

<p>2. Organize, examine, and adjust instruction based on student progress monitoring data. (AD)</p>	<p>Implement an extensive data analyzation process by drilling down on school-wide, grade level, and classroom EOG Milestones results. Teachers will collaborate in grade/content vertical groups during staff meetings, teams meetings, and individually, to determine how to adjust instruction accordingly. K-5 teachers will participate in EOG Milestones reflection to determine necessary steps to impact instruction.</p>	<p>Local standards based assessment results throughout year; EOG Milestones assessment results 2016-17</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>None; Teacher collaboration will take place during designated school meeting times</p>	<p>In 3rd grade, we had a total of 15 children who scored below grade level in ELA. This is no change from Spring 2016. 85% of third grade students scored on grade level or above in ELA compared to 83% last year.</p> <p>In 4th grade, we had a total of 15 students who scored below grade level in ELA compared to 19 in 2016. In math, 8 students scored below grade level compared to 16 from last year. 85% of 4th grade students scored on grade level or above in ELA compared to 81% last year. In math, 92% of our students scored on grade level or above compared to last year's score of 82%.</p> <p>In 5th grade, we had a total of 13 students who scored below grade level in ELA, compared to 21 from 2016. In Math, 16 scored below grade level compared to 20 from last year. There were 9 children who were below grade level in both areas, whereas last year there were 16. 85% of 5th graders scored at or above grade level in ELA compared to 80% last year. In math, 82 % scored at or above grade level compared to 72 % last year.</p>	<p>M</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------	---	---	----------

	Implement grade level data team meetings once monthly to monitor progress. Team leader will present data at monthly vertical team data meeting.	Local standards based assessment results throughout year	Certified Teachers/ Admin	None; teacher collaboration will take place during designated school meeting times	Grade level data teams met monthly; this data was presented at vertical data team meeting with documented minutes according to data team template.	M
--	---	--	------------------------------	--	--	---

<p>3. Develop and deliver flexible formative assessments in all core content areas for monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction to meet individual student learning needs. (S)</p>	<p>Address student understanding by utilizing reading and math data from formative assessments and adjust instructional strategies accordingly.</p>	<p>Pre and post math assessments; RI and MI assessment results</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>Funds for subs for collaboration time</p>	<p><u>MI Growth by level:</u> K – 265 quantiles 1 – 275 quantiles 2 – 185 quantiles 3 – 260 quantiles 4 – 305 quantiles 5 – 205 quantiles <u>RI Growth by level</u> 1 – 162 Lexile points 2 – 274 Lexile points 3 – 235 Lexile points 4 – 133 Lexile points 5 – 136 Lexile points <u>Pre/Post Math</u> 1st grade had average gains of 40% of students meeting or exceeding standards over the course of 4 quarters. 2nd grade had average gains of 30% of students meeting or exceeding standards over the school year. 3rd grade had average gains of 63% of students meeting or exceeding standards, often giving extra support with additional testing to gain student success. 4th grade had average gains of 54% over the course of the school year. 5th grade had average gains of 50%. Kindergarten showed the lowest average gains with 16.25%, but had many students coming in with the</p>	<p>M</p>
---	---	--	--------------------------------------	--	---	----------

					knowledge of the standard being tested than other grades.	
<i>4. Align critical professional learning by grade level/content area and ensure access for all teachers. (AD)</i>	Implement Positive Behavior Incentives & Supports (PBIS) decrease the number of behavioral office referrals and promote a positive school climate.	PBIS Team Action Plan Summary reports from SWIS (School-Wide Information System)	Certified Teachers/ Admin	Funds for the printing of “Starbucks” incentive for PBIS	School discipline data dropped by 54 discipline reports from this school year to the previous school year. We had 80 discipline reports for the 2016-17 school year. In January we dropped by 6 referrals, 13 in February, 6 in both March and April and 4 in May.	M
	Engage in professional learning on behavior strategies which correlate with PBIS school-wide initiative.	Teacher feedback, summary reports from SWIS	Certified Teachers/ Admin	Funds for speaker services rendered; subs for teachers	Behavior data with our staff during staff meetings on November 9, 2016, January 4, 2017, and May 10, 2017. School discipline data dropped by 54 discipline reports from this school year to the previous school year. We had 80 discipline reports for the 2016-17 school year. In January we dropped by 6 referrals, 13 in February, 6 in both March and April and 4 in May.	M
	Identify strengths/weaknesses in instruction through staff training on and implementation of SLDS (State Longitudinal Data System) and adjust instruction accordingly. Monitor implementation of SLDS with staff on SLDS website.	Reports on the number of hits on SLDS website	Certified Teachers/ Admin	None	Significant improvement over previous year. May 9, 2017 total was 10,661, which is 7,346 more than the previous year (3,346)	M

