Lamar Consolidated Independent School District Arredondo Elementary

2023-2024 Campus Improvement Plan



Mission Statement

At Arredondo Elementary School, we instill a passion for learning while equipping our students with the tools for success, encouraging them to take risks, and celebrating our diverse community of learners.

Vision

At Arredondo Elementary School, we provide a rigorous and stimulating environment that engages students while preparing them to be global innovators, well-rounded citizens, diverse thinkers, confident scholars, and self-initiating life-long learners.

Motto

I CAN & I WILL

Table of Contents

| Comprehensive Needs Assessment | 4 |
|---|----|
| Needs Assessment Overview | 4 |
| Demographics | 5 |
| Student Learning | 10 |
| School Processes & Programs | 14 |
| Perceptions | 16 |
| Priority Problem Statements | 18 |
| Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation | 19 |
| Goals | 21 |
| Goal 1: By June 2024, all students will show academic achievement gains of 5% or more in literacy and mathematics on End of Year State and District Reading, Math, and Science assessments. | 21 |
| Goal 2: By June 2024, students in all sub-pops will perform within 10% of all students on end of year State and District academic achievement assessments and will meet all Target Measures for the Closing the Gap Domain on STAAR in math and student Success Status. | 30 |
| Goal 3: By the end of the 2023-2024, the percentage of students who feel safe, supportive, and not stressed out will improve by at least 7% as measured by the end of year | |
| social emotional survey. | 36 |
| State Compensatory | 40 |
| Budget for Arredondo Elementary | 40 |
| Personnel for Arredondo Elementary | 40 |
| Title I | 41 |
| 1.1: Comprehensive Needs Assessment | 41 |
| 2.1: Campus Improvement Plan developed with appropriate stakeholders | 41 |
| 2.2: Regular monitoring and revision | 41 |
| 2.3: Available to parents and community in an understandable format and language | 41 |
| 3.1: Annually evaluate the schoolwide plan | 41 |
| Title I Personnel | 42 |
| Site-Based Decision Making Committee | 43 |
| Campus Funding Summary | 44 |

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Revised/Approved: June 6, 2024

Needs Assessment Overview

Needs Assessment Overview Summary

During our first meeting which was held on May 15, 2023, the Site Based Team discussed the purpose for the meeting including the process for identifying our campus needs and the methods for analyzing data. We identified several pieces of data that would assist the team including the Federal Report Card for 2021-2022, Campus Climate Survey, NWEA Map data, EOY GRA Levels, 22-23 STAAR Scores, Kindergarten TX-KEA and Pre-Kindergarten CIRCLE Assessment. At the conclusion of the meeting, we assigned individuals to collect the data to be reported to the team at the next meeting.

During the second meeting which was held on June 6, 2023, the Site Based Team evaluated 16 pieces of data and identified strengths and problems in each area. Each team member was given the opportunity to present their data. The Site Based Team worked together to identify strengths and problems of the campus. After identifying the strengths and problems, the team decided on four areas of focus for the school year. Documentation of the process includes meeting minutes, agendas, sign-in sheets, and copies of data reviewed.

Stakeholders on the Site-Based Committee are included in the Appendix.

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Arredondo Elementary is a PK-5th grade Title I school with a total enrollment of 695 students and an overall state accountability rating of A as of 2022. Our overall daily attendance rate is 94.89%. The information below summarizes enrollment by demographic and student groups: (22-23 Teacher Data will be added when the School Report Card is published.)

| | 2021-2022 Student Percentage | 2022-2023 Student Percentage | 2021-2022 Teacher Percentage | 2022-2023 Teacher Percentage |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| African American | 29.85% | 30.65% | 10.8% | |
| Hispanic | 41.49% | 43.31% | 18.6% | |
| White | 14.03% | 11.80% | 68.8% | |
| Asian | 11.04% | 11.51% | 1.8% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 55.82% | 52.81% | | |
| Emergent Bilingual | 23.18% | 26.04% | | |
| Special Education | 16.52% | 17.41% | | |
| At-Risk | 58.91% | 57.99% | | |
| Gifted and Talented | 5.87% | 7.34% | | |
| Campus Mobility Rate | 20.69% (Covid Remote) | 13.37% | | |
| Daily Attendance Rate | 94.38% | 94.89% | | |
| Female | 50.05% | 48.49% | 92.7% | |
| Male | 49.95% | 51.51% | 7.3% | |

CLASS SIZE RATIOS

| | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| Kindergarten | 22.4 | |
| 1st Grade | 19.7 | |
| 2nd Grade | 23.5 | |

| | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 3rd Grade | 22.1 | |
| 4th Grade | 18.6 | |
| 5th Grade | 21.0 | |

ATTENDANCE AND DISCIPLINE INFORMATION



| | | 1 - First six weeks 2 - Second six weeks | | 3 - Third six weeks | | - | 4 - Fourth six weeks | | 5 - Fifth six weeks | |
|----------------|-------|--|-------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | PIA | Attendance Enrollment | PIA | Attendance Enrollment | PIA | Attendance Enrollment | PIA | Attendance Enrollment | PIA | Attendance Enrollment |
| Grade EE | 95.7% | 12 | 92.8% | 14 | 95.7% | 17 | 93.2% | 23 | 94.5% | 23 |
| Grade PK | 90.9% | 47 | 89.8% | 48 | 92.8% | 47 | 93.7% | 47 | 94.3% | 48 |
| Grade KG | 93.5% | 78 | 91.8% | 79 | 93.6% | 81 | 94.3% | 82 | 93.3% | 84 |
| Grade 01 | 94.5% | 126 | 92.8% | 128 | 92.4% | 130 | 95.3% | 127 | 95.0% | 125 |
| Grade 02 | 96.3% | 93 | 95.5% | 95 | 94.8% | 94 | 94.9% | 95 | 95.3% | 92 |
| Grade 03 | 97.1% | 100 | 95.6% | 101 | 94.0% | 100 | 96.2% | 98 | 95.4% | 96 |
| Grade 04 | 96.4% | 106 | 95.6% | 107 | 96.0% | 106 | 97.0% | 107 | 95.6% | 105 |
| Grade 05 | 96.9% | 122 | 95.8% | 122 | 96.0% | 122 | 96.2% | 123 | 95.9% | 124 |
| Total Students | 95.7% | 684 | 94.4% | 693 | 94.4% | 697 | 95.6% | 702 | 95.1% | 697 |

