

LEA or Charter Name/Number: Hickory City Schools - 181  
 School Name/Number: W. M. Jenkins Elementary / 326  
 School Address: 3750 Noth Center Street NW Hickory, NC 28601  
 Plan Year(s): 2010 - 2011  
 Date prepared: October 4, 2010

Principal Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Local Board Approval Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

### 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*
Principal	<b>Stephanie Dischiavi</b>	Adm Member
Assistant Principal Representative	<b>Arlene Lail</b>	Adm Member
4th grade Teacher Representative	<b>Harriett Jeffords</b>	Globally Competitive Chairperson
1st grade Teacher Representative	<b>Kathryn Fisher</b>	Member at Large
Kindergarten Teacher Representative	<b>Paula Gambill</b>	Literacy Committee Chairperson
2nd grade Teacher Representative	<b>Mary Rose Grimes</b>	Member at Large
3rd grade Teacher Representative	<b>Laurie Ferguson</b>	Math Committee Chairperson
5th grade Teacher Representative	<b>Corinne Barwick</b>	Member at Large
P.E. Teacher Inst. Support Representative	<b>Kerri Howe</b>	Safety Committee Chairperson
Teacher Assistant Representative	<b>Lore Bolick</b>	Instructional Assistant
Parent Representative	<b>Beth Ansley</b>	PTA Board President

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

## School Vision and Mission Statements for Jenkins Elementary

### Vision:

We believe

... Our curriculum should meet the diverse needs of our students.

... Learning is a collaborative process with students, teachers, parents, and community working together.

... A safe school environment is necessary for teaching and learning.

### Mission:

The mission of W. M. Jenkins Elementary school is to promote academic achievement, character development, and citizenship in all students.



## 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

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?

81.4% of students are proficient in reading, math, and science (88.5% proficient in math, 75.9% proficient in reading).

Met AYP (15 of 15 targets) and High Growth Standard.

Currently utilizing various data sources to guide appropriate instruction.

Teachers and administrators hold high expectations for one another and students.

Instruction is aligned with NC Standard Course of Study and local curriculum maps.

Instructional strategies are varied to address social and academic learning needs of all students.

Utilizing various forms of communication to keep parents and the school community informed



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

In math and reading white students are significantly out performing all subgroups. There is a need to increase proficiency for all students in order to meet the increasing AYP targets. Although we made high growth for the 2009-2010 school year, growth data in respect to both teacher and student trends indicates a need to further target academic growth for all students. Collaborative planning will allow time for teachers to conduct thorough data reveiws, plan with support staff, and appropriately plan for differentiated instruction.



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

There is a need to establish baseline literacy data in grades K, 1, and 2 in the areas of phonological awareness, phonics, spelling, fluency, and comprehension. Literacy First provides specific assessments and a process for ongoing monitoring of student progress. We also lack valid student performance data in literacy and math for grades 3, 4, and 5. Teachers will continue to create and administer reading assessments to measure quarterly progress. Hickory Public Schools will provide quarterly math benchmark assessments during the 2010-2011 school year.

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.

1. Reading proficiency - Increase proficiency for all students (75.9%) to meet the AYP target of 77.2% for the 2010-2011 school year. Target minority subgroup reading proficiency to reduce the achievement gap between minority subgroups and white students. (White 89.5%), (Black 50%), Hispanic (78%), Limited English Proficient (53%), Students with Disabilities (84%)
2. Math proficiency - Increase proficiency for all students (88.5%) to meet the AYP target of 88.6% for the 2010-2011 school year. Target minority subgroup math proficiency to reduce the achievement gap between minority subgroups and white students. (White 96.7%), (Black 82%), (Hispanic 95%), (Limited English Proficient 78%), (Students with Disabilities 92%)
3. Implement Literacy First in grades K-2 to establish baseline student performance data.



**Priority Goal 1 and Associated Strategies**

**Area for improvement and supporting data:**

Reading proficiency scores of the following sub-groups (African American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, and Students with Disabilities) are below the federal target (77.2%) for the 2010-2011 school year. There is also an achievement gap between our white and minority sub-groups. Performance discrepancies between white student reading proficiency (89.4%) and the indicated subgroups ranges from 2.7% -52.1%.

