

Targets for 2016-17 for WCPSS Strategic Plan

Draft
6/27/2012

1: Targets for High Academic Achievement for All Students					
Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)		Target by 2016-17	
		AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass
1. The percentage of students scoring in the “low risk” (Tier 1) category on curriculum-based measures (e.g. AIMSweb and DIBELS/DIBELS NEXT within mCLASS) will increase annually. Target: Reduce Tier 2 and 3 by one third by 2016-17.	Tier 1				
	K (PSF)	56.8%	72.0%	71.2%	81.3%
	1 (NWF)	65.7%	64.0%	77.1%	76.0%
	2 (RCBM/ORF)	67.0%	61.0%	78.0%	74.0%
2. The percentage of students scoring in the “high risk” (Tier 3) category on curriculum-based measures will decrease annually. Target: Decrease Tier 3 by one third by 2016-17.	% in Tier 3				
	K (PSF)	21.0%	6.0%	14.0%	4.0%
	1 (NWF)	17.3%	7.0%	11.5%	4.7%
	2 (R-CBM/ORF)	11.0%	21.0%	7.3%	14.0%
3. The percentage of students reaching their growth targets in reading and math on the EOG will increase at all grades by 2016-17. Target: 2% higher than highest grade.	% meeting growth targets	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	4	69.4%	60.4%	73.0%	63.0%
	5	67.3%	61.0%	73.0%	63.0%
	6	56.7%	57.4%	73.0%	63.0%
	7	58.7%	59.8%	73.0%	63.0%
	8	70.8%	58.8%	73.0%	63.0%
	4_8	64.6%	59.5%	73.0%	63.0%
4. The percentage of WCPSS students scoring at Level III or IV on the EOG in math and reading at grade 5 will increase annually. Target: Reduce the percentage of students not proficient by 30% overall and 50% by ethnicity/race.	Grade 5 % Proficient	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	All	79.2%	85.9%	85.4%	90.6%
	Amer Indian	70.8%	81.3%	85.4%	90.7%
	Asian	91.0%	>95%	95.5%	>95%
	Black	61.7%	69.6%	80.9%	84.8%
	Hispanic	62.0%	79.1%	81.0%	89.6%
	Multi-Racial	82.1%	87.3%	91.1%	93.7%
	Pacific Islander	40.0%	60.0%	70.0%	80.0%
	White	91.6%	94.7%	95.8%	>95%
	ED	59.3%	72.1%	79.7%	86.1%
LEP	31.9%	60.3%	66.0%	80.2%	
SWD	52.4%	63.8%	76.2%	81.9%	
5. By subject, the percentage of students who complete Math I and English I (by the end of grade 9), and Biology (by the end of grade 10), with a grade of “C” or better will increase annually. Target: Increase of 10 percentage points by 2016-17.	Letter Grades	ABC	DF Other	ABC	DF Other
	Algebra I	77.1%	20.7%	87.1%	12.9%
	English I	70.6%	26.0%	80.6%	19.4%
	Biology I	76.2%	21.9%	86.2%	13.8%

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)		Target by 2016-17	
<p>6. The percentage of students in grade 9-11 who earn enough credits to be on track for graduation will increase annually. (based on promotion rates, which factor in number of credits and specific credits such as English to determine on track status)</p> <p>Target: Decrease those not on track by one third by 2016-17.</p>	Grade	Retention in Grade	Promoted	Retention in Grade	Promoted
	9	15.2%	84.8%	10.2%	89.9%
	10	9.6%	90.4%	6.4%	93.6%
	11	7.4%	92.6%	5.0%	95.1%
<p>7. The percentage of twelfth-grade students who have enrolled in at least one advanced course (Honors, AP, or IB) or who complete a concentration within a CTE Career Cluster will increase annually.</p>	Honors, AP, IB CTE Contrators	85.3%	$7477/8765 = 85.3\%$ CTE adds 119 extra students Total of 7596 or 86.5%	Set target this summer once 11-12 data are available. Increase of 5% to 91.5%? Increase half way from 86.5% to 100% or 93.3%?	
<p>8. The percentage of students achieving ACT targets for college readiness by subject area will increase annually.</p>	ACT	Eng. Comp. 18 Math 21 Reading 24 Science 24	Set target this summer.	determine this fall once ACT scores come in Dropped SAT because score files can't be combined	
<p>9. The percentage of students graduating from WCPSS will increase annually. Target: Reduce non-graduates by one fifth.</p>	Total 4 year	80.9%		84.7%	
	Total 5 year	81.6%		85.4%	