Our daily attendance rating decreased during the 5th and 6th six weeks while our discipline incidents increased.

Demographics Strengths

- We service a diverse group of students that come from different countries, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds. We have 33 different languages spoken at the campus.
- We have a high teacher retention rate for staff on campus (88% for 22-23).
- 100% of paraprofessionals meet the highly qualified requirements.
- 83% of our teachers are ESL Certified.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math. **Root Cause:** Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Economically Disadvantaged students are underperforming on end of year 2023 GRA. Below Grade Level: Kindergarten: 62.5%; 1st Grade: 43.33%; 2nd grade: 37.25%. **Root Cause:** Students lack basic foundational skills in reading such as phonological awareness and phonics as well as limited access to text outside of the school setting.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%) **Root Cause:** Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): 44% of students in 3rd-5th grade reported being teased/annoyed by others at school. Root Cause: Students lack coping skills for self-regulation. Some teachers lack strategies for de-escalation.

Problem Statement 5: 29% of parents do not feel they have useful information to help their students with school. Root Cause: There is a lack of communication between the school and parents regarding the curriculum and what students are expected to learn and know.

Problem Statement 6: There is a disparity between our expressive and receptive language domains within the Advanced and Advanced High composite proficiency ratings on TELPAS. (97% of EB students with an AH composite did not meet criteria for Exit due to Expressive Domains - Speaking / Writing.) **Root Cause:** Students lack opportunities to practice speaking and writing using academic vocabulary.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

STAAR DATA

| | 2021-2022 Meets / Masters Percentages | 2022-2023 Meets / Masters Percentages |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| 3rd Grade Reading | 54% / 34% | 69% / 27% |
| 3rd Grade Math | 42% / 25% | 38% / 15% |
| 4th Grade Reading | 60% / 29% | 56% / 29% |
| 4th Grade Math | 41% / 24% | 61% / 35% |
| 5th Grade Reading | 65% / 40% | 63% / 33% |
| 5th Grade Math | 59% / 32% | 51% / 24% |
| 5th Grade Science | 50% / 21% | 32% / 9% |
| OVERALL 3rd-5th READING | 59% / 34% | |
| OVERALL 3rd-5th MATH | 47% / 27% | |

NWEA MAP DATA - Fall 2022 to Spring 2023 Growth Comparison

| | % Met Growth - MATH | % Met Growth - READING | % Met Growth - SCIENCE |
|-----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1st Grade | 38% | 41% | N/A |
| 2nd Grade | 40% | 53% | 49% |
| 3rd Grade | 73% | 55% | 63% |
| 4th Grade | 58% | 52% | 53% |
| 5th Grade | 32% | 35% | 51% |

2023 STAAR Scores for Extended Constructed Responses

| Grade | # of Students | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|-------|------------------|-----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|----|
| 3rd | 94 | 27% | 1% | 5% | 3% | 15% | 14% | 7% | 12% | 14 |
| 4th | 105 | 41% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 10% | 6% | 8% | 8% | 10 |
| 5th | 123 | 16% | 4% | 10% | 7% | 14% | 9% | 9% | 8% | 11 |

End Of Year - GRA Data: % ON or ABOVE Grade Level

| | EOY 2020-2021 | EOY 2021-2022 | EOY 2022-2023 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Kindergarten | 54% | 45% | 56% |
| 1st Grade | 44% | 63% | 64% |
| 2nd Grade | 59% | 64% | 72% |

*Color pattern follows the COHORT of students (Example: 2020-2021 Kindergarten group - 54% to 63% to 72%)

Special Education - Failure Rate by Nine Weeks

| | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1st Nine Weeks | 35.07% | 27.00% | 10.92% |
| 2nd Nine Weeks | 25.17% | 17.28% | 13.53% |
| 3rd Nine Weeks | 20.27% | 8.28% | 6.47% |
| 4th Nine Weeks | 19.00% | 6.97% | 10.55% |

EARLY CHILDHOOD LITERACY AND MATH TARGETS

- Percent of Kindergarten students that score on grade level or above on the Guided Reading Assessment will increase from 54% (2021) to 85% by June 2024.
- Percent of 1st grade students that score on grade level or above on the Guided Reading Assessment will increase from 44% (2021) to 70% by June 2024.
- Percent of 2nd grade students that score on grade level or above on the Guided Reading Assessment will increase from 59% (2021) to 70% by June 2024

3rd Grade TARGETS

- The percent of 3rd grade students that meet grade level or above on STAAR math will increase from 41% (2022) to 75% by June 2024.
- The percent of 3rd grade students that meet grade level or above on STAAR reading will increase from 54% (2022) to 75% by June 2024.

