

District Name:	School Name:	School Code:	Year:
Wilson County Schools	Margaret Hearne Elementary School	356	2015-16
Principal Name (or Designee)	Jenny Hayes	Principal Name (or Designee) Email	jenny.hayes@wilsonschooolsnc.net
School Mission	Our mission is to improve academic achievement for all students and to ensure that all students graduate from high school prepared for college careers and life.		
School Vision	Margaret Hearne Elementary School will prepare each of our learners to climb to the highest peak of success in a safe, nurturing, and challenging learning environment. Hearne learners will become productive, responsible, and globally competitive citizens by actively exposed to a curriculum that is delivered with up-to-date technology and innovative collaboration. Working with all advocates: faculty, parents, community, and learners; we will ensure that each learner is prepared for the 21st century.		
Data Analysis: Give a brief description of the data sources your team analyzed and the root causes uncovered during the analysis. What was learned from the data review? How did these data inform decisions for school improvement initiatives? (to include TWC, EOG/EOC results, attendance, graduation rates, among other sources of data)			

School Profile: Just 30 minutes from Raleigh, the state capital, Hearne Elementary is in a growing community with a population of almost 50,000 people at the crossroads of I-95 and US 264. We are less than an hour from Research Triangle Park and less than two hours from North Carolina's beautiful beaches. Our location affords our students many cultural and educational opportunities such as our local arts council, Barton College, and the North Carolina baseball museum. Students from Hearne go on to Toisnot or Darden Middle Schools and then to Beddingfield or Fike High Schools. Hearne has partnered with Barton College for the past 6 years and received a Golden Leaf grant to fund the partnership. The grant ended in June 2015; however, the partnership continues. The partnership includes providing placement opportunities for student teachers, practicum placements, as well as Barton teacher candidates providing classroom instruction for a science initiative called "Science on the Go" in which Hearne 5th grade students go to Barton College for science classroom instruction. In addition, Barton hosts a Math Carnival and Family Reading Night at Hearne for parents and students.

Hearne is a neighborhood school located near downtown Wilson. The school serves about 470 students in grades K through 5th. It is the oldest school in operation in the city of Wilson. Originally called Maplewood School because of its location on Maplewood Avenue, Hearne is now in the third building bearing our name. The demographic population includes 66.5% African-American, 25% Hispanic, 4% Caucasian, and 3.5% other races or ethnicities. Hearne is the largest Title I school in Wilson County Schools. Student attendance is 96% which is equal to the state and district averages. Currently there are 32 teachers, 11 teacher assistants, 2 custodians, 2 student support personnel, and 2 administrators. All teachers are Highly Qualified except 1. As part of the partnership with Barton College, Hearne teachers were given an opportunity to earn scholarships to obtain Master's degrees. Currently 23% of our teachers have advanced degrees which is the same as the district average and below the state average. Hearne has no National Board Certified Teachers at this time. Our teacher turnover rate is 17%, which is slightly higher than the district and state average.

Hearne was deemed low-performing in 2011 and was part of the Race to the Top grant. As part of the grant, the district chose to implement a 1:1 iPad initiative. The teachers received training from Apple and they have embraced the use of technology in the school. However, a plan to sustain the technology has not been put in place and the iPads are becoming obsolete as new updates take place.

In the 2013-14 school year, Hearne started a Spanish Immersion program in Kindergarten in which students were taught in Spanish 90% of the day. All testing was done in Spanish as well. The following year, a 1st grade Spanish Immersion program was added and students were taught in Spanish every other day. By mid-year, there was concern that students in the 1st grade Spanish Immersion classes were not making adequate progress. Intensive reading interventions were then introduced in English every day. Recruiting students to sustain the program was difficult and the district decided to move the program to a school in which there was more interest. The 1st grade data includes students in Spanish Immersion.