	<p>Restructure Nicholson Governance model to align with CCSD District Priority #4, focusing on grade level/content collaboration, data driven decision making, strategies for differentiation and engagement.</p>	<p>EOG Milestones assessment results 2016-17; RI, MI end of year results</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>We had vertical data teams meet on October 26, November 30, and March 29 to see where we are meeting the needs of our students and in what areas we need to grow.</p> <p>In 3rd grade, we had a total of 15 children who scored below grade level in ELA. This is no change from Spring 2016. 85% of third grade students scored on grade level or above in ELA compared to 83% last year.</p> <p>In 4th grade, we had a total of 15 students who scored below grade level in ELA compared to 19 in 2016. In math, 8 students scored below grade level compared to 16 from last year. 85% of 4th grade students scored on grade level or above in ELA compared to 81% last year. In math, 92% of our students scored on grade level or above compared to last year's score of 82%.</p> <p><u>MI Growth by level:</u> K – 265 quantiles 1 – 275 quantiles 2 – 185 quantiles 3 – 260 quantiles 4 – 305 quantiles 5 – 205 quantiles</p> <p><u>RI Growth by level</u> 1 – 162 Lexile points 2 – 274 Lexile points 3 – 235 Lexile points</p>	<p>M</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------	-------------	--	----------

					4 – 133 Lexile points 5 – 136 Lexile points	
<i>5. Increase percentage of students reading on grade level. (S) (Based on CCRPI 2014 Reading Scores)</i>	Track student progress by administering RI 3x yearly.	Track gains in RI Lexile data	Certified Teachers/ Admin	None	RI Growth by level 1 – 162 Lexile points; average 332 2 – 274 Lexile points; average 419 3 – 235 Lexile points; average 684 4 – 133 Lexile points; average 866 5 – 136 Lexile points; average 930	M
	Identify below grade level students in reading and invite them to participate in tutoring opportunities during the day from retired teachers for 3 rd and 5 th grade students, and after school from certified teachers for grades 3, 4, 5.	Track gains in RI Lexile data	Certified Teachers/ Admin	20 Day Funds for tutors	3 rd grade tutoring children gained 254 Lexile points and had an average Lexile of 539. 4 th grade tutoring children gained 94 Lexile points and had an average Lexile of 670. 5 th grade tutoring children gained 193 Lexile points and had an average Lexile of 795.	M
<i>6. Increase percentage of student performance in math/algebra at every grade level. (S) (Based on CCRPI ES-MS Math & HS Algebra Scores)</i>	Track student progress by administering MI 3x yearly to direct instruction.	Track student progress through MI results	Certified Teachers/ Admin	None	MI Growth by level: K – 265 quantiles; average 140 1 – 275 quantiles; average 340 2 – 185 quantiles; average 430 3 – 260 quantiles; average 580 4 – 305 quantiles; average 745 5 – 205 quantiles; average 785	M

	<p>Implement Number Talks, GLOSS (Diagnostic Math Assessment), Guided Math, Modeled Drawing, "Wiser Wednesdays" (extra hr. math weekly) in all grades except 2nd (STEM) and 4th (90 min. math daily)</p>	<p>Track student progress through EOG Milestones results, pre and posttest math data, MI results</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>None</p>	<p><u>MI Growth by level:</u> K – 265 quantiles 1 – 275 quantiles 2 – 185 quantiles 3 – 260 quantiles 4 – 305 quantiles 5 – 205 quantiles</p> <p>In 3rd grade, we had 9 students who scored who scored an achievement level 1 in math compared to 15 students last year. 90% of our 3rd grade students scored at or above grade level in math compared to 85% last year.</p> <p>In 4th grade we had 8 students who scored below grade level in math compared to 16 from last year. 92% of our students scored on grade level or above compared to last year's score of 82%.</p> <p>In 5th grade, we had 16 scored below grade level in math compared to 20 from last year. There were 9 children who were below grade level in both areas, whereas last year there were 16. 82 % scored at or above grade level compared to 72 % last year.</p> <p><u>Pre/Post Math</u> 1st grade had average gains of 40% of students meeting or exceeding standards over the course of 4 quarters. 2nd</p>	<p>M</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------------------	-------------	---	----------

