instruction on these materials will be included in the services provided by the school guidance counselor as he schedules monthly instructional visits to all classrooms. Classes will have 5 PETS installments between November 2015 and June 2016.	**5. AIG school team will identify at least one field trip for all AIG students. The AIG team will be encouraged to visit museums and science centers judged to be within a reasonable travel distance so as not to incur great expenses.**
	2. Administer and review results of CogAT tests for all third-grade students. These test results will be used to qualify students for AIG services; these results, however, will not be the only means by which a student can qualify for AIG services.	**6. Oakwood will strongly encourage 3 staff members to participate in local AIG courses that teach differentiated instructional strategies and strategies proven to be highly effective for AIG students. These courses are offered in the Fall and Winter. As of 10/23, two teachers have committed to these courses.**
	3. Hold the AIG Parent Meeting in conjunction with another parent event that will have the ability to draw a large crowd. This year, instead of pairing AIG and Title I night, we paired the AIG Parent Meeting with the Back-to-School Open House. The turnout was exceptional.	**7. Additionally, members of the AIG team are to coordinate a presence at each of the monthly parent focus meetings. One focus meeting at a date to be determined should center on STEM projects and initiatives.**
	4. Hold monthly enrichment lessons for identified AIG and AIG nurturing students.	
Strategy 2:	**Research and provide exposure to STEM/STEAM concepts for possible adoption in the 2016-2017 school year.**	
	Action steps:	
	1. Find and apply for grants that will allow Oakwood to secure STEM/STEAM kits for use in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade science classes. Depending on the kit providers, send two staff members to the contingent professional development seminars.	**5. Evaluate current staff and current daily schedule to see how disruptive STEM implementation might be. Prioritize offerings and resources to meet stakeholder needs. Develop a report of who holds proper credentials to teach new course offerings in STEM/STEAM curricula. Discuss whether the changes are feasible. If so, begin to develop a plan for communicating a transition to STEM/STEAM curricula.**
	2. Identify other STEM schools in a 2-hour radius in North Carolina and in Virginia. Arrange to send faculty members to these sites for information and first-hand observations of STEM classes and the STEM environment.	
	3. Apply for grants that will allow Oakwood to purchase digital learning materials and hand-held devices for use in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math lessons.	
	4. Find and offer training and support for re-centering curriculum on STEM concepts.	

Plan/Do

Professional development - Identify the professional development required to successfully implement the strategies above.

Staff person or group	Course name/title	Course provider	Date completed
Lauryn Thomas, Cary Lee Cumbo	Mastering Literacy through STEM	NCSTA	Nov. 12-13, 2015
Open to all teachers	Local AIG courses	Dr. Chris Godwin	October - February

How will we fund these strategies and associated professional development?

Funding source 1: School general funds

Funding amount: $0

Total initiative funding: **$0**

Review frequency: Quarterly

Assigned implementation team: AIG Team, MTSS Team, Principal, and District AIG Coordinator

Check

What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?

We will be tracking the number of students whose CogAT scores qualified them for AIG services and comparing that to the number of students who enter the program. Part of our district AIG plan requires us to keep demographic data regarding our students participants. Analysis of that data will also shed light on whether we are too narrow in our intake or if we have too wide of a berth. We also will be able to show on the school calendar and by parent sign-ins sheets which events were planned, advertised, and well-attended and what the agenda for those nights included. Our hope is that, over the next 3 years, we see a migration of our student scores (by distribution)--the heavy distribution of level 2 scores will separate into a more even distribution of scores in levels 2 and 3 (preferably); the collection of students scoring level 3, which is proficient, will over time have a balance of students who are proficient and students who are reaching mastery. The MTSS team and AIG co-chairs will work with all grade levels to adopt initial STEM concepts. These parties will then also report at the MTSS mid-year and end-of-year meeting the school's progress towards STEM/STEAM implementation.

Check

How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)

The introduction of the PETS program should have a correlation to scores on the 2nd grade benchmark assessments this year and should continue to trend positively into 3rd grade on benchmark and EOG scores in the second year. The inclusion of STEM concepts should have a direct effect on EOG Math scores in grades 3, 4, and 5, and also on EOG Science scores in grade 5. Currently, science is an underserved curriculum in grades K-4, which puts 5th-grade students at a disadvantage on the Science EOG. Hopefully, earlier introduction of STEM concepts will provide an immediate upturn in student engagement and yield greater results on 5th grade science EOGs.

What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?

Act

Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?

District Support			
Strategy	Person(s) Responsible	Timeframe	Comments
Develop, discuss, and implement a strategic planning process which provides a roadmap for academic achievement and re-culturing the school district and individual schools.	Superintendent and all Directors	Ongoing yearly	Directors and principals met in spring 2015 to begin work on a new district strategic plan. Subcommittees reconvened in the fall of 2015 to submit strategies for their respective sections of the plan and to refine the vision and mission.
Support and ensure school leaders' effectiveness by implementing with fidelity NCEES.	Superintendent and Director of Human Resources	Monthly	Principals are given a schedule for completing observations.
Organize and facilitate data retreats and meetings to monitor the district's process on board goals.	Superintendent, Director of Accountability, Directors of K-12 Curriculum, Director of Exceptional Children, and Chief Technology Officer	Every nine weeks	Meet with principals to review, analyze, and discuss results of benchmark assessments.
Provide time to allow teachers to develop pacing guides that guide instruction.	Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Fall and Spring	Meet with teachers to review and revise pacing guides.
Provide teachers with reading foundations that will ultimately improve the reading proficiency of all students.	Director of Pre-K-5 Curriculum and Director of Exceptional Children	Ongoing yearly	Emphasis on reading foundations at Pre-K-5.
Increase the promotion and graduation rates of all schools by closely monitoring data.	Director of Accountability and Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Every nine weeks	Meet with principals to review attendance, discipline, and report card data.
Provide district benchmark assessments for EOG and EOC courses for the purpose of monitoring student progress.	Superintendent, Director of Accountability, and Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Every nine weeks	Meet with principals to review benchmark data.
Support schools in implementing quality professional learning communities; provide feedback as needed.	Superintendent and Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Monthly	Meet with principals to disaggregate qualitative and quantitative data from weekly PLC meetings.
Support schools in implementing a strategic literacy plan.	Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Three years	Implementing literacy design collaboratively.
Encourage parents and the community to be involved in the academics offered in each school as well as extra-curricular activities.	Superintendent and Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Ongoing yearly	PTSOs, social media, parents' nights that focus on: AIG, elementary, middle and high schools curriculum, career awareness, 1:1 initiative, advisory board memberships, and SIT memberships.
Provide teachers with learning opportunities and test-taking strategies that may enhance students' performance on EOG's, EOC's, AP Exams, ACT PLAN, The ACT, ACT ASPIRE, and ACT WORKKEYS.	Director of Accountability and Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Ongoing yearly	Partnerships with PTEC and PCC to provide training for teachers on test-taking strategies.
Provide resources to teachers that will assist them in creating formative assessments.	Director of Accountability and Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Ongoing yearly	Teacher training by NCDPI staff on effective use of formative assessments.
Schedule time for vertical articulation meetings between K-12 teachers.	Directors of K-12 Curriculum	Twice a year	Teachers at grades 5, 6, 8 and high school core teachers meet to share strengths and weakness of student preparedness.