<b>School Goal 1:</b>	To increase the literacy proficiency scores of the following sub-groups; Black, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient (LEP), Students with Disabilities (SWD).
<b>Supports this district goal:</b>	Improve student achievement: A) Reduce student achievement gap by 25%

<b>Target:</b>	Increase the above sub-groups by a minimum of 15 percentage points.
<b>Indicator:</b>	End of Grade Proficiency Scores
<b>Milestone date:</b>	June 10, 2011

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

	<b>Strategy:</b> Align 90% of instructional lesson plans with the Anatomy of a Lesson framework.	
<b>Strategy 1:</b>	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1. Provide professional development on the Anatomy of a Lesson framework.	5
	2. Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	6
	3. Provide teachers feedback on collected classroom data.	7.
	4. Facilitate small group teacher discussion groups to review and analyze collected data pertaining to classroom instruction.	8.
	<b>Strategy:</b> Utilize data to establish whole and small, flexible reading groups based on student needs.	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1. Analyze formal and informal data to reteach and accelerate student learning. (learning targets, quarterly benchmark assessments)	5. Administrators facilitate teacher discussions to review student performance data, observation data, and instructional practices. (Lesson plans, work samples, PEPs, and assessments will serve



<b>Strategy 2:</b>	2. Teachers work collaboratively to form appropriate groupings of students based on student performance data.	6. Schedule co-planning opportunities to include classroom teachers, ESL, EC, and AIG teachers. (data review, lesson planning)
	3. Teachers deliver quality differentiated instruction that responds to students' needs identified through benchmarks.	
	4. Conduct classroom walk-throughs to verify whole and small group lessons are being conducted with varied and appropriate instructional strategies.	
<b>Strategy 3:</b>	<b>Strategy:</b>	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1	5
	2	6.
	3	7.
4	8.	

**How will we fund these strategies?**

**Funding source 1:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 2:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 3:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 4:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 5:** Select a funding source

**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Total initiative funding:**

**Review frequency:** Quarterly

**Assigned implementation team:** Administrators, Teachers, Literacy Coach

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

Classroom Walkthrough Data, Lesson Plans, Remediation/Acceleration Plans, Minutes from co-planning sessions

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

Quarterly Data Reports (quarterly assessments, teacher class records of informal assessments)  
Comparing EOG results in reading from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011 results.

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

Check



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

Act



**Priority Goal 2 and Associated Strategies**

**Area for improvement and supporting data:**

Math proficiency scores of the following sub-groups (African American, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient, and Students with Disabilities) are below the federal target (88.6%) for the 2010-2011 school year. There is also an achievement gap between our white and minority sub-groups. Performance discrepancies between white student math proficiency (89.4%) and the indicated subgroups ranges from 7% - 33%.

<b>School Goal 2:</b>	To increase the math proficiency scores of the following sub-groups; Black, Hispanic, Limited English Proficient (LEP), Students with Disabilities (SWD).
<b>Supports this district goal:</b>	Improve student achievement: A) Reduce student achievement gap by 25%, B) Remove LEA improvement status by meeting AYP in math.

<b>Target:</b>	Increase the above sub-groups by a minimum of 15 percentage points.
<b>Indicator:</b>	End of Grade Proficiency Scores
<b>Milestone date:</b>	June 10, 2011

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

<b>Strategy 1:</b>	<b>Strategy:</b> Align 90% of instructional lesson plans with the Anatomy of a Lesson framework.	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1. Provide professional development on the Anatomy of a Lesson framework.	5
	2. Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	6
	3. Provide teachers feedback on collected classroom data.	7.
4. Facilitate small group teacher discussion groups to review and analyze collected data pertaining to classroom instruction.	8	
<b>Strategy 2:</b>	<b>Strategy:</b> Utilize data to establish whole and small, flexible math groups based on student needs.	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1. Analyze formal and informal data to reteach and accelerate student learning. (learning targets, quarterly benchmark assessments)	5. Schedule co-planning opportunities to include classroom teachers, ESL, EC, and AIG teachers. (data review, lesson planning)

<b>Strategy 2:</b>	2. Teachers work collaboratively to form appropriate groupings of students based on student performance data.	6
	3. Conduct classroom walk-throughs to verify whole and small group lessons are being conducted with varied and appropriate instructional strategies.	7
	4. Administrators facilitate teacher discussions to review student performance data, observation data, and instructional practices. (Lesson plans, work samples, PEPs, and assessments will serve as evidence of appropriately differentiated instruction).	8.
<b>Strategy 3:</b>	<b>Strategy:</b>	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1	5
	2	6
	3	7
4	8.	