Student Learning Strengths

2022-2023 STAAR:

Cohort Data shows a steady increase in Approaches, Meets, and Masters scores for our 2023 5th grade students in READING:

| READING SCORES | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Approaches | 76% | 80% | 85% |
| Meets | 53% | 61% | 63% |
| Masters | 25% | 31% | 33% |

Cohort Data shows an increase in Approaches and Meets for our 2023 4th grade students in READING:

| READING SCORES | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| APPROACHES | 80% | 89% |
| MEETS | 53% | 56% |
| MASTERS | 32% | 29% |

Cohort Data shows an increase in Approaches and Meets for our 2023 5th grade students in MATH:

| MATH SCORES | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| APPROACHES | 72% | 75% | 79% |
| MEETS | 39% | 43% | 51% |
| MASTERS | 21% | 28% | 24% |

Cohort Data shows an increase in Approaches, Meets, and Masters for our 2023 4th grade students in MATH:

| MATH SCORES | 2021-2022 | 2022-2023 |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| APPROACHES | 70% | 87% |
| MEETS | 41% | 61% |
| MASTERS | 23% | 35% |

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Economically Disadvantaged students are underperforming on end of year 2023 GRA. Below Grade Level: Kindergarten: 62.5%; 1st Grade: 43.33%; 2nd grade: 37.25%. **Root Cause:** Students lack basic foundational skills in reading such as phonological awareness and phonics as well as limited access to text outside of the school setting.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math. **Root Cause:** Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%) Root Cause: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

Problem Statement 4: Only 74% of parents (77% of staff) agree or strongly agree that "Discipline is enforced fairly at school" according to the Campus Climate Surveys taken in February 2023. **Root Cause:** Lack of understanding of district / campus consequences when mitigating factors are considered (i.e. Special Education students with BIPs, previous referrals, intent, homeless factors, etc.)

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%) **Root Cause:** Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Teacher Retention Information

| | # of Teachers | # Retired | # Promoted | # Other | # Rezoning | % Retained |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|------------|---------|------------|------------|
| 2021-2022 | 61 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 69% |
| 2022-2023 | 48 | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | 88% |

*Due to the rezoning for the 22-23 school year, the retention rate of teachers is significantly lower. Without the rezoning teacher count, retention rate would have been at 84% for 21-22.

Instructional

- We have worked hard to create an effective planning and coaching system that includes content teachers planning every other week with instructional coaches. Assessments are reviewed and approved by instructional coaches.
- KidWatch meetings are strategically planned to the grading periods and are used to discuss each student's gaps and areas of strength. Plans for intervention are developed, monitored, and evaluated throughout the year.
- PLCs are used to effectively dissaggregate data, monitor student progress, and adjust plans as needed.
- GRA and MAP data are used to make informed decisions about student learning and growth.
- The Instructional Rounds Process will restart this year to evaluate our student use of academic language in their responses.
- Guided math will continue to be a priority to fully implement.
- Guided Reading Assessments will continue to be used for all grades Kinder through 5th grade.

Personnel

- Teachers receive support from our team of instructional coaches and administration.
- Consistency with staff/teachers is important for creating an overall effective instructional program. Moderate changes were made to grade level positions for the 2022-2023 school year with the reduction of staff and students due to rezoning.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- Data-driven decisions are made during KidWatch meetings, and students are provided with interventions during the MTSS time built into the master schedule.
 Data points used: GRA, TxKEA, and will incorporate MAP Growth Data
- All teachers collaborate with others in their grade level content area to plan how they will provide Tier I instruction.
- Our positive school culture and the high level of support provided to teachers will continue to enhance the learning environment.
 - We will conduct monthly checks with staff to monitor the morale on campus.
 - Each month the Sunshine committee will put together a morale booster for the staff.
 - Team Leaders will be selected for each grade level / team to help with communication and needs.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Economically Disadvantaged students are underperforming on end of year 2023 GRA. Below Grade Level: Kindergarten: 62.5%; 1st Grade: 43.33%; 2nd grade: 37.25%. **Root Cause:** Students lack basic foundational skills in reading such as phonological awareness and phonics as well as limited access to text outside of the school setting.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math. **Root Cause:** Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Problem Statement 3: Only 74% of parents (77% of staff) agree or strongly agree that "Discipline is enforced fairly at school" according to the Campus Climate Surveys taken in February 2023. **Root Cause:** Lack of understanding of district / campus consequences when mitigating factors are considered (i.e. Special Education students with BIPs, previous referrals, intent, homeless factors, etc.)

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%) **Root Cause:** Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

We base our climate and culture on the premise that all students can learn at high levels and that all students deserve someone to champion for them. Our motto is "I CAN & I WILL". We teach our students life-long lessons of respect, manners, teamwork, etc. using our Jaguar Essentials. Each student is inducted into a HOUSE in which they belong to as long as they are on our campus. This House teaches them a sense of pride, belonging, and responsibility for self and others. We incorporate our Character Counts principles into our morning Jag Time, instilling these traits into all that we do. We highlight and celebrate students and staff using Shout-Outs, Teacher / Para of the Month, Affirmations, etc that are posted in the main hallway for all to see. Students are also able to give a Shout-Out to their fellow peers and teachers. Incentives are used to increase student and staff attendance.

Our attendance rate is consistent with the district rate and similar through all race/ethnicity groups. Through positive incentives and communication, our attendance and tardies rates have improved each year. Due to our special education programs, we are able to assist students with extreme behaviors and get them the support they need to be successful in school. We will use a mentor program and focus on relationship building with our students as well as all teachers being trained to use Solution Focused and Trauma-Informed techniques.

We will continue to use a leadership committee on campus to allow opportunities for staff to gain leadership experience throughout the year. Staff are encouraged to provide feedback and innovative ideas. Staff morale was reported higher than previous years.