					<p>grade had average gains of 30% of students meeting or exceeding standards over the school year. 3rd grade had average gains of 63% of students meeting or exceeding standards, often giving extra support with additional testing to gain student success. 4th grade had average gains of 54% over the course of the school year and 5th grade had average gains of 50%. Kindergarten showed the lowest average gains with 16.25%, but had many students coming in with the knowledge of the standard being tested than other grades.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>Identify below grade level students in math and invite them to participate in tutoring opportunities focusing on math content standards during the day from retired teachers for 3rd and 5th grade students and after school from certified teachers for grades 3, 4, 5.</p>	<p>Track student progress through EOG Milestones results, pre and posttest math data, MI results</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>20 Day Funds for Tutors</p>	<p>5th grade tutoring students showed 214 quantile gains on the MI, with an average score of 628. There was 1 negative score of 110.</p> <p>4th grade tutoring students showed 255 quantile gains on the MI, with an average score of 583. There was 1 negative score of 325.</p> <p>3rd grade students averaged 204 quantile gains on the MI, with an average score of 523. There were no negative scores for this group of students.</p> <p>In 3rd grade, we had 9 students who scored who scored an achievement level 1 in math compared to 15 students last year. 90% of our 3rd grade students scored at or above grade level in math compared to 85% last year.</p> <p>In 4th grade we had 8 students who scored below grade level in math compared to 16 from last year. 92% of our students scored on grade level or above compared to last year's score of 82%.</p> <p>In 5th grade, we had 16 scored below grade level in math compared to 20 from last year. There were 9 children who were below</p>	<p>M</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	----------

					<p>grade level in both areas, whereas last year there were 16. 82 % scored at or above grade level compared to 72 % last year.</p> <p><u>Pre/Post Math</u> 3rd grade had average gains of 63% of students meeting or exceeding standards, often giving extra support with additional testing to gain student success. 4th grade had average gains of 54% over the course of the school year and 5th grade had average gains of 50%.</p>	
<p>7. Increase number of students academically completing every grade.(S)</p>	<p>Identify students at risk of failing and utilize peer mentors and tutors to assist struggling students.</p>	<p>Track student performance through RI data for 3, 4, 5, and MI data for 4, 5</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>20 Day Funds for tutors</p>	<p><u>Reading</u> 3rd grade tutoring children gained 254 Lexile points and had an average Lexile of 539. 4th grade tutoring children gained 94 Lexile points and had an average Lexile of 670. 5th grade tutoring children gained 193 Lexile points and had an average Lexile of 795. <u>Math</u> 5th grade tutoring students showed 214 quantile gains on the MI, with an average score of 628. There was 1 negative score of 110. 4th grade tutoring students showed 255 quantile gains on the MI, with an average score of 583. There was 1 negative score of 325.</p>	<p>M</p>

<p>8. Other: (Priorities specific to school, division, or area. Can be multiple.)</p>	<p>Increase student attendance through implementation of PBIS.</p>	<p>Quarterly attendance reports in CSIS, and Social Worker tracking reports for attendance</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin/ School Social Worker</p>	<p>Attendance, PBIS incentives</p>	<p>Based on CSIS, average daily attendance over the last 3 school years increased. 2015: 95.9 2016: 96.1 2017: 96.3</p> <p>Based on CCRPI Indicator the percentage of students with 5 or fewer absences increased over the last 3 school years: 2015: 51.1% 2016: 53.3% 2017: 58.8% We will continue to work on meeting the elementary benchmark of 68.3%.</p>	<p>M</p>
	<p>Clarify instructional expectations and structure monitoring systems.</p>	<p>Checklists for monitoring instructional expectations</p>	<p>Admin</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Checklists completed throughout the year; if missing items, instructional expectations addressed and followed through until complete. Expectations were set during preplanning and monitored consistently.</p>	<p>M</p>

Board Goal 2: Differentiate resources for students based on needs.

<p><i>District Focus Priorities 2016-2019</i></p> <p>Focus Priorities: (Based on priorities identified by IE², AdvancEd-AdvED, Superintendent-S, and Academic Division-AD)</p>	<p>2016-17 Aligned Actions and Measurements (Due September 1, 2016)</p>					<p>Focus Priority Status: NM = Not Met IP = In Progress M = Met</p>
	<p>Key Actions: (List as many actions as needed in each box.)</p>	<p>Measured by:</p>	<p>Owner(s):</p>	<p>Resources Needed:</p>	<p>Results Of Key Actions: (Due June 30, 2017)</p>	