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)		Target by 2016-17	
2: Reduce Achievement Gaps by Challenging Students at All Levels					
Target	Grade/ Subject	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)		Target by 2016-17	
<p>1a. Reduce gaps by racial/ethnic, income, and special status subgroup in the percentage of students scoring in the “low-risk” (Tier 1) range on curriculum-based assessments (e.g., AIMSweb and DIBELS/DIBELS NEXT within mCLASS) by increasing underperforming groups’ performance at a faster rate than that of higher performing groups.</p> <p>Target: 50% reduction in students in Tier 2 or 3 by subgroup.</p> <p><i>Note: Students are generally targeted for additional support based on academic needs, not demographic characteristics. Exceptions are LEP (based on English proficiency) and SWD (based on some identified disabilities). Supports should help subgroup performance indirectly.</i></p>	K(PSF) TIER 1	AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass
	Asian	57.0%	73.0%	78.5%	86.5%
	Black	35.1%	67.0%	67.6%	83.5%
	Hispanic	43.0%	68.0%	71.5%	84.0%
	White	68.5%	75.0%	84.3%	87.5%
	ED	NA	NA	NA	NA
	LEP	29.0%	NA	64.5%	NA
	SWD	25.0%	NA	62.5%	NA
	1 (NWF) TIER 1	AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass
	Asian	74.0%	85.0%	87.0%	92.5%
	Black	57.0%	61.0%	78.5%	80.5%
	Hispanic	49.2%	58.0%	74.6%	79.0%
	White	71.8%	72.0%	85.9%	86.0%
	ED	NA	NA	NA	NA
	LEP	47.0%	71.0%	73.5%	85.5%
	SWD	45.4%	53.0%	72.7%	76.5%
	2 (R-CBM/ORF) TIER 1	AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass
	Asian	84.4%	93.0%	92.2%	96.5%
	Black	45.0%	56.0%	72.5%	78.0%
	Hispanic	43.0%	47.0%	71.5%	73.5%
	White	80.0%	73.0%	90.0%	86.5%
	ED	NA	NA	NA	NA
	LEP	36.6%	44.0%	68.3%	72.0%
	SWD	45.2%	21.0%	72.6%	60.5%
K(PSF) TIER 3	AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass	
Asian	26.0%	3.0%	13.0%	1.5%	
Black	38.8%	8.0%	19.4%	4.0%	
Hispanic	33.0%	8.0%	16.5%	4.0%	
White	11.3%	5.0%	5.7%	2.5%	
ED	NA	NA	NA	NA	
LEP	51.0%	NA	25.5%	NA	
SWD	58.0%	NA	29.0%	NA	
1 (NWF) TIER 3	AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass	
Asian	7.3%	2.0%	3.7%	1.0%	
Black	20.0%	9.0%	10.0%	4.5%	
Hispanic	34.2%	6.0%	17.1%	3.0%	
White	13.5%	5.0%	6.8%	2.5%	
ED	NA	NA	NA	NA	
LEP	36.0%	7.0%	18.0%	3.5%	
SWD	36.3%	18.0%	18.2%	9.0%	
2 (R-CBM/ORF) TIER 3	AIMSweb	mClass	AIMSweb	mClass	
Asian	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	2.5%	
Black	20.0%	26.0%	10.0%	13.0%	
Hispanic	26.0%	34.0%	13.0%	17.0%	
White	5.2%	12.0%	2.6%	6.0%	
ED	NA	NA	NA	NA	
LEP	32.1%	37.0%	16.1%	18.5%	
SWD	34.0%	63.0%	17.0%	31.5%	