We communicate with families monthly through electronic newsletters that provide various information about the campus as well as articles and/or activities in all content and specials areas. Teachers communicate with families through various means of electronic communication (ex. Class Dojo, Blooms, Seesaw, Canvas, email) relaying campus information as well as classroom information. Each grade level sends home a weekly newsletter through various electronic communications and posts each newsletter on their Canvas homepage for easy access by parents and administration. Families, community members, and organizations are invited to participate in various events on campus throughout the year.

Perceptions Strengths

This will be our 9th year using Jaguar Essentials and our students use them on a regular basis. Families and visitors have praised our students' use of manners.

Students, staff and families are supportive of the House system and show their support by participating in House Day and House activities.

Mentoring programs, relationship building, and Solution Focused techniques allow staff members to effectively work with students with extreme behaviors while we go through the Special Education process to provide more support for the students to be successful in school.

The campus based leadership committee allows staff members to participate in various leadership roles, activities, and learning processes. We provide many learning and growth opportunities for all staff members that are interested in any type of leadership role.

Administrators and Core Team provide encouragement, incentives, and morale boosters throughout the year to keep a positive environment throughout the year, especially the more stressful times.

PTO is actively involved on the campus by providing events, volunteering, and hosting fundraisers.

- 98% of staff rated our campus with an "A or B" on the climate surveys.
- 88% of **parents** rated our campus with an "A or B" on the climate surveys.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 44% of students in 3rd-5th grade reported being teased/annoyed by others at school. **Root Cause:** Students lack coping skills for self-regulation. Some teachers lack strategies for de-escalation.

Problem Statement 2: Only 74% of parents (77% of staff) agree or strongly agree that "Discipline is enforced fairly at school" according to the Campus Climate Surveys taken in February 2023. **Root Cause:** Lack of understanding of district / campus consequences when mitigating factors are considered (i.e. Special Education students with BIPs, previous referrals, intent, homeless factors, etc.)

17 of 45

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%)

Root Cause 1: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math.

Root Cause 2: Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 3: Economically Disadvantaged students are underperforming on end of year 2023 GRA. Below Grade Level: Kindergarten: 62.5%; 1st Grade: 43.33%; 2nd grade: 37.25%.

Root Cause 3: Students lack basic foundational skills in reading such as phonological awareness and phonics as well as limited access to text outside of the school setting. Problem Statement 3 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: 44% of students in 3rd-5th grade reported being teased/annoyed by others at school.Root Cause 4: Students lack coping skills for self-regulation. Some teachers lack strategies for de-escalation.Problem Statement 4 Areas: Demographics - Perceptions

Problem Statement 5: A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%)
Root Cause 5: Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence
Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

The following data were used to verify the comprehensive needs assessment analysis:

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Accountability Distinction Designations
- Federal Report Card and accountability data
- Local Accountability Systems (LAS) data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- · Local benchmark or common assessments data
- Texas approved PreK 2nd grade assessment data

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- · Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Emergent Bilingual (EB) /non-EB data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, gender etc.
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

• Attendance data

- Discipline records
- Student surveys and/or other feedback
- Class size averages by grade and subject

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- T-TESS data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent engagement rate
- Community surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data

Goals

Revised/Approved: November 21, 2023

Goal 1: By June 2024, all students will show academic achievement gains of 5% or more in literacy and mathematics on End of Year State and District Reading, Math, and Science assessments.

Performance Objective 1: Reading: Improve Tier I instruction in every ELAR classroom, focusing on the components of Science of Teaching Reading with an emphasis on research-based early literacy strategies and use targeted Tier 2 interventions for students who are not successful.

Evaluation Data Sources: Summative : Performance on STAAR Universal Screeners (MAP Growth) Campus / District Performance Tests Benchmarks

Formative : GRA Reading Levels TXKea myON Usage Beanstack Usage Reports MAP Growth Heggerty Phonological Awareness Screeners Weekly Read Aloud Check-Ins during Planning Weekly Phonics Check-Ins during Planning

| Strategy 1 Details | | Formative Reviews | | |
|---|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| Strategy 1: K-2 teachers will use Really Great Reading phonics lessons daily as evidenced by weekly learning walks and check-ins during | | Formative | | |
| planning. | Nov | Feb | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Explicit and strategic phonics lessons will increase GRA levels. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Instructional Coach, Teachers Title I: 2.4, 2.6 Funding Sources: Supplemental Resources for Tutorials - 211 Title I, Part A - \$2,000, Software Licenses (RGR) - 211 Title I, Part A - | 80% | 85% | | |
| \$1,100 | | | | |

| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
|--|-----|-------------|------|
| Strategy 2: Teachers will provide daily Heggerty phonological awareness lessons to students who score below level on GRA and show | | Formative | |
| weakness in Phonological Awareness as evidenced in Heggerty's Phonological Awarness Surveys. | Nov | Feb | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will close gaps on Heggerty Phonological Awareness surveys by the EOY screener. It will be administered to below level students at BOY, MOY, and EOY. | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals, Teachers, Instructional Coach | 20% | 25% | |
| Strategy 3 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
| Strategy 3: Teachers will implement literacy routines that increase components of the Science of Teaching Reading which include read alouds | | Formative | |
| with accountable talk, shared reading, engaging stations, independent reading, and other research based strategies as evidenced by myON Usage, Beanstack reports, weekly read aloud check-ins during planning, lesson plans, and learning walks. | Nov | Feb | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be able to read a wider variety of texts with increased fluency, accuracy, and | | | |
| comprehension. | 40% | 50% | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals, EL Coach, and Teachers | | | |
| Title I: | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | |
| Funding Sources: Software Licenses (MyOn; RAZ Kids) - 211 Title I, Part A - \$7,089 | | | |
| Strategy 4 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
| Strategy 4: Provide ongoing professional development to improve teacher strategies for extended constructed responses so that students are | | Formative | |
| provided with effective instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student scores on the STAAR test on ECR question will decrease the number of zero scores by | Nov | Feb | June |
| 10%. | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches | 35% | 50% | |
| Principal | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Learning 5 - School Processes & Programs 4 | | | |
| \sim No Progress \sim Accomplished \rightarrow Continue/Modify X Discontinue | e | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|---|
| Problem Statement 5: A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%) Root Cause: Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence |

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%) Root Cause: Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence

Goal 1: By June 2024, all students will show academic achievement gains of 5% or more in literacy and mathematics on End of Year State and District Reading, Math, and Science assessments.

Performance Objective 2: Math: Improve Tier I instruction in every math classroom by following the Guided Math Framework and use targeted Tier 2 interventions for students who are not successful.

Evaluation Data Sources: Formative: Universal Screeners (MAP Growth) Campus / District Performance Tests Benchmarks

Summative : STAAR

| Strategy 1 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
|--|-----|-------------|------|
| Strategy 1: Teachers will create mathematical routines to increase numeracy which include Number Talks, deep practice, student discourse, | | Formative | |
| engaging stations, and other research-based strategies as evidenced by routine learning walks. | Nov | Feb | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be able to demonstrate a deeper understanding in a variety of mathematical concepts. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Teachers, and Instructional Coach Title I: 2.4, 2.6 | 45% | 60% | |
| Funding Sources: Supplemental Resources - 211 Title I, Part A - \$1,520, Think Up - Teacher Resource - all students - 199 PIC 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - \$8,100, Software Resources - STEMScopes Math - 199 PIC 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - \$2,928 | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
| Strategy 2: Teachers will use data to determine gaps in student learning and conduct intentional small group lessons to close the gaps. | | Formative | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will close the gaps and address student weaknesses throughout the year. | Nov | Feb | June |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Instructional Coach, and PrincipalsProblem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 2 | 40% | 50% | |

| Strategy 3 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
|--|-----------|-------------|------|
| Strategy 3: Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs to break down the TEKS, learn new teaching strategies and analyze data to impact | Formative | | |
| instruction throughout the year. | Nov | Feb | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will have a greater understanding of the curriculum and an increased ability to teach students with varying abilities to close gaps and improve student performance. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coach, Teachers Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 2 | 35% | 50% | |
| No Progress ON Accomplished -> Continue/Modify X Discontinue | ; | | |

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math. **Root Cause**: Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%) Root Cause: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math. **Root Cause**: Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%) **Root Cause**: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: 51% of all 3rd-5th grade students scored at "Meets Grade Level" for STAAR Math. **Root Cause**: Students are still missing some foundational skills (numerical fluency including lack of automaticity with math facts, number / concept relationships). Students were unfamiliar with the new question types. Teachers teach skills in isolation rather than integrating concepts to provide students a deeper understanding.

Goal 1: By June 2024, all students will show academic achievement gains of 5% or more in literacy and mathematics on End of Year State and District Reading, Math, and Science assessments.

Performance Objective 3: Science: Improve Tier I instruction in every science classroom focusing on hands-on experiments and activities (in accordance with the TEKS: K-1st-80%; 2nd-3rd-60%; 4th-5th - 50% Hands-on), vocabulary building, and connecting hands-on learning to questioning on assessments.

Evaluation Data Sources: Formative: Universal Screeners District Benchmark Tests Curriculum Checkpoints

Summative; STAAR

| Strategy 1 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
|--|------------|-------------|------|
| Strategy 1: Teachers will design lessons that will incorporate hands-on experiences, labs and active learning in context as evidenced by lesson | | Formative | |
| plans and regular learning walks. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be able to relate to science concepts using concrete examples. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals, Teachers and Instructional Coach Title I: 2.4, 2.5 | Nov 30% | Feb | June |
| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
| Strategy 2: Improve vocabulary knowledge and student use of academic vocabulary by providing a vocabulary rich, spiraling science | Formative | | |
| curriculum aligned to the TEKS using resources such as Flocabulary, Interactive Word Walls, Visual Non-Glossary, STEMscopes, and science vocabulary cards as evidenced by learning walks. | Nov | Feb | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be able to use academic vocabulary to articulate learning throughout lessons. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Teachers, Instructional Coach | 30% | 50% | |
| Funding Sources: Flocabulary School License - 199 PIC 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - \$2,271, - 199 PIC 25 State Bilingual/ESL - \$1,000 | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | Formative Reviews | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|------|--|
| Strategy 3: Teachers will use assessment data to determine appropriate interventions such as flexible tutorial groups, additional science lab rotations, and resources needed to meet the needs of all students. | | Formative | | |
| | | Feb | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will improve scores over the year. Data will include: Minor / Major grades, MAP scores, teacher observations. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Teacher, Instructional Coach | 35% | 50% | | |
| Image: Second state Image: Second state< | 2 | | | |

Goal 1: By June 2024, all students will show academic achievement gains of 5% or more in literacy and mathematics on End of Year State and District Reading, Math, and Science assessments.