<p>Identify local school innovations through system flexibility to increase student achievement. (IE²)</p>	<p>Reallocate resources to meet student needs through 4th Grade Team Teaching, 5th Grade Departmentalization, and 2nd Grade STEM Block weekly.</p>	<p>Track student progress through RI and MI assessment data; and EOG assessments</p>	<p>2nd, 4th/5th Grade Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>2nd grade RI: gained 274 Lexile points with an average Lexile of 419 2nd grade MI: average quantile growth of 185 with an average Quantile of 430</p> <p>4th grade RI: gained 133 Lexile points with an average Lexile of 866 4th grade MI: average quantile growth of 305 with an average Quantile of 745</p> <p>5th grade RI: gained 136 Lexile points with an average Lexile of 930 5th grade MI: average quantile growth of 205 with an average Quantile of 785</p> <p>For this section we focused on collecting data for our level 1 and level 4 students. On the Milestones, we had 15 4th grade students (15%) scoring at level 1 in ELA and 8 students (8%) scoring at level 1 in math. 24 of our 4th graders (24%) scored a level 4 in ELA section of the Milestones, and 17 of our 4th graders (17%) scored at level 4 for math.</p> <p>For 5th grade, we had 9 students (11%) who scored at level 1 in ELA and 16 students (19%) who scored at level 1 in math. 9 of our students (11%) scored a level 1 in ELA and 16 students (19%) scored a</p>	<p>M</p>
---	---	--	--	-------------	---	----------

					level 1 in math. 9 students (11%) scored a level 4 in ELA and 8 students (9%) scored a level 4 in math.	
Divisionally support local school innovations identified through system flexibility for increasing student achievement. (IE²)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

<p>Provide targeted resources for students</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. not reading on grade level (Lexile) 2. unsuccessful in Math/Algebra (Based on 2014 CCRPI Math/Algebra scores) 3. not on-track for graduation (S) 	<p>Identify struggling learners and monitor progress through accelerated instruction, remedial, special education, and ESOL learning strategies.</p>	<p>Track RI, MI, and pre/post data for targeted students</p> <p>Reports/data from System 44 to show progress</p>	<p>Certified Teachers/ Admin</p>	<p>System 44/Read 180 computer program</p> <p>20 Day funds</p>	<p><u>MI Growth by level:</u> K – 265 quantiles 1 – 275 quantiles 2 – 185 quantiles 3 – 260 quantiles 4 – 305 quantiles 5 – 205 quantiles</p> <p><u>RI Growth by level</u> 1 – 162 Lexile points 2 – 274 Lexile points 3 – 235 Lexile points 4 – 133 Lexile points 5 – 136 Lexile points</p> <p><u>System 44/Read 180</u> Nicholson had 17 4th and 5th grade students who participated in an average of 42 sessions in Read 180 this year. The average reading inventory growth in Lexiles was 140. We had 45 students who participated in System 44. 40 of the 45 students in System 44 completed 0-49% of the software, 4 students completed between 50-75% of the program, and 1 student completed 80-100% of the program. The average reading inventory score in Lexiles was 532.</p> <p><u>Pre/Post Math</u> 1st grade had average gains of 40% of students meeting or exceeding standards over the course of 4 quarters. 2nd grade had average gains of 30% of students meeting or exceeding standards over the school year. 3rd grade</p>	<p>M</p>
---	--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--	----------

					had average gains of 63% of students meeting or exceeding standards, often giving extra support with additional testing to gain student success. 4 th grade had average gains of 54% over the course of the school year and 5 th grade had average gains of 50%. Kindergarten showed the lowest average gains with 16.25%, but had many students coming in with the knowledge of the standard being tested than other grades.	
Identify and provide resources to increase opportunities for advanced, on-level, and remedial students to earn initial credit, embedded credit, dual credit, recovered credit, distance learning, and certifications in areas of student interest. (AD)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other: (Priorities specific to school, division, or area. Can be multiple.)						