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)		Target by 2016-17	
<p>2. Reduce gaps in performance on EOG and EOC based on ethnic/racial, income, and special status by increasing underperforming groups' performance composites at a faster rate than that of higher performing groups.</p> <p>Target: Decrease non-proficient percentages by 50% by 2016-17 for subgroups.</p>	Grades 3 to 5				
	% Proficient	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	Black	58.0%	70.7%	79.0%	85.4%
	Hispanic	58.1%	79.5%	79.1%	89.8%
	White	90.0%	95.0%	95.0%	97.5%
	ED	54.9%	72.5%	77.5%	86.3%
	SWD	51.7%	63.9%	75.9%	82.0%
	Grade 6 - 8				
	Black	56.5%	69.2%	78.3%	84.6%
	White	89.9%	94.2%	95.0%	97.1%
	Hispanic	60.8%	76.9%	80.4%	88.5%
	ED	54.7%	69.5%	77.4%	84.8%
	SWD	46.4%	60.6%	73.2%	80.3%
	Grade 10				
	Black	58.7%	71.6%	79.4%	85.8%
White	86.0%	>95%	93.0%	>95%	
Hispanic	58.8%	80.5%	79.4%	90.3%	
ED	52.2%	72.0%	76.1%	86.0%	
SWD	38.0%	62.2%	69.0%	81.1%	
<p>3. Increase the percentage of students in lower-performing groups who are meeting their growth targets in reading and mathematics on the EOG/EOC annually at a faster rate than that of higher performing groups.</p> <p>Target: Add 2%age points to highest subgroup growth by grade span and target that level for all subgroups.</p>	Grades 3 - 5				
	% Meeting Growth	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	Asian	67.5%	77.9%	70.0%	80.0%
	Black	55.2%	61.2%	70.0%	80.0%
	Hispanic	59.5%	66.5%	70.0%	80.0%
	White	62.6%	70.9%	70.0%	80.0%
	ED	55.8%	62.6%	70.0%	80.0%
	SWD	55.7%	58.9%	70.0%	80.0%
	LEP	57.2%	65.2%	70.0%	80.0%
	Grades 6-8				
	% Meeting Growth	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	Asian	65.0%	75.0%	67.0%	77.0%
	Black	56.3%	56.2%	67.0%	77.0%
	ED	56.6%	55.3%	67.0%	77.0%
	Hispanic	59.8%	58.0%	67.0%	77.0%
	LEP	60.0%	60.4%	67.0%	77.0%
	SWD	57.3%	56.9%	67.0%	77.0%
	White	58.8%	64.2%	67.0%	77.0%
	High School				
	% Meeting Growth	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
	Asian	73.5%	73.5%	75.5%	75.5%
Black	52.5%	54.7%	75.5%	75.5%	
Hispanic	54.9%	47.8%	75.5%	75.5%	
White	63.5%	65.5%	75.5%	75.5%	
ED	52.5%	54.7%	75.5%	75.5%	
SWD	48.3%	47.8%	75.5%	75.5%	
LEP	53.9%	55.4%	75.5%	75.5%	

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)		Target by 2016-17	
4. Decrease the dropout rate by subgroup annually, with faster progress for those subgroups who have higher dropout rates. Target: 8% reduction per year, for overall reduction of 40% by 2016-17.	Asian	1.0%		0.6%	
	Black	5.4%		3.2%	
	Hispanic	5.8%		3.5%	
	Multiracial	2.7%		1.6%	
	White	1.7%		1.0%	
	ED	5.3%		3.2%	
	SWD	6.5%		3.9%	
	LEP (NA 10-11)	NA		NA	
5. All schools will increase levels of participation by all subgroups of students in Honors, AP, IB, and CTE advanced level classes.		Honors,AP, IB			
		CTE Cluster			
	Amer. Indian	84.4%		Add CTE this summer	Set this summer based on two years of data.
	Asian	94.9%			
	Black	69.8%			
	Hispanic	80.0%			
	White	92.6%			
	ED	68.1%			
SWD	46.2%				
LEP	NA for 10-11				
6. Increase the percentage of students graduating in four or five years for each subgroup, with faster progress for those subgroups with lower graduation rates. Target: Reduce non-graduates by one fourth.	Percentage (%)	4-Year	5-Year	4-Year	5-Year
	Amer. Indian	83.3%	>95%	87.48%	>95%
	Asian	91.0%	93.3%	93.25%	95.0%
	Black	67.9%	69.8%	75.93%	77.4%
	Hispanic	65.2%	60.2%	73.90%	70.2%
	White	90.7%	91.1%	93.03%	93.3%
	ED	63.0%	65.9%	72.25%	74.4%
	SWD	55.9%	64.6%	66.93%	73.5%
	LEP	36.7%	45.6%	52.53%	59.2%
7. WCPSS will strive to eliminate the disproportionate representation of African American in special education categories. Note: NC identified discrepancies in three categories in 2010-11. Target: Reduce rate by one fourth.	Disability	Rate 2010-11		Rate 2016-17	
	Serious Emotional Disability	5.01		3.75	
	Separate Environment	4.96		3.70	
	ID Mild	5.54		4.20	

