

Form A2 – School Improvement Plan

Principal: Ann Mock

Assistant Superintendent: Astein Osei

School: Oak View

Date: 2016-17

The School Improvement Plan priorities focus on three areas: **reading, mathematics, and student behavior**. The School Improvement Plan must include: (1) the utilization of MCAs as a data point for one or more goals; (2) articulated goals related to proficiency rate(s), growth, and achievement gap reduction, (3) student behavior; and, if applicable, (4) a graduation rate goal.

Guidelines

- (1) The district will insert the baseline data prior to the scheduled site improvement meeting with the Research, Assessment and Accountability Department.
- (2) The district will insert the basic and transformational goals at the start of school using the 2015-16 cohorts. Students enrolled for the 2015-16 school year make up each cohort.
- (3) Basic goals represent reasonable student progress or improvement based on trends. Transformational goals represent the scores that are necessary to close the achievement gaps and are based on state expectations.
- (4) General Color Coding Key (most data tables include a more specific key):

Far Below Basic Goal	Well Below Basic Goal	Below Basic Goal	Near Basic Goal	Met Basic Goal	Met Transformational Goal
---------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------

- (5) Site team should use these **guiding questions** for discussion in development of the action plan for each area of the plan:
 - a. What did the data tell you about your current state? What were things the data did not tell you?
 - b. What adult practices might be the cause of the data?
 - c. What are the root causes of the data concerns that will be addressed in action plans?
 - d. What research-based actions, strategies, and interventions will support students in meeting the goals?
 - e. What knowledge and skills (professional learning) will adults need to support students in meeting the goal(s)?

Priority One: READING		<i>Measure: Proficiency (% Low Risk on DIBELS)</i>					
Column Header	Definition						
Avg of 2014 & 2015	This includes only students who were "at-risk" or at "some risk" based on the fall LNF, LSF or ORF screening. The value reported is the percentage of these students who were "low risk" by spring (average of Spring 2014 and Spring 2015)						
Basic Goal	Reduce at-risk and some risk by half in four years (minimum = 40%)						
Transformational Goal (Trans)	Reduce at-risk and some risk by half in two years (minimum = 50%)						
2016 Results	Percentage of students low risk in Spring 2016						
Avg of 2015 & 2016	Average percentage of students low risk - Spring 2015 and Spring 2016						
Color Coding	30% + from Basic Goal	15 - 29% from Basic Goal	5 - 14% from Basic Goal	<5% from Basic Goal	Met Basic Goal	Met Transformational Goal	
% Low Risk	2015-16 Baseline, Goals and Results				2016-17 Baseline and Goals		
Group	Avg of 2014 & 2015	2016 Basic	2016 Trans.	2016 Results	Avg of 2015 & 2016	2017 Basic	2017 Trans.
Kindergarten	44%	51%	58%	58%	51%	57%	63%
Grade 1	28%	40%	50%	50%	39%	47%	54%
Grade 2	12%	40%	50%	32%	22%	40%	50%

Priority One: READING		<i>Measure: MCA Proficiency (Index Rates)</i>				
Column Header						
Results	Index rate for students with scores from last spring, enrolled on October 1 and tested in the spring.					
Fall Cohort	Index rate for students tested in the previous spring and enrolled the following fall.					
Basic Goal	The lower of the district average change and the MDE index target (reduce non-proficiency by half in two years), with a minimum of 25.					
Transformational (Trans.) Goal	The higher of the district average change and the MDE index target (reduce non-proficiency by half in two years), with a minimum of 30.					
Color Coding	10+ points below basic goal	6-9 points below basic goal	1.1 to 5.9 points below basic goal	Within 1 index point of basic goal	Met basic goal	Met transformational
Notes: Student group goals are addressed under gap reduction. Also, when results are calculated, the cohort scores and goal scores are updated to reflect the students with pretest scores who were enrolled in the fall and took the test in the spring.						