Board Goal 3: *Develop stakeholder involvement to promote student success.*

<p><i>District Focus Priorities 2016-2019</i></p> <p><u>Focus Priorities:</u> (Based on priorities identified by IE², AdvancEd-AdvEd, Superintendent-S, and Academic Division-AD)</p>	<p>2016-17 Aligned Actions and Measurements (Due September 1, 2016)</p>					<p><u>Focus Priority Status:</u> NM = Not Met IP = In Progress M = Met</p>
	<p>Key Actions: (List as many actions as needed in each box.)</p>	<p>Measured by:</p>	<p>Owner(s):</p>	<p>Resources Needed:</p>	<p>Results Of Key Actions: (Due June 30, 2017)</p>	
<p>Seek and evaluate stakeholder input for critical processes. (AdvED)</p>	<p>Review feedback from School Council and PTA on SSP and adjust on relevant feedback.</p>	<p>Minutes from stakeholder meetings and documents with results from implementation in meeting minutes.</p>	<p>Administration Office of Accountability</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Minutes document feedback results from PTA and School Council</p>	<p>M</p>
	<p>Provide community information and question/answer session on CCRPI and its components.</p>	<p>Feedback from attendees</p>	<p>Office of Accountability</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Director of Office of Accountability spoke to School Council and PTA Executive Board in November meeting.</p>	<p>M</p>
<p>Establish programs and practices that enhance parental involvement and reflect the needs of students and their families.(S)</p>	<p>Conduct English classes on Rosetta Stone computer program once weekly (2hrs.) for parents with limited English proficiency, free of charge.</p>	<p>Parent participation</p>	<p>ESOL Teacher and EIP Teacher</p>	<p>Rosetta Stone software licenses, provided by ESOL/Title III department</p>	<p>English classes completed by 10 parents.</p>	<p>M</p>

	Conduct PBIS at home classes for parent and community members based on parent input.	Parent participation; report on number of discipline referrals from SWIS program	School Social Worker	None	Although School discipline data dropped by 54 discipline reports from this school year to the previous school year, the school social worker was unable to complete home visits.	NM
	Seek parent input in multiple venues on a variety of topics to determine needs and actions. Provide table at curriculum night with parent surveys. Connect home/school with a variety of topics on website.	Parent participation; report on number of discipline referrals from SWIS program	School Social Worker	None	School discipline data dropped by 54 discipline reports from this school year to the previous school year. In January we dropped by 6 referrals, 13 in February, 6 in both March and April and 4 in May.	M
Other: (Priorities specific to school, division, or area. Can be multiple.)	Increase parent involvement and participation through parent callouts from school and new PTA Executive Board. Work with PTA to support Toolbox, a user friendly way to engage parents and increase involvement. Bring on other partners in education which encourage parental involvement.	Attendance data from PTA events	Key Committee School and Community Involvement PTA Executive Board	None	Parent participation increased by 3%. New Partners in Ed brought on: The School Box, Chick-fil-A, Ivy Lane	M

Board Goal 4: *Recruit, hire, support and retain employees for the highest level of excellence.*

<p><i>District Focus Priorities 2016-2019</i></p> <p>Focus Priorities: (Based on priorities identified by IE², AdvancEd-AdvED, Superintendent-S, and Academic Division-AD)</p>	<p>2016-17 Aligned Actions and Measurements (Due September 1, 2016)</p>					
	<p>Key Actions: (List as many actions as needed in each box.)</p>	<p>Measured by:</p>	<p>Owner(s):</p>	<p>Resources Needed:</p>	<p>Results Of Key Actions: (Due June 30, 2017)</p>	<p>Focus Priority Status: NM = Not Met IP = In Progress M = Met</p>
<p>Seek and hire teachers who meet the qualifications for a highly effective teacher. (IE²)</p>	<p>Revise criteria and utilize interview questions specific to Nicholson as to what constitutes a highly effective teacher.</p>	<p>TKES evaluation data</p>	<p>Admin and Building Leadership Team</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Criteria developed and utilized throughout year and end of year during interview process</p>	<p>M</p>
<p>Seek and hire school administrators who meet the qualifications for a highly effective school leader and who are best suited for the school's environment. (IE²)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Support local school teachers and leaders to improve retention rate. (IE²) (S)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Ensure that teachers are highly trained in the standards, learning engagement strategies, formative assessments, and student progress monitoring. (AD)</p>	<p>Increase teacher knowledge of formative assessments and student progress monitoring.</p>	<p>Walkthrough data, lesson plans, minutes from data team meetings, TKES evaluation data</p>	<p>Certified Staff/ Admin</p>	<p>Training in SGM and SLDS</p>	<p>Training took place on both SGM by school staff and SLDS by State Dept. of Ed.; lesson plan checks and data team meetings demonstrate implementation of formative assessments and student progress monitoring</p>	<p>M</p>
<p>Fully implement and evaluate state system of teacher and leaders evaluation (TKES and LKES).</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

Use results of TKES and LKES to improve professional performance (IE ²)	Identify and address the needs of all staff based on self-assessment surveys and determine important strategies.	TKES portal documentation, TKES evaluation data	Certified Staff/ Admin	None	TKES portal documentation and evaluation data discussed during Preconference, Post-conference, and Summative conferences, training on CTLS resources	M
Other: (Specific to school, division, or area. Can be more than one.)						