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17				
3: Recruit, Train, & Retain High Quality Employees							
	Baseline 2010-11		Target by 2016-17				
1. The number of teachers with advanced degrees and the number of teachers with National Board Certification will increase annually. Target: 25% improvement over five years	Ethnicity	NBPTS	Advanced	NBPTS 2	Advanced2		
	American Indian	4	9	5	11		
	Asian	17	27	21	34		
	Black	96	425	120	531		
	Hispanic	20	55	25	69		
	Multi-Racial	1	8	1	10		
	Pacific Islander	1	2	1	3		
	White	1,419	3,045	1774	3806		
	Totals	1,558	3,571	1948	4464		
2. The percentage of teachers with EVAAS scores that are considered average or above will increase annually. (based on % NDD or better--labeling will change this summer to average or above) Target: Reduce percentage of teachers below average by one fourth.	Grade/Subject	Reading	Math	Science	Reading2	Math2	Science2
	5	98.6%	91.4%	81.0%	99.0%	93.6%	85.8%
	6	93.4%	78.0%	NA	95.1%	83.5%	
	7	93.5%	76.8%	NA	95.1%	82.6%	
	8	94.3%	76.2%	85.3%	95.7%	82.2%	89.0%
	Algebra I		86.7%			90.0%	
	English I	96.3%			97.2%		
	Biology I			81.7%			86.3%
3. The demographic make-up of the teacher population will more closely reflect the demographic composition of the student population by 2016-17. Target: 50% improvement in number of teachers from all subgroups except White teachers by 2016-17. Note: Number of teachers will increase, so percentages will also be important to monitor.	2010-2011 Teacher Demographics			2016-2017 Targets			
	Teacher Race/Ethnicity	Total Number	Percentage of Total	Total Number	Percentage of Total2		
	American Indian	20	0.21%	30	0.32%		
	Asian	52	0.55%	78	0.83%		
	Black	1,094	11.65%	1,641	17.47%		
	Hispanic	194	2.07%	291	3.10%		
	Multi-Racial	106	1.13%	159	1.69%		
	Pacific Islander	4	0.04%	6	0.06%		
	White	7,922	84.35%	7,187	76.52%		
	Total	9,392	100	9,392	100.00%		
	Student Race/Ethnicity 2010-2011	Number	Percentage				
	American Indian	638	0.40%				
	Asian	8,644	6.00%				
	Black	35,494	24.90%				
	Hispanic	20,909	14.60%				
Multi-Racial	6,471	4.50%					
Pacific Islander	147	0.10%					
White	70,986	49.50%					
Total	143,289	100.00%					
4. Target: 95% of 2011-12 teachers will receive training related to common core.	Based on 10-11	9,392		8922 would be 95%--finalize this summer			
5. The annual teacher turnover rate will not exceed the state average with a goal of being less than 10% on annual basis.	Teacher Turnover 2010-2011	Percentage	Teacher Turnover 2016-2017	Percentage			
	State	N/A	State				
	Wake County	1024 11.39%	Wake County	TBD			

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17
6. Once a baseline is established by the state, the number of teachers evaluated at or above "Proficient" on the teacher evaluation instrument will exceed the state average.		A baseline has not been established by the state	Must set later.

- Target 1 will be measured annually through Oracle teacher data
- Target 2 will be measured annually through review of the EVAAS teacher score results
- Target 3 will be measured annually through a comparison of Oracle teacher data and NCWISE student data
- Target 4 will be measured by annual review of professional development results
- Target 5 will be measured based on comparison of annual teacher turnover from the state and school system
- Target 6 will be measured by a comparison of annual NCEs online system reports and state data
- Target 7 will be measured by eSchools plus other methods to be determined

NOTES:
 Capital Diagnostic could inform **Target No. 1.**
 calculated teacher effects over time and
 inform **Target No.5.** It calculated the rates at

4: Supportive, Innovative, and Transparent Culture of Continuous Improvement Singularly Focused on Student Achievement

Targets for Culture of Continuous Improvement	2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17
1. Every central office department will develop an annual work plan with all initiatives tied to the five focus areas		
2. Scorecards will be in place for every district office/department to ensure continuous improvement		
3. Dashboards will be in place for every district office/department to ensure continuous improvement		
4. Interim dashboards will link to year-end scorecards that display leading indicators designed to predict whether a school or the district is on-track to meet its year-end performance expectations		
5. Information Technology will develop a comprehensive Information Technology Strategic plan for the district to enable student achievement and operational efficiency through the deployment of appropriate technical solutions for students, families, our employees and the community		