Hearne is currently in the 3rd year of PBIS implementation. According to the NC School Report Card, our short-term suspension rate is 14.96 per 100 students which is much higher than the district average but only slightly above the state average. Through data analysis, we have determined that while all new teachers tend to struggle with classroom management, new teachers at Hearne have a tremendous struggle even after PBIS training and follow-ups. The PBIS team re-evaluates the discipline processes each year and teachers who struggle with classroom management are given additional training. The district has implemented a new discipline reporting system and it requires teachers to document interventions before submitting an electronic referral. We are already experiencing a decline in discipline referrals this year. The School Improvement Team meets throughout the year and analyzes current data and trends from past data. The data is used to make school improvement plan goals and strategies. Additionally, discipline data is shared at monthly faculty meetings. We discuss where the referrals are occurring as well the offense. The PBIS team then offers suggestions and gives teachers an opportunity to ask questions about their discipline data. Teachers also meet in Professional Learning Communities on a weekly basis to analyze data. In addition to regular PLC meetings to discuss data, each grade level meets several times each year in Extended PLCs to discuss district benchmark data. They complete a data analysis worksheet for the grade level in which they list students who are proficient as well as those who are at-risk based on standards mastery. They discuss strategies for interventions and enrichment and plan ways to address deficiencies. Teachers also maintain data walls in their classrooms that are updated based on pre-and post-tests. This creates awareness by students of their data. State EOG data as well as Reading 3D and K-2 math assessment data are used to set goals for improving student achievement. In addition, student discipline and attendance data are analyzed in order to address those issues which may negatively impact student achievement. The data that is used to drive decisions within the school improvement plan are included within this plan. After careful analysis of the data, certain trends surfaced. The school only has 4 subgroups: All, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged. There is a significant achievement gap between our Hispanic students and all other subgroups. We have also noted significant decreases in grades K-2 reading and math proficiency. Our team has concluded that parent involvement is the significant difference in our Hispanic subgroup and the other subgroups. The Hispanic families are more involved during parent engagement nights and parent conferences. To address the concern, the team is planning some parent nights in the neighborhood apartment complexes and housing projects which is home to many of our students. Some factors contributing to the K-2 decline is the change in Reading testing teacher initiated running records to Reading 3D testing. The Reading 3D testing has a writing component which was not previously considered when testing students in reading. For math, the assessments are scored based on students understanding the skills and having the ability to explain their answers. We have implemented SchoolNet testing for math in grades K-2 to help students be better acquainted with EOG-type questions. Our goals within this plan were created to address the deficits. We have developed a working continuous improvement plan (an abridged working version of the plan in which staff members can refer easily) in which all teachers are assigned specific goals, priorities or strategies. These are continuously progress monitored and updated as we go through each of the action steps.

District Name:	School Name:	School Code:	Year:
Wilson County Schools	Margaret Hearne Elementary School	356	2015-16
GOAL #1: (SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound)	<i>By June 2016, increase grades 3-5 Reading proficiency on End-of-Grade tests from 32% proficient to 40% proficient.</i>		
	SBE Goal Alignment:	<i>Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.</i>	
	LEA Goal Alignment:	Every Wilson County Schools student receives a personalized education in order to graduate from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.	
	Indistar Indicator: (if applicable)		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	In Progress	
GOAL #2: (SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound)	<i>By June 2016, increase grades 3-5 Math proficiency on End-of-Grade tests from 41% proficient to 48% proficient.</i>		
	SBE Goal Alignment:	<i>Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.</i>	
	LEA Goal Alignment:	Every Wilson County Schools student receives a personalized education in order to graduate from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.	
	Indistar Indicator: (if applicable)		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	In Progress	
GOAL #3: (SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound)	<i>By June 2016, increase 5th grade proficiency on science End-of-Grade tests from 26.5% proficient to 32% proficient.</i>		
	SBE Goal Alignment:	<i>Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.</i>	
	LEA Goal Alignment:	Every Wilson County Schools student receives a personalized education in order to graduate from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.	
	Indistar Indicator: (if applicable)		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	In Progress	