Group	2015 Results	Fall 2015 Cohort	2016 Basic Goal	2016 Trans. Goal	2016 Results	Fall 2016 Cohort	2017 Basic Goal	2017 Trans. Goal	2017 Results
All Students	61.8	53.6	58.4	65.2	63.5	55.5	60.3	66.6	
Grade 3	54.5	62.5	61.1	71.9	50.0	49.2	48.0	61.9	
Grade 4	46.2	53.8	57.4	65.3	72.0	47.5	52.0	60.6	
Grade 5	68.5	43.6	55.9	57.7	68.2	69.4	77.0	80.6	
Amln									
Asian	60.0				71.4				
Black	46.4				29.4				
Hispanic	42.1				48.1				
White	76.4				78.5				
EL	23.8				30.4				
Spec Ed	23.2				32.3				
F/R Lunch	49.7				47.7				
Female	68.4				65.0				
Male	54.9				61.7				

Priority One: READING				Measure: MCA Growth (Z-Score - District)				
Color Coding for 2016 Results for Growth Z-Score Minus District								
.30 or more below Basic Goal	.15 to .29 below Basic Goal	.04 to .14 below Basic Goal	Within .03 of Basic Goal	Met Basic Goal	Met Transformational Goal			
Results are only reported if there are 10 or more students in the group.								
2017 Goals								
Description	Result	Basic Goal		Transformational Goal				
Well above district avg.	+ .15 and up	0.15		0.2				
Above district average	+ .10 to +.14	0.1		0.15				
Near district average	- .09 to +.09	0.05		0.1				
Below district average	- .10 and below	0		0.1				
Growth Z - District		Baseline		2016 Goals		Results	2017 Goals	
Indicator	Group	2014	2015	Basic	Trans.	2016	Basic	Trans.
Growth	All Students	-0.16	-0.07	0.05	0.10	0.51	0.15	0.20
Growth	Grade 4	-0.14	-0.29	0.00	0.10	0.52	0.15	0.20
Growth	Grade 5	-0.20	-0.12	0.00	0.10	0.49	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Am Ind							
Gap Reduction	Asian	-0.08	-0.04	0.05	0.10	0.66	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Black	-0.22	-0.35	0.00	0.10	0.50	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Hispanic	-0.22	-0.21	0.00	0.10	0.43	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	White	-0.13	0.12	0.10	0.15	0.51	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	EL	-0.21	-0.27	0.00	0.10	0.60	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Spec Ed	-0.46	-0.36	0.00	0.10	0.02	0.05	0.10
Gap Reduction	F/R Lunch	-0.21	-0.16	0.00	0.10	0.45	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Female	-0.08	0.10	0.10	0.15	0.55	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Male	-0.24	-0.25	0.00	0.10	0.45	0.15	0.20

Priority One: Reading			
Reading Continuous Improvement Action Plan: (add steps as needed by using tab key)			
Strategies: <i>What specific strategies will be implemented?</i>	Adult actions: <i>What adult actions will ensure the strategies are successful?</i>	Measure student progress: <i>What student data will be collected?</i>	Person(s) Responsible:
Continued ENVoY Implementation	Implementation building wide Monthly coaching sessions and walk-throughs	Stake holders survey Increase in student on - task time and engagement in instruction as measured by reduction in ODR out of classroom Walk through student engagement evidence Google sign up for each coaching session	Ann Mock, Stephanie Webster, Marian Rainville (consultant) Trainers: Nati
Reading Intervention and Support: Tier II and III interventions for students scoring in the bottom 10% and/or lower third of our district assessment data	Analyze data (MAP, DIBELS, MAZE) Identify specific students in each grade level needing additional support Progress monitoring every other week of all identified students, EL and SPED Professional Learning Teams will identify different instructional strategies	Increase in pre/post assessment DIBELS oral reading fluency MAZE comprehension checks Informal assessments in classrooms	Ann Evenson, Ann Mock, K-5 teachers, SPED and EL staff
Flexible, Tier One groupings that meet the specific reading needs of students.	Progress Monitoring Reorganizing groups based on data	TIES fluency data every other week Benchmark ORR checks MAZE assessments	Licensed staff, Academic Coach, Administration
CLEAR/NUA implementation	Ongoing staff trainings	Pre and post data	Licensed staff, Administration,

Form A2 – School Improvement Plan

School: Oak View Elementary

Date: 2016-17

	Professional Learning Teams will identify different instructional strategies	DIBELS/MAZE progress monitoring	Coaches, System Staff Development Specialist (SDAS)
Adaptive Equity Focus	Equity team will engage staff in formal and informal activities that build consciousness of race and the impact race has in our achievement data	Student and Staff Stakeholder data MAP MCAIII	Equity Team, Equity Teacher, Equity Specialist, District level staff
Continued, focused implementation of Thinking Maps	Complete online modules Teach one map/week for 8 weeks Integrate Thinking Maps into reading/writing	Thinking Maps “Wall of Honor” Student reading notebooks MAP/MCAIII data	All Staff Coaches Thinking Maps Trainer