Performance Objective 4: Teachers across all content areas in grades PK-5 will consistently provide authentic learning opportunities to engage students in the writing process as evidenced by routine learning walks.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student Exemplars ECRs and SCRs on Unit/District/State Assessments

| Nov | Formative | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Nov | Formative | | | |
| 25% | Feb | June | | |
| | | | | |
| Foi | rmative Rev | iews | | |
| | Formative | | | |
| Nov | Feb | June | | |
| 20% | 45% | | | |
| For | rmative Rev | iews | | |
| | Formative | | | |
| Nov | Feb | June | | |
| 5% | 30% | | | |
| nue | | | | |
| 1 | For Nov 20% For Nov | Formative Rev Formative Nov 20% 45% 20% 45% Some set of the se | | |

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%) Root Cause: Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: A significant number of students in grades 3-5 scored a zero on the ECR question on the STAAR-ELA assessment (3rd: 27%; 4th: 41%; 5th: 16%) Root Cause: Students lacked the appropriate instruction and practice to answer an ECR effectively to address the topic and provide text evidence

Goal 2: By June 2024, students in all sub-pops will perform within 10% of all students on end of year State and District academic achievement assessments and will meet all Target Measures for the Closing the Gap Domain on STAAR in math and student Success Status.

Performance Objective 1: Improve Tier I instruction for all special education students.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Summative Data Nine Weeks grades / failure reports Progress Monitoring Assessments Universal Screeners

| Strategy 1 Details | For | mative Revi | ews |
|--|-------------------|-------------|------|
| Strategy 1: Teachers will review all SpEd student files and services to ensure that they are provided the least restrictive environment to make | | Formative | |
| progress. Stratagyla Expected Desult/Impact. Students will be provided with the peeded convises to make progress on IED goals | Nov | Feb | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be provided with the needed services to make progress on IEP goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Special Education teachers Administrators Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 3 | 50% | 75% | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Formative Reviews | | ews |
| Strategy 2: Special Education teachers will attend PLC meetings with GenEd teachers on a weekly basis to increase their knowledge of the curriculum and content being taught. | Formative | | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive aligned instruction that closes gaps and improves their performance. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: SpEd Teachers GenEd Teachers Instructional Coaches Administrators | Nov 30% | Feb | June |
| Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 3 | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Formative Reviews | | |
|---|-----|-------------------|------|--|
| Strategy 3: SpEd teachers will meet biweekly with GenEd teachers to discuss and plan additional strategies for any special education students | | Formative | | |
| who fails a progress report or report card grade. | Nov | Feb | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be provided with scaffolded instruction and additional strategies to close the gaps. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: SpEd Teachers GenEd Teachers Administrators Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 3 | 30% | 50% | | |
| No Progress Os Accomplished -> Continue/Modify X Discontinue | 2 | | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%) Root Cause: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students are underperforming on the 2023 STAAR. (Meets Level: 3rd Math 15%; 4th Math 25%; 5th Math 27%; 3rd Reading 20%; 4th Reading 21%; 5th Reading 19%) **Root Cause**: Due to unforeseen circumstances, Special Education students were serviced by a long term substitute for the majority of the school year.

Goal 2: By June 2024, students in all sub-pops will perform within 10% of all students on end of year State and District academic achievement assessments and will meet all Target Measures for the Closing the Gap Domain on STAAR in math and student Success Status.

Performance Objective 2: Improve Tier I instruction for Emergent Bilingual (EB) students.

Evaluation Data Sources: TELPAS Proficiency Ratings Formative assessments

| Strategy 1 Details | | Formative Reviews | | |
|--|------------|-------------------|------|--|
| Strategy 1: Students will complete a minimum of 4 practice activities per week on Summit K12 as evidenced by usage reports. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase one level in each proficiency domain on TELPAS exit criteria is met. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: EB Coach, Teachers, Administrators Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | | Formative | | |
| | | Feb | June | |
| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews | |
| Strategy 2: Teachers will receive professional development and utilize campus vocabulary programs such as 38 Academic Language | | Formative | | |
| Builders, Vocabulary Magic, Concept Mapping, Thinking Maps, etc as evidenced by learning walks and planning documents. | | Feb | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will utilize vocabulary strategies during instruction resulting in increase student knowledge and performace. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches, Administrators Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | 15% | 30% | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | For | mative Revi | ews | |
| Strategy 3: Provide students with additional resources to support language acquisition in the classroom. | Formative | | | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will improve their listening and speaking skills resulting in a higher proficiency level as measured by TELPAS. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: EB Coach Administration | Nov 30% | Feb | June | |
| Title I: 2.4, 2.6 Funding Sources: Supplemental Resources - 199 PIC 25 State Bilingual/ESL - \$4,430 | | | | |

| No Progress | Accomplished | X Discontinue |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| | | |

Goal 2: By June 2024, students in all sub-pops will perform within 10% of all students on end of year State and District academic achievement assessments and will meet all Target Measures for the Closing the Gap Domain on STAAR in math and student Success Status.

Performance Objective 3: Identify students who are at-risk of not meeting grade level expectations and provide additional interventions to ensure they meet grade level standards.