District Name:	School Name:	School Code:	Year:
Wilson County Schools	Margaret Hearne Elementary School	356	2015-16
GOAL #1:	<i>By June 2016, increase grades 3-5 reading proficiency on End-of-Grade tests from 32% proficient to 40% proficient.</i>		
Strategy #1: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Integrate Thinking Maps in instruction to increase students' reading comprehension.</i>		
Progress:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<i>-Certified staff will be trained on Thinking Maps according to their instructional needs. -Students will be introduced to Thinking Maps and will receive support to develop the skills needed to implement them. -Teachers will plan collaboratively during PLC's to effectively implement Thinking Maps into instruction while completing online modules "Thinking Like a Mathematician" and "Guiding Questions." -Students will think critically to demonstrate comprehension of the text read by creating the corresponding thinking map. -Teachers will focus on writing by instructing students to take information off the thinking maps and create a final written product. Teachers will complete the corresponding module. -Teachers will continue to guide students to think critically through the use of Thinking Maps across the curriculum while using guiding questions as demonstrated through the corresponding module. -Teachers will complete the module "Focus on Academic Vocabulary" while implementing the strategy in their classroom. -Teachers will complete the module which focuses on the Frame of Reference in Thinking Maps and implement strategies within the classroom to promote critical thinking. -Administration will monitor lesson plans, TMLC reports, and PLC minutes. -Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Training sign-in sheets; module completion certificates; student samples uploaded in TMLC; PLC Notes	
	Person(s) Responsible:	Monika Sharma & Classroom Teachers	
	Timeline:	October 2014-June 2016	
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)
Strategy #2: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Balanced literacy instruction will be implemented daily in grades K-5 classrooms to promote independent reading and problem-solving</i>		
Progress:	Has Begun		

Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<i>-Train all teaching staff in balanced literacy.</i> <i>-Implement balanced literacy during literacy block using the appropriate lesson plan format.</i> <i>-Implement flexible grouping based on students needs within specific content and skill areas based on pre-tests and formative assessments.</i> <i>-Monitor growth through ongoing progress monitoring and benchmark assessments.</i> <i>-Monitor implementation via walk-throughs, observations and lesson plans.</i> <i>-Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Lesson plans, Reading 3D progress monitoring, SchoolNet data	
	Person(s) Responsible:	Monika Sharma and Laura Nelson; all reading teachers	
	Timeline:	May 2015-June 2016	
Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)	
Strategy #3: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Provide Foundations of Reading Training for specific teachers.</i>		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<i>-Identify teachers who would benefit from the training.</i> <i>-Teachers attend training and use strategies in their classroom.</i> <i>-Monitor growth through ongoing progress monitoring and benchmark assessments.</i> <i>-Monitor implementation via walk-throughs, observations and lesson plans.</i> <i>-Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	CEU/Completion certificate; observations/walk-through documents;	
	Person(s) Responsible:	Kimberly Fischer	
	Timeline:	September 2015-May 2016	
Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)	

District Name:	School Name:	School Code:	Year:
Wilson County Schools	Margaret Hearne Elementary School	356	2015-16
GOAL #2:	<i>By June 2016, increase grades 3-5 math proficiency on End-of-Grade tests from 41% proficient to 48% proficient.</i>		
Strategy #1: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Small group math instruction will be implemented daily in grades K-5 classrooms to address the needs of all students through differentiation.</i>		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<i>-Train all teaching staff in small group math instruction. -Implement small group math instruction. -Implement flexible grouping based on students needs within specific content and skill areas based on pre-tests and formative assessments. -Monitor growth through ongoing progress monitoring and benchmark assessments. -Monitor implementation via walk-throughs, observations, and lesson plans. -Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Lesson plans; eleot walk-throughs/observations; SchoolNet data; various Math online program data, i.e. Moby Max, Accelerated Math, Front Door, Xtra Math	
	Person(s) Responsible:	Paige Davis and Karen Mathison; All math teachers	
	Timeline:	May 2015-June 2016	
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)
Strategy #2: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Implement Math Tasks from NC Math Wiki to drive instruction based on formative assessments in order to meet the mathematical thinking needs of all students in all grade levels.</i>		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<i>-Download grade level math tasks from http://maccss.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/Elementary. -Implement math tasks through small group, whole group and individualized instruction. -Monitor growth through ongoing progress monitoring and benchmark assessments and PLC Minutes. -Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Lesson plans; eleot walk-throughs/observations; SchoolNet data; various Math online program data, i.e. Moby Max, Accelerated Math, Front Door, Xtra Math	