Check	<b>How will we fund these strategies?</b>		
	<b>Funding source 1:</b>	Select a funding source	<b>Funding amount:</b> \$0
	<b>Funding source 2:</b>	Select a funding source	<b>Funding amount:</b> \$0
	<b>Funding source 3:</b>	Select a funding source	<b>Funding amount:</b> \$0
	<b>Funding source 4:</b>	Select a funding source	<b>Funding amount:</b> \$0
	<b>Funding source 5:</b>	Select a funding source	<b>Funding amount:</b> \$0
			<b>Total initiative funding:</b> \$0
	<b>Review frequency:</b> Quarterly		
	<b>Assigned implementation team:</b> Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Accountability Department		
	<b>What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?</b>		
Classroom Walk-through Data, Lesson Plans, Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, Remediation/Acceleration Plans, Minutes from co-planning sessions			
<b>How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)</b>			
Quarterly Data Reports (benchmark & quarterly assessments, teacher class records of informal assessments) EOG results in reading from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011 results.		Comparing	
<b>What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?</b>			
<b>Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?</b>			

Act



**Priority Goal 3 and Associated Strategies**

**Area for improvement and supporting data:**

There is a need to establish baseline literacy data in the areas of phonological awareness, phonics, spelling, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension and a systematic approach to literacy instruction.

<b>School Goal 3:</b>	Provide K-2 teachers and support staff (ESL, EC, Literacy Coaches, & Media Specialists) with a systematic approach to teaching and assessing literacy.
<b>Supports this district goal:</b>	Improve student achievement: A) Reduce student achievement gap by 25% Reduce teacher turnover.

<b>Target:</b>	100% of K-2 and support staff will complete Phase 1 of Literacy First training and implement identified components.
<b>Indicator:</b>	Professional Development rosters, student assessment data, lesson plans, classroom walk-through data
<b>Milestone date:</b>	June 10, 2011

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

<b>Strategy 1:</b>	<b>Strategy:</b> Teachers will implement assessments and instructional strategies related to phonological awareness, phonics, spelling, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1. Teachers attend professional development sessions scheduled for the 2010-2011 school year.	5. Revise and reteach based on students' strengths and weaknesses.
	2. Complete student assessments and analyze data to diagnose student reading strengths and weaknesses.	6.
	3. Prescribe the most appropriate curriculum and learning strategies for both whole group and small group instruction.	7.
	4. Monitor to ensure student progress.	8.
<b>Strategy 2:</b>	<b>Strategy:</b> Utilize a literacy coach to extend teacher knowledge and support effective implementation of Literacy First strategies.	
	<b>Action steps:</b>	
	1. Hire and train a Literacy Coach.	4. Literacy Coach teaches through model lessons, feedback on walk-throughs, grade level meetings, and one on one instructional conversations.
	2. Literacy Coach will analyze student data, conduct classroom walk-throughs, and evaluate implementation.	5
	3. Literacy Coach will meet weekly with Principal, Assistant Principal, and grade level teams.	6

**How will we fund these strategies?**

**Funding source 1:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 2:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 3:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 4:** Select a funding source  
**Funding source 5:** Select a funding source

**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Funding amount:**  
**Total initiative funding:** \$0

**Review frequency:** Quarterly

**Assigned implementation team:** Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Literacy Coaches

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

Professional development attendance rosters, My Data First reviews, Teacher grouping reports, Classroom Walkthrough data (Teachscape and Literacy First Walkthroughs), Weekly grade level meetings (agendas, minutes, etc.), feedback from Literacy First Consultants.

**Milestone date:** June 10, 2011

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

All teachers will independently utilize Phase I strategies and the My Data First data collection system.

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

Check

Act

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

--