Priority Two: MATHEMATICS					Measure: MCA Proficiency (Index Rates)				
Column Header									
Results									
Index rate for students who had a score from the previous year, were enrolled on October 1 of the next year, and tested the next spring.									
Fall Cohort									
Index rate for students tested in the previous year and enrolled in the fall of the next year.									
Basic Goal									
The lower score between the MDE index target (reduce non-proficiency by half in two years) and the district average change, with a minimum of 25.									
Transformational (Trans.) Goal									
The higher of the MDE index target (reduce non-proficiency by half in two years) and the district average change.									
Color Coding									
10+ points below basic goal		6-9 points below basic goal		1.1 to 5.9 points below basic goal		Within 1 index point of basic goal		Met basic goal	Met transformational
Notes: Student group goals are addressed under gap reduction. Also, when results are calculated, the cohort scores and goal scores are updated to reflect the students with pretest scores who were enrolled in the fall and took the test in the spring. The minimum basic goal is 25.									
Group	Spring 2015 Results	Fall 2015 Cohort	2016 Basic Goal	2016 Trans. Goal	Spring 2016 Results	Fall 2016 Cohort	2017 Basic Goal	2017 Trans. Goal	Spring 2017 Results
All Students	62.4	70.0	69.3	77.5	71.1	72.1	70.2	79.1	
Grade 3	78.9	77.5	78.9	83.1	72.5	73.4	74.4	80.0	
Grade 4	59.8	73.8	72.5	80.4	76.9	67.8	65.6	75.8	
Grade 5	63.0	57.3	54.9	68.0	62.7	75.0	70.4	81.3	
Amln									
Asian	66.3				69.0				
Black	43.2				48.5				
Hispanic	40.1				51.9				
White	78.6				86.2				
EL	25.4				37.5				
Spec Ed	21.4				36.7				
F/R Lunch	47.9				55.9				
Female	68.0				69.5				
Male	56.9				73.1				

Priority Two: MATHEMATICS				Measure: MCA Growth (Z-Score - District)				
Color Coding for 2016 Results for Growth Z-Score Minus District								
.30 or more below Basic Goal	.15 to .29 below Basic Goal	.04 to .14 below Basic Goal	Within .03 of Basic Goal	Met Basic Goal	Met Transformational Goal			
Results are only reported if there are 10 or more students in the group.								
2017 Goals								
<i>Description</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>Basic Goal</i>		<i>Transformational Goal</i>				
Well above district avg.	+.15 and up	0.15		0.2				
Above district average	+.10 to +.14	0.1		0.15				
Near district average	-.09 to +.09	0.05		0.1				
Below district average	-.10 and below	0		0.1				
Growth Z - District		Baseline		2016 Goals		Results	2017 Goals	
Indicator	Group	2014	2015	Basic	Transform.	2016	Basic	Transform.
Growth	All Students	-0.15	-0.13	0.00	0.10	0.44	0.15	0.20
Growth	Grade 4	-0.03	-0.63	0.00	0.10	0.34	0.15	0.20
Growth	Grade 5	-0.24	-0.12	0.00	0.10	0.56	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Am Ind							
Gap Reduction	Asian	-0.19	-0.15	0.00	0.10	0.57	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Black	-0.28	-0.36	0.00	0.10	0.16	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Hispanic	-0.39	-0.27	0.00	0.10	0.14	0.10	0.15
Gap Reduction	White	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.10	0.64	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	EL	-0.57	-0.43	0.00	0.10	0.30	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Spec Ed	-0.53	-0.53	0.00	0.10	0.09	0.05	0.10
Gap Reduction	F/R Lunch	-0.29	-0.33	0.00	0.10	0.29	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Female	-0.15	-0.10	0.00	0.10	0.37	0.15	0.20
Gap Reduction	Male	-0.15	-0.16	0.00	0.10	0.54	0.15	0.20