	Person(s) Responsible:	Paige Davis and Karen Mathison		
	Timeline:	May 2015-June 2016		
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)	
Strategy #3: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Integrate Thinking Maps in instruction to increase students' reading comprehension across the curriculum and writing proficiency.</i>			
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun		
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<p><i>-Certified staff will be trained on Thinking Maps according to their instructional needs.</i></p> <p><i>-Students will be introduced to Thinking Maps and will receive support to develop the skills needed to implement them.</i></p> <p><i>-Teachers will plan collaboratively during PLC's to effectively implement Thinking Maps into instruction while completing online modules "Thinking Like a Mathematician" and "Guiding Questions."</i></p> <p><i>-Students will think critically to demonstrate comprehension of the text read by creating the corresponding thinking map.</i></p> <p><i>-Teachers will focus on writing by instructing students to take information off the thinking maps and create a final written product. Teachers will complete the corresponding module.</i></p> <p><i>-Teachers will continue to guide students to think critically through the use of Thinking Maps across the curriculum while using guiding questions as demonstrated through the corresponding module.</i></p> <p><i>-Teachers will complete the module "Focus on Academic Vocabulary" while implementing the strategy in their classroom. Teachers will complete the module which focuses on the Frame of Reference in Thinking Maps and implement strategies within the classroom to promote critical thinking.</i></p> <p><i>-Administration will monitor lesson plans, TMLC reports, and PLC minutes.</i></p> <p><i>-Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i></p>			
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Training sign-in sheets; module completion certificates; student samples uploaded in TMLC; PLC Notes		
	Person(s) Responsible:	Monika Sharma; all classroom teachers		
	Timeline:	October 2014-June 2016		
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)	

District Name:	School Name:	School Code:	Year:
Wilson County Schools	Margaret Hearne Elementary School	356	2015-16
GOAL #3:	<i>By June 2016, increase 5th grade proficiency on science End-of-Grade tests from 26.5% proficient to 32% proficient.</i>		
Strategy #1: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Strengthen implementation of science content across the curriculum</i>		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	
Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.	<i>-Form a Science Committee to identify essential standards that are common to various grade levels. -Science Committee will create a curriculum guide based on the district guide for grade levels to collaborate when teaching the various science standards. -Integrate Science reading materials within Literacy centers. -Monitor student achievement via common assessments in SchoolNet. -Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	SchoolNet data; eleot walk-throughs/observations; district benchmark assessments	
	Person(s) Responsible:	Joseph Ricks and all classroom teachers	
	Timeline:	August 2015-June 2016	
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)
Strategy #2: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	<i>Integrate Thinking Maps in instruction to increase students' reading comprehension across the curriculum and writing proficiency.</i>		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:	Has Begun	

<p>Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.</p>	<p><i>-Certified staff will be trained on Thinking Maps according to their instructional needs.</i> <i>-Students will be introduced to Thinking Maps and will receive support to develop the skills needed to implement them.</i> <i>-Teachers will plan collaboratively during PLC's to effectively implement Thinking Maps into instruction while completing online modules "Thinking Like a Mathematician" and "Guiding Questions."</i> <i>-Students will think critically to demonstrate comprehension of the text read by creating the corresponding thinking map.</i> <i>-Teachers will focus on writing by instructing students to take information off the thinking maps and create a final written product. Teachers will complete the corresponding module.</i> <i>-Teachers will continue to guide students to think critically through the use of Thinking Maps across the curriculum while using guiding questions as demonstrated through the corresponding module.</i> <i>-Teachers will complete the module "Focus on Academic Vocabulary" while implementing the strategy in their classroom.</i> <i>-Teachers will complete the module which focuses on the Frame of Reference in Thinking Maps and implement strategies within the classroom to promote critical thinking.</i> <i>-Administration will monitor lesson plans, TMLC reports, and PLC minutes.</i> <i>-Periodic review dates are listed in the working continuous improvement plan.</i></p>		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)	Training sign-in sheets; module completion certificates; student samples uploaded in TMLC; PLC Notes	
	Person(s) Responsible:	Monika Sharma; all classroom teachers	
	Timeline:	October 2014-June 2016	
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)
Strategy #3: Describe the strategy that will support this goal	[Enter Goal Goal #3 Strategy #3]		
Progress:	Progress Monitoring Status:		
<p>Tasks/Action Steps: Describe the action steps that will be taken to support this strategy.</p>	[Enter Tasks/Action Steps for Goal #3 Strategy #3]		
	Evidence: (Identify documents and artifacts)		
	Person(s) Responsible:		
	Timeline:		
	Budge Amount: (if applicable)		Budget Source: (if applicable)