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17
6. Facilities will develop a comprehensive building and renovation plan that anticipates the expected growth in student population in the district over the term of this strategic plan and responds with the appropriate facilities planning that builds schools in a cascading fashion in support of the new student assignment plan			
7. Future schools will be built taking advantage of future technology and energy saving capabilities			
8. Develop new innovative delivery models	Baseline 2011-2012 Created 2 new single-gender/early college 6-12		2012-2013 Open 3 innovative schools
9. Cultivate and manage relationships with local education leaders, state officials and external partners to build new and existing school innovation initiatives	Received approval of 2 cooperative innovative grants by SBE Requested nearly \$800,000 from state legislature for early college design Received \$50K from AJ Fletcher Foundation Engaged numerous local education leaders and		By 2014-2015, Develop network of partners for innovation mapping. Leverage partners to secure funding and resources totaling minimal \$500,000/annually
10. Ensure that innovation programs and schools are rigorously monitored for efficacy, using data that measures student academic growth, graduation rates and percentage of students' college bound.			
11. Develop standardized criteria to streamline key district processes in school transition and/or start-up	Developed initial project tracking system while opening two new academies and converting K-5 to K-8 model.		By 2014-2015 Expand Office of School Innovation

Target 1 will be measured by the submission and posting of the departmental work plans

Target 2 will be measured by the submission and posting of the departmental scorecards

Target 3 will be measured by the submission and posting of the departmental dashboards

Target 4 will be measured by the submission and posting of the departmental interim dashboards

Target 5 will be measured by the submission and posting of a comprehensive Information Technology Strategic plan

Target 6 will be measured by the submission and posting of a comprehensive building and renovation plan

Target 7 will be measured by the number of schools built with consideration to future technology and energy-saving capabilities

Target 8 will be measured by the annual increase of innovative delivery models

Target 9 will be measured by the increase in relationships established with local education leaders, state officials and external partners and the development of new and existing school innovation initiatives

Target 10 will be measured by student EVAAS data, graduation rates as reported by NCDPI, and the percentage of college bound students

Target 11 will be measured by consistent utilization of key district processes in school transition and/or start-up

5. Targets for Engaging Family and Community Members

A survey is planned to collect baseline information and other data collection methods are under discussion.

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2011-12	Target by 2016-17
------------	----------------	------------------	-------------------

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17
1. Increase in percentage of community members who are more informed, engaged and trusting, as evidenced by survey results.			
2. Increase in number of website hits, return visitors, time on-site, and pages viewed.			
3. Increase in number of success stories.			
4. Increase in stakeholder belief that they are being listened to and the district is using feedback constructively, as evidenced by survey results.			
5. Increase in number of staff serving as members of key community groups and organizations.			
Family Involvement			
1. Twenty percent increase in the number of contacts between families/parents and teachers, and the parent satisfaction level with parent/teacher interaction will be at least 80% as evidenced in a parent survey.			
2. The majority of parents (overall and within subgroups) will be involved in at least one student-led individual conference as evidenced in a parent survey.			
3. The majority of parents will have attended at least two school-based events as evidenced in a parent survey and reports from schools.			
4. Increase the use of SPAN and Blackboard and report on effectiveness.			
5. Schools (district offering by area/region?) will offer 2-3 workshops/year designed to build capacity of parents to support their child's learning, with topics selected based on parental interest as evidenced in meeting agendas. Attendance/participation will have increased at least 10% each year as evidenced in attendance rosters.			

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17
6. Title I Pre-K teachers will offer at least six family workshops per year and attendance will increase by at least 5% each year as documented by attendance rosters.			
7. Target 1-4 will be measured through an annual parent/community survey			
8. Target 5 will be measured by annual review and tracking of workshops held and participation rates			

Focus Area	Grade or Group	Baseline 2010-11 (unless marked)	Target by 2016-17
Community Partnerships			
1. Assess community partners (cover all sectors, e.g., businesses, nonprofits, donors, etc.) to measure how much they understand the district's priorities and the unique needs of schools and students.			
2. Increase level of involvement of partners in district committees, task force activities, which improve community understanding of district needs, goals and priorities.			
3. Increase in number of partners seeking out the district to be involved (including individuals and organizations).			
4. Increase in number of volunteers and volunteer hours for each school; set goals for each school.			
5. Increase in the total number of partners.			
6. Increase in the total number of donors overall and by school (organizations and individuals)			
7. Total amount of financial contributions overall and by school.			
8. Number of school and district partnerships serving our diverse populations.			