Evaluation Data Sources: Universal screeners Formative / Summative assessments GRA Levels MAP Data

| Strategy 1 Details | | mative Revi | ews | |
|--|-------------------|-------------|------|--|
| Strategy 1: Provide before/during/after school tutorials with effective and timely additional assistance, supplies and materials for STAAR | | Formative | | |
| tested subjects. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will close gaps on concepts in which they are struggling as evidenced by their performance on STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals, Teachers, and Instructional Coach Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Nov 30% | Feb | June | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Formative Reviews | | ews | |
| Strategy 2: Continue to hire teachers, paraprofessionals, and supplemental staff to target at-risk students, including Pre-K students, by | Formative | | | |
| providing coaching support to teachers, tutorials for students, and on-going monitoring. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff will target at-risk students to provide necessary interventions to close the gaps. Success will | Nov | Feb | June | |
| be measured by summative and formative assessments. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal Instructional Coordinator Paraprofessionals | 65% | 85% | | |
| Funding Sources: Instructional Coordinator - 211 Title I, Part A - \$89,216, Pre-K Teacher and paraprofessional - 199 PIC 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - \$178,261 | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | For | mative Revie | ews |
|--|-----|--------------|------|
| Strategy 3: Students will engage in critical thinking activities in all content areas that incorporate purposeful talk in various group settings and provide opportunities to practice developing and revising new concepts by explaining, questioning, reflecting, synthesizing, and debating. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills that will transfer to new and novel situations. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Instructional Coaches, Administrators Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | | Formative | |
| | | Feb | June |
| | | 30% | |
| Image: No Progress Image: Accomplished Image: Continue/Modify Image: Continue/Modify | e | II | |

Goal 3: By the end of the 2023-2024, the percentage of students who feel safe, supportive, and not stressed out will improve by at least 7% as measured by the end of year social emotional survey.

Performance Objective 1: Increase parent, family, and community participation in various campus and district outreach activities.

Evaluation Data Sources: Formative: Sign In Sheets by grade level, Copies of Communication, Quarterly Parent Communication Logs

Summative: Staff and Parent Climate Surveys

| Strategy 1 Details | | Formative Reviews | | |
|--|-----|--------------------------|------|--|
| Strategy 1: We will offer a variety of communication (i.e. social media, parent newsletters, Skylert callout, Canvas, etc.) and outreach events to provide parents with monthly tips and strategies to support their student(s) with social-emotional and/or academic needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parents will stay up-to-date on campus events and ways to support their student(s)' needs as evidenced sign-in sheets and campus surveys. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal , Assistant Principal, Instructional Coaches, teachers | | ts Formative | | |
| | | Feb | June | |
| | | E avy | | |
| | | 50% | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 4.1, 4.2 | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews | |
| Strategy 2: Provide family engagement opportunities throughout the year that allow parents to be informed about and provide support for | | Formative | | |
| their students' needs both social-emotional and academic (i.e. curriculum nights, STEAM night, International Night, etc.) | Nov | Feb | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parents will feel informed and students will feel supported with their needs both social-emotional and academic as evidenced by the Social-Emotional Survey 3rd-5th, Campus Climate Surveys, and campus based surveys. | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Title I Campus Coordinator | 40% | 50% | | |
| | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 4.1, 4.2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| No Progress 😡 Accomplished -> Continue/Modify X Discontinu | e | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Goal 3: By the end of the 2023-2024, the percentage of students who feel safe, supportive, and not stressed out will improve by at least 7% as measured by the end of year social emotional survey.

Performance Objective 2: Students will have increased access to curriculum lessons and supports that enhance student self-awareness and skills needed for daily life.

Evaluation Data Sources: Counselor Guidance Lesson Plans and Schedule Teacher / Campus Schedule for SE lessons Learning Walks Student / Parent Surveys

| Strategy 1 Details | | Formative Reviews | | |
|--|------------|-------------------|------|--|
| ategy 1: Each nine weeks the counselor will provide guidance lessons using the six pillars of Character Counts character education | | Formative | | |
| curriculum. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will be provided skills that help them problem solve and handle everyday conflict and emotions. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor and principals Title I: 2.5, 2.6 | Nov 40% | Feb | June | |
| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews | |
| Strategy 2: Teachers will conduct weekly social-emotional lessons that support the LCISD Whole Child Safety & Wellness Model. | Formative | | | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive frequent lessons that enhance their skills to cope with self-awareness and social circumstances so students fill they are less anxious and stressed out. | Nov | Feb | June | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Counselor, Principal Title I: 2.5, 2.6 | 50% | 60% | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | Formative Reviews | | ews |
|---|-------------------|-----------|------|
| Strategy 3: Increase the students' access to the counselor to help address immediate concerns and challenges and decrease the need for student protocols completed for students in crisis. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will problem solve and learning coping strategies to address their needs instead of using words / actions involving self-injury, homicidal and suicidal ideations. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Teacher, Principal Title I: 2.5, 2.6 | | Formative | |
| | | Feb | June |
| | | 50% | |
| Image: No Progress Image: Accomplished Image: Continue/Modify Image: Continue/Modify | e | | |
| | | | |

Goal 3: By the end of the 2023-2024, the percentage of students who feel safe, supportive, and not stressed out will improve by at least 7% as measured by the end of year social emotional survey.

Performance Objective 3: Decrease the number of office referrals, ISS incidents, and OSS incidents.

Evaluation Data Sources: Discipline reports Office Referrals

| Strategy 1 Details | | Formative Reviews | | |
|--|-----------|-------------------|------|--|
| Strategy 1: Implement Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) process to reduce the number of students removed from their regular educational setting (includes use of Jag Time, restorative practices, use of rewards system) | | Formative | | |
| | | Feb | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are engaged in the learning environment and on task learning and classroom disruptions are minimized. | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PBIS Committee including teachers, counselor, administrators | 40% | 60% | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | For | mative Revi | ews | |
| Strategy 2: Provide professional development and resources to support teacher and staff with teaching self-regulation strategies to students, | Formative | | | |
| using deescalation strategies during times of crisis, and recognizing signs of distress in students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff will have the necessary skills and resources to support students with their social-emotional | Nov | Feb | June | |
| needs. | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches, Counselor, Administrators | 35% | 40% | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | | | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | For | mative Revi | ews | |
| Strategy 3: Increase student engagement in the learning process and time on task. | | Formative | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Administrators | Nov | Feb | June | |
| Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | 35% | 40% | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify X Discontinu | e | | | |
| | | | | |