Discipline Data

		2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
M.Hearne	Referalls	314	281	120	152
	Suspensions	100	128	81	145

Student Attendance

2010-2011	95.60%
2011-2012	96.50%
2012-2013	96%
2013-2014	96%
2014-2015	95.90%

3rd Grade Math

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	54.1%	46.7%	69.2%	54.2%
2009-2010	64.7%	54.5%	81.8%	64.4%
2010-2011	74.2%	69.8%	82.8%	73.3%
2011-2012	85.5%	82.1%	95.0%	86.1%
2012-2013	10.3%	7.0%	18.5%	10.7%
2013-2014	47.6%	30.0%	61.8%	48.7%
2014-2015	52.9%	46.9%	70.6%	52.5%

3rd Grade Reading

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	36.1%	28.9%	53.8%	35.6%
2009-2010	36.3%	28.8%	51.5%	36.6%
2010-2011	47.2%	43.4%	51.7%	45.3%
2011-2012	61.4%	62.5%	54.5%	62.0%
2012-2013	18.4%	19.3%	18.5%	17.9%
2013-2014	42.3%	31.3%	50.0%	44.7%
2014-2015	36.8%	32.8%	52.9%	32.8%

4th Grade Math

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	65.2%	58.3%	80.0%	66.1%
2009-2010	68.6%	60.0%	84.6%	67.3%
2010-2011	76.8%	73.9%	88.0%	78.5%
2011-2012	60.4%	59.3%	64.5%	60.7%
2012-2013	16.9%	13.0%	22.7%	17.1%
2013-2014	16.9%	10.3%	31.8%	16.3%
2014-2015	49.4%	36.7%	61.3%	45.8%

4th Grade Reading

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	48.5%	45.8%	53.3%	50.0%
2009-2010	47.1%	48.6%	46.2%	44.9%
2010-2011	51.2%	39.1%	68.0%	51.9%
2011-2012	45.1%	37.0%	54.8%	44.9%
2012-2013	11.3%	10.9%	9.1%	11.4%
2013-2014	28.9%	27.6%	36.4%	26.3%
2014-2015	41.4%	28.6%	51.6%	37.5%

5th Grade Math

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	71.7%	67.4%	83.3%	71.4%
2009-2010	53.8%	46.4%	70.6%	52.7%
2010-2011	76.9%	69.4%	92.9%	77.1%
2011-2012	60.5%	54.3%	83.3%	60.3%
2012-2013	11.5%	5.0%	27.6%	12.2%
2013-2014	18.8%	12.2%	30.4%	20.0%
2014-2015	21.7%	12.9%	50.0%	22.4%

5th Grade Reading

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	61.7%	63.0%	58.3%	60.7%
2009-2010	51.3%	50.0%	47.1%	48.6%
2010-2011	67.3%	61.1%	78.6%	66.7%
2011-2012	50.0%	41.3%	72.2%	50.7%
2012-2013	12.6%	7.7%	13.8%	11.0%
2013-2014	20.3%	24.4%	13.0%	21.5%
2014-2015	18.1%	14.5%	25.0%	16.4%

5th Grade Science

	ALL STUDENTS	BLACK STUDENTS	HISPANIC STUDENTS	ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
2008-2009	36.70%	32.6%	41.7%	33.9%
2009-2010	33.8%	28.6%	47.1%	31.1%
2010-2011	71.2%	66.7%	78.6%	70.8%
2011-2012	48.7%	37.0%	77.8%	50.7%
2012-2013	14.9%	11.5%	17.2%	14.6%
2013-2014	26.1%	24.4%	30.4%	27.7%
2014-2015	26.5%	21.0%	37.5%	26.9%

Kindergarten	Reading	Math
2010-2011	82%	93.00%
2011-2012	81%	95.00%
2012-2013	73%	**
2013-2014	72%	91.00%
2014-2015	42%	91.00%

**Math rubrics for 2012-13 were incorrect

1st Grade	Reading	Math
2010-2011	76%	90%
2011-2012	77%	81%
2012-2013	77%	**
2013-2014	66%	72.50%
2014-2015	29.% *	69%

*This included 38 students who were in Spanish Immersion.