Priority Two: Mathematics

Mathematics Continuous Improvement Action Plan: (add steps as needed by using tab key)			
Strategies <i>What specific strategies will be implemented?</i>	Adult actions: <i>What adult actions will ensure the strategies are successful?</i>	Measure student progress: <i>What student data will be collected?</i>	Person(s) Responsible:
Continued ENVoY Implementation	Implementation building wide Monthly coaching sessions and walk-throughs	Stake holders survey Increase in student on - task time and engagement in instruction as measured by reduction in ODR out of classroom Walk through student engagement evidence Google sign up for each coaching session	Administration Consultant and trainer from ENVoy
CLEAR/NUA implementation	Ongoing staff trainings Professional Learning Teams will identify different instructional strategies	Pre and post data DIBELS/MAZE progress monitoring	Licensed staff, Administration, Coaches, System Staff Development Specialist (SDAS)
Adaptive Equity Focus	Equity team will engage staff in formal and informal activities that build consciousness of race and the impact race has in our achievement data	Student and Staff Stakeholder data MAP MCAIII	Equity Team, Equity Teacher, Equity Specialist, District level staff
System Staff Development (Mathematical mindsets, math talks, number sense,...)	Engage in monthly professional development opportunities	Student use of strategies Informal classroom walk-throughs PLT discussions	Administration SDAS Coaches Staff
Math Intervention and Support: Tier II and III interventions for students scoring in the bottom 10% and/or lower third of our district assessment data	Analyze data (MAP, MCAIII) Identify specific students in each grade level	Increase in pre/post assessment Informal and formal assessments in classrooms	Adiminstratio9n, Coaches, K-5 teachers, SPED and EL staff

Form A2 – School Improvement Plan

School: Oak View Elementary

Date: 2016-17

	needing additional support Professional Learning Teams will identify different instructional strategies		
--	--	--	--

Priority Three: Student Behavior

Evidence of Need:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Office Discipline Referrals: During the 2015-2016 school year there was a sharp reduction of Office Discipline Reports (ODRs) from the previous year. There were 296 reported ODRs compared to 2,874 ODRs in the 2014-2015 school year. In 2014-2015 black students received 65% of the ODRs and comprised 28% of the student population. In 2015-2016, black students received 72% of the ODRs and comprised 21% of the population. 2. The disproportion of ODRs for black students increased during the 2015-2016 school year. Compared to white students, who received 17% of referrals and comprise 49% of the student population. Hispanic students received 5% of referrals and comprise 16% of the student population.
--------------------------	---

Student Behavior (Example: office referrals, suspensions, etc.)	Baseline data by target group (Example: ethnicity, socioeconomic, grade level, etc.)	Goal
ODR Disproportionality	Percent ODRs/Enrollment Black: 72%/21% White: 17%/49% Hispanic: 5%/16%	In 2016-2017, Oak View will reduce the over representation of black students in ODR data by 30% as measured by our data reported in SWIS.

Student Behavior Continuous Improvement Action Plan: (add steps as needed by using tab key)			
Strategies: <i>What specific strategies will be implemented?</i>	Adult actions: <i>What adult actions will ensure the strategies are successful?</i>	Measure student progress: <i>What student data will be collected?</i>	Person(s) Responsible:
Sustained PBIS implementation	TFI evaluation 2x per year	PBIS Site Team: will meet regularly, conduct self-assessments, and monitor sustainability.	Administration, Counselor and the PBIS team
Use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions	Check In/Check Out Pilot Focus Room	Examination of SWIS data monthly.	Administration PBIS team School Social Worker

Form A2 – School Improvement Plan

School: Oak View Elementary

Date: 2016-17

			School Psychologist
Continued ENVoY training and coaching sessions for teachers and ESP's	Implementation Building Wide	Reduction in classroom ODRs Walkthrough data	Administration Trainers from ENVoY
Through a MTSS model, formal interventions will be put in place for students needing increased behavior support.	SWIS data will be reviewed on a weekly basis to identify students that may require an increase in support or intervention.	Formal interventions will be tracked by classroom teachers, support staff, administration, and PST Team	Administration School Pyschologist PST team
Mentoring and support groups focused on culturally responsive practices	One to One and small group sessions will be implemented weekly.	SWIS data, PST follow up meetings, and classroom data will be reviewed to measure decrease in ODRs.	Equity teacher and Specialist

School: Oak View Elementary

Date: 2016-17

Site Improvement Team

Name	Position	Name	Position
1. Ann Mock	Principal	5. Barbara Weist	Teacher
2. Stephanie Webster	Asst. Principal	6. Jason Scherber	Teacher
3. Ann Evenson	Academic Coach	7. Karen Blix/Mary Ditter	Teacher
4. Tammi Provart	System Staff Development Specialist (SDAS)	8. Stacy Harvey	ATPPS Coach

The Principal and Assistant Superintendent will sign the School Improvement Plan to indicate that the school performance goals and action plan have been shared, discussed, and agreed upon.

Principal: _____ Date: _____

Assistant Superintendent: _____ Date: _____