State Compensatory

Budget for Arredondo Elementary

Total SCE Funds: \$13,299.00 **Total FTEs Funded by SCE:** 2.5 **Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs**

Personnel for Arredondo Elementary

| Name | Position | FTE |
|---------------------|---------------|-----|
| Alejandra Hernandez | Pre K Aide | 0.5 |
| Brenda Valdez | Pre K Aide | 0.5 |
| Diana Hernandez | Pre-K Aide | 0.5 |
| Donna Karastamatis | Pre K Teacher | 1 |

Title I

1.1: Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Arredondo conducted a comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) on the following dates: May 15, 2023 and June 6, 2023. The CNA serves as the centerpiece of our planning process and the driving force most impacting the campus improvement plan. While data is gathered and analyzed throughout the year, a comprehensive effort is always made at the end of each school year. This year, administrators and teachers collected data in collaboration with teacher leaders and others. Root causes were identified, written as needs and reported to the site-based decision-making committee. The team was given time to reflect on the data and ask clarifying questions. When the team felt that all appropriate data had been disaggregated and analyzed, this step of the comprehensive needs assessment was finalized and written into the plan.

2.1: Campus Improvement Plan developed with appropriate stakeholders

Our Site Based Decision Committee includes teachers, parents, community members, and administrative personnel. In addition, we were sure to include members of the staff that were paraprofessionals and/or part of the special education and ESL departments. Site Based Decision Making Committee Members are listed in the committee table.

2.2: Regular monitoring and revision

To remain current and relevant, the CIP will be reviewed and revised, as needed, for the following year (2024-2025 school year) and/or evaluated during the following months (September, November, January, March). Tentative Campus Improvement Council/SOM meeting dates are as follows: September 18, November 6, January 22, and March 18.

2.3: Available to parents and community in an understandable format and language

To help parents be informed the campus will provide the following in English and Spanish for families: Campus Improvement Plan, Title 1 Compact, and the Parent and the Family Engagement Policy. These policies will accessible in the following locations for parents and community members: campus website, the school's front office, at parent and family engagement activities, and in the State and Federal Programs Office at the district's administration building.

3.1: Annually evaluate the schoolwide plan

The Parent and Family Engagement Policy will be adopted and revised in the fall and spring. The Parent and Family Engagement Policy will be distributed at Open House and at each Parent and Family Engagement Activity offered at this school. The policy will be available in English and Spanish, and it will be located on the campus website, the front office, and in the State and Federal Programs Office at the district administration building.

Title I Personnel

| Name | Position | Program | <u>FTE</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------|---------|------------|
| Jamie Cloma | Instructional Coordinator | | 1.0 |

Site-Based Decision Making Committee

| Committee Role | Name | Position |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Administrator | Amber Barbarow | Principal |
| Administrator | Nancy Garcia | Assistant Principal |
| Non-classroom Professional | Katrina Williams | Instructional Coach |
| Classroom Teacher | Kaley Kusler | Kindergarten Teacher |
| Classroom Teacher | Angela Johnson | 1st Grade Teacher |
| Classroom Teacher | Jamie Daaboul | 2nd Grade Teacher |
| Classroom Teacher | Kimberly Rychlik | 3rd Grade Teacher |
| Classroom Teacher | Amanda Richards | 4th Grade Teacher |
| Classroom Teacher | Shalimar Washington | 5th Grade Teacher |
| Parent | Amy Hensley | Parent |
| Community Representative | Norma Wilson | Parent |
| Paraprofessional | Julie Chapa | School Secretary |
| District-level Professional | Jamie Vincek | Director of Talent Development |

Campus Funding Summary

| | | | 211 Title I, Part A | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|--|----------------|--------------|--|
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Software Licenses (RGR) | | \$1,100.00 | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Supplemental Resources for Tutorials | | \$2,000.00 | |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | Software Licenses (MyOn; RAZ Kids) | | \$7,089.00 | |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | Supplemental Resources | | \$1,520.00 | |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | Instructional Coordinator | \$89,216.00 | | |
| | Sub-T | | | | | |
| Budgeted Fund Source Amount | | | | | | |
| | | | | +/- Difference | \$0.00 | |
| | | | 199 PIC 24 State Compensatory Ed (SCE) Accelerated | | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount | |
| | | | | | \$0.00 | |
| Sub-T | | | | | | |
| Budgeted Fund Source Amo | | | | | | |
| +/- Differe | | | | | | |
| | | | 199 PIC 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit | | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount | |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | Think Up - Teacher Resource - all students | | \$8,100.00 | |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | Software Resources - STEMScopes Math | | \$2,928.00 | |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | Flocabulary School License | | \$2,271.00 | |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | Pre-K Teacher and paraprofessional | | \$178,261.00 | |
| | | | | Sub-Total | \$191,560.00 | |
| Budgeted Fund Source Amount | | | | | | |
| +/- Difference | | | | | | |
| | | | 199 PIC 25 State Bilingual/ESL | | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount | |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | | | \$1,000.00 | |

| | 199 PIC 25 State Bilingual/ESL | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount | | | | |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | Supplemental Resources | | \$4,430.00 | | | | |
| | Sub-Total | | | | | | | | |
| Budgeted Fund Source Amount | | | | | \$5,430.00 | | | | |
| +/- Difference | | | | | \$0.00 | | | | |
| Grand Total Budgeted | | | | | \$297,915.00 | | | | |
| | Grand Total Spent | | | | | | | | |
| | +/- Difference | | | | | | | | |