**Math rubrics for 2012-13 were incorrect

2nd Grade	Reading	Math
2010-2011	90%	86%
2011-2012	85%	82%
2012-2013	91%	**
2013-2014	55%	67%
2014-2015	32%	34%

**Math rubrics for 2012-13 were incorrect

Hearne	All (1.5)		E.D.		Not E.D.		Black		Hispanic		White	
	257	Off the WCS Mark	200	Off the WCS Mark	97	Off the WCS Mark	175	Off the WCS Mark	68.1%	24.9%	2.7%	Off the WCS Mark

BOTH Reading and Math Proficiency												
	3rd - 5th Reading and Math						3rd - 5th Reading and Math					
2011	48.4	(21.7)	47.4	(14.0)	70.0	(16.9)	40.0	(16.4)	61.8	(8.2)	66.7	(19.6)
2012	46.8	(43.3)	46.9	(12.5)	44.4	(44.3)	47.4	(11.1)	59.2	(14.3)	38.5	(45.8)
2013	5.0	(16.7)	5.1	(6.0)	5.0	(26.6)	5.0	(6.0)	6.4	(15.4)	5.0	(26.5)
2014	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	
2015	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	

Reading Proficiency												
	3rd - 5th Reading = 257						3rd - 5th Reading					
2011	53.4	(20.2)	52.6	(13.6)	70.0	(18.0)	46.7	(15.2)	63.2	(9.2)	66.7	(21.1)
2012	52.0	(19.8)	52.8	(11.8)	44.4	(44.3)	47.4	(11.1)	59.2	(13.1)	53.8	(32.4)
2013	14.3	(23.3)	13.6	(12.8)	33.3	(28.7)	12.9	(9.4)	14.1	(19.8)	20.0	(18.4)
2014	14.5	(23.8)	14.5	(13.1)	15.4	(46.4)	10.1	(11.2)	17.7	(17.3)	28.6	(30.1)
2015	17.9	(18.5)	15.5	(8.7)	0.0		13.1	(17.6)	28.1	(15.9)	38.6	(29.9)

3rd Reading = 87												
	3rd Reading = 87						3rd Reading					
2011	47.2	(18.6)	45.3	(13.3)	-	-	43.4	(11.8)	51.7	(12.9)	40.0	(40.0)
2012	61.4	(16.8)	62.0	3.7	-	-	62.5	7.5	54.5	(9.6)	-	-
2013	28.4	(17.8)	17.8	(12.8)	-	-	28.3	6.0	18.5	(17.8)	-	-
2014	20.7	(24.8)	21.1	(6.4)	16.7	(48.7)	0.0	(26.7)	26.5	(6.2)	5.0	(37.3)
2015	17.2	(20.2)	11.5	(9.6)	0.0		14.1	(6.2)	35.3	1.4	5.0	(54.9)

4th Reading = 87												
	4th Reading = 87						4th Reading					
2011	51.2	(28.0)	51.9	(22.0)	-	-	39.1	(29.6)	68.0	(11.2)	83.3	(8.7)
2012	45.4	(24.8)	44.9	(18.8)	-	-	37.0	(24.4)	58.8	(14.8)	37.0	(27.8)
2013	11.3	(18.3)	11.4	(18.3)	-	-	10.9	(18.6)	9.1	(20.6)	-	-
2014	11.3	(27.1)	13.5	(10.8)	-	-	13.8	(11.1)	13.6	(16.1)	5.0	(24.6)
2015	26.3	(14.5)	23.6	(4.8)	0.0		16.9	(6.0)	29.0	(6.5)	5.0	(55.4)

5th Reading = 83												
	5th Reading = 83						5th Reading					
2011	67.3	(11.3)	66.7	(4.3)	-	-	61.1	(6.7)	78.6	3.8	-	-
2012	50.0	(21.4)	50.7	(17.7)	-	-	41.3	(7.7)	72.7	(15.9)	62.5	(47.7)
2013	12.6	(18.8)	11.9	(16.6)	40.0	(17.4)	7.7	(1.0)	12.8	(11.1)	-	-
2014	8.7	(18.9)	9.2	(12.5)	0.0		7.3	(14.3)	8.7	(18.3)	5.0	(47.3)
2015	10.8	(21.5)	10.4	(11.4)	0.0		9.7	(6.4)	18.8	(10.8)	5.0	(48.3)

Math Proficiency												
	3rd - 5th Math = 257						3rd - 5th Math					
2011	75.8	(10.4)	76.1	(6.2)	70.0	(25.0)	71.1	(7.6)	86.8	0.8	75.0	(20.0)
2012	68.8	(16.3)	68.9	(14.4)	66.7	(28.3)	66.0	(11.9)	78.9	(6.0)	46.2	(47.1)
2013	12.7	(19.0)	13.1	(8.9)	5.0	(47.8)	7.1	(9.2)	23.1	(18.8)	20.0	(29.3)
2014	17.1	(15.4)	17.6	(4.7)	7.7	(47.2)	9.4	(6.9)	26.6	(14.4)	28.6	(22.7)
2015	21.5	(6.8)	28.5	7.5	0.0		21.7	4.8	31.6	(7.8)	42.8	(9.1)

3rd Math = 87												
	3rd Math = 87						3rd Math					
2011	74.2	(6.8)	73.3	(4.4)	-	-	69.8	(1.8)	82.8	(0.1)	60.0	(32.8)
2012	85.5	4.1	86.1	9.4	-	-	82.1	8.8	95.0	10.0	-	-
2013	28.9	(21.8)	28.9	(20.1)	-	-	28.9	(18.8)	18.5	(20.6)	-	-
2014	25.6	(11.1)	28.3	0.1	16.7	(48.5)	0.0	(15.0)	29.4	(13.9)	5.0	(31.4)
2015	35.6	(1.4)	32.8	5.3	0.0		28.1	3.3	58.8	20.2	5.0	(13.2)

4th Math = 87												
	4th Math = 87						4th Math					
2011	76.8	(12.4)	78.5	(7.1)	-	-	73.9	(9.0)	88.0	(1.1)	83.3	(11.7)
2012	60.4	(26.1)	60.7	(22.8)	-	-	59.3	(21.8)	85.5	(24.4)	50.0	(15.9)
2013	16.9	(18.6)	17.1	(8.9)	-	-	13.0	(6.8)	22.7	(13.3)	-	-
2014	10.8	(21.1)	11.3	(7.1)	-	-	8.9	(10.9)	22.7	(20.0)	5.0	(23.6)
2015	37.9	3.9	31.9	7.1	0.0		26.5	10.2	48.4	11.0	5.0	(45.4)

5th Math = 83												
	5th Math = 83						5th Math					
2011	76.9	(10.5)	77.1	(6.8)	-	-	69.4	(10.2)	82.9	4.1	-	-
2012	60.5	(24.4)	60.3	(20.0)	-	-	54.3	(21.2)	83.3	(7.4)	62.5	(31.7)
2013	11.5	(20.7)	12.1	(17.8)	5.0	(61.3)	5.0	(14.8)	17.6	(13.1)	-	-
2014	14.5	(16.8)	15.4	(16.1)	0.0		7.3	(16.8)	26.1	(14.8)	5.0	(43.6)
2015	20.5	(21.5)	20.9	(11.5)	0.0		11.3	(17.9)	50.0	(6.8)	5.0	(48.3)

Science Proficiency												
	5th Science = 83						5th Science					
2011	71.2	(10.3)	70.8	(4.9)	-	-	66.7	(6.9)	78.6	(2.3)	-	-
2012	48.7	(21.4)	49.7	(19.2)	-	-	37.0	(22.7)	77.8	(5.1)	42.5	(30.6)
2013	14.9	(20.5)	14.6	(11.4)	20.0	(37.7)	11.5	(9.1)	17.2	(15.9)	-	-
2014	17.4	(26.7)	18.5	(19.0)	-	-	14.6	(14.4)	21.7	(19.6)	5.0	(60.0)
2015	15.7	(26.7)	15.4	(19.4)	0.0		12.9	(21.6)	25.0	(27.7)	5.0	(66.1)

NC	NC E.D.	NC-Not E.D.	NC-Black	NC-Hisp.	NC-White
----	---------	-------------	----------	----------	----------

3rd - 5th Reading and Math					
47.6	53.1	62.8	48.5	54.4	70.0
67.5	54.2	61.1	61.4	55.1	73.3
32.8	17.4	49.8	46.3	39.1	43.5

3rd - 5th Reading					
79.7	58.1	69.2	54.3	57.7	61.9
71.2	59.1	69.4	59.3	56.5	62.1
43.9	28.7	62.5	25.4	28.8	36.4
44.7	29.1	61.7	29.3	29.2	37.8
46.1	29.7	59.3	26.7	28.9	36.4

3rd Reading					
67.6	54.9	63.9	51.4	51.7	70.8
68.8	56.2	61.7	52.8	51.3	60.5
45.2	30.0	63.7	27.1	27.3	28.1
47.7	29.7	62.4	26.4	31.2	31.1
46.5	31.8	61.0	29.2	30.1	40.3

4th Reading					
71.6	59.7	69.5	55.4	58.3	61.0
71.6	59.9	67.4	59.0	56.1	62.9
43.7	29.3	63.1	27.7	28.9	36.7
44.1	29.0	64.3	29.4	27.6	37.2
47.1	31.2	61.0	28.0	28.8	40.7

5th Reading					
73.3	60.1	66.4	67.0	60.1	62.9
72.1	60.9	67.2	69.0	60.2	62.7
29.5	24.4	68.5	24.0	23.6	23.6
29.5	23.0	69.5	23.2	24.1	23.1
42.2	28.2	67.0	23.4	24.4	36.2

3rd - 5th Math					
82.4	74.2	81.8	69.0	78.5	89.8
82.8	73.0	82.5	70.0	78.1	89.7
42.3	27.7	60.1	22.2	22.7	33.8
43.1	28.2	61.3	22.9	23.5	34.8
44.1	29.1	60.4	24.3	24.6	36.1

3rd Math					
82.1	74.3	81.1	67.8	77.6	89.8
82.8	73.0	81.2	69.0	78.9	89.2
48.9	31.4	61.3	24.0	23.6	31.6
48.1	31.6	62.1	23.1	23.1	40.4
48.8	34.8	61.0	29.7	28.1	41.4

4th Math					
83.8	74.4	82.8	71.2	81.0	90.7
85.1	78.4	84.1	74.4	81.4	91.5
47.6	31.8	64.5	26.7	26.4	40.1
47.1	31.9	65.1	25.5	25.3	39.8
48.5	33.4	62.1	27.1	26.1	42.5

5th Math					
82.0	73.8	81.7	68.1	78.2	89.4
82.1	74.4	82.2	75.1	80.3	89.3
47.9	31.4	61.9	23.0	23.9	31.6
47.9	31.8	62.6	23.6	23.1	31.2
51.3	38.0	61.0	24.1	24.9	43.4

5th Science					
79.4	61.8	67.1	54.8	62.2	65.1
75.9	62.5	69.4	58.0	60.0	66.2
45.4	31.0	63.7	26.0	26.6	34.4
42.8	37.8	71.1	31.3	28.0	40.0
54.1	38.9	64.0	24.5	25.9	44.3

Black (vs. White)	E.D. (vs. Not E.D.)
-------------------	---------------------

3rd - 5th Reading and Math	
(26.1)	(22.0)
4.4	2.5
0.0	0.0
0.0	0.0

3rd - 5th Reading	
(20.8)	(17.4)
(6.4)	7.9
(7.1)	(13.7)
(18.0)	(10.9)
(11.0)	16.1

||
||
||