Lamar Consolidated Independent School District

George Junior High

2022-2023 Campus Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

George Junior High School is a 7th- and 8th-grade Title I campus in Lamar CISD. George is a pillar of the Rosenberg area. Our school has served multiple generations of students and families express pride in sending their child to a school they also attended. George Junior High is a majority-minority school with a student ethnic breakdown of:

African American	**15.4%**
Hispanic	72.9%
White	9.0%
American Indian	0.2%
Asian	0.9%
Pacific Islander	0.2%
Two or More Races	1.4%

George Junior High has a 73.5% economically disadvantaged student population. 15.5% of students receive Special Education services and 20.7% of students are in the Emergent Bilingual program. 8.7% of the student population of George JH receives services through section 504. In the 2019-202 school year, roughly 2% of the student population was categorized as Homeless.

With a large number of economically disadvantaged families, some George Junior High School students do not have access to technology at home, and internet provider service is unreliable in some areas of our attendance zone.

Teachers at George Junior High have a wide range of experience levels with between 13 and 20% in each level of experience: beginner, 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, and more than 20 years of experience.

African American	**27.2%**
Hispanic	19.2%
White	51.5%
American Indian	0.0%
Asian	2.1%
Pacific Islander	0.0%
Two or More Races	0.0%

Demographics Strengths

As an ethnically diverse campus, GJH benefits from a wide variety of cultural perspectives in our students and teachers. Additionally, serving generations of Rosenberg families has developed a sense of pride and support for the campus.

At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, the opening of Wright Junior High changed the school boundaries for George Junior High. Our school population for 2021-2022 is roughly 400 students smaller than last school year. Some teachers who taught at GJH moved to Wright Junior high for the 2021-2022 school year. This significant change in the student and teacher population has provided a point of re-start for culture building and creating procedures on campus.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): As a campus with a high rate of economically disadvantaged students, GJH provides for student's basic needs while also challenging students to reach their full academic potential. **Root Cause:** Poverty in our area

Problem Statement 2: George JH is experiencing staff and student population change this school year. **Root Cause:** At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, the opening of Wright Junior High changed the school boundaries for George Junior High. Our school population for 2021-2022 is roughly 400 students smaller than last school year. Some teachers who taught at GJH moved to Wright Junior high for the 2021-2022 school yea

Problem Statement 3: A majority of of emergent bilingual students are at an advanced/advanced high level and have been in the program for 5+ years.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

George Junior High School has struggled to make gains on STAAR tests in the last five tested school years. Since 2017, the approaches rate on all STAAR tests (except Algebra I) were 76% or below with the lowest approach rate consistently in Social Studies. Algebra I students passed the STAAR EOC at a rate of 100% in 2022 and the meets (92%) and masters (82%). Test scores in the 2022 increased in all areas except 8th grade math (52%). However, 7th grade math, 8th grade science, and 8th grade social studies all fell below 60% approaches. Additionally, Meets and Masters levels on STAAR tests have consistently performed below the state average in the last 5 tested school years except in Algebra I EOC.

Based on the "Closing the Gaps" data reported on TEA STAAR and TELPAS reports, none of our demographic groups met the state target for grade-level standards or above in the 2021 school year. Some improvement in this area was seen in the 2022 school year with the following targets met:

- ELAR in all subpopulations for growth
- ELAR academic achievement for African American, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Emergent Bilingual students.

No targets were met in the 2022 school year for mathematics. Due to continued struggles in the Closing the Gaps domain, George Junior High is identified for targeted support and improvement.

	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EB/EL (Current & Monitored)[+]	Special Ed (Current)
Count of Indicators Missed for Three Consecutive Years* A student group that misses the targets in at least the same three indicators, for three consecutive years, is identified for targeted support and improvement.										
	1	3	4	-	-	-	-	2	2	4
Academic Achievement (Percent at Meets Grade Level or Above)										
Reading Target	32%	37%	60%	43%	74%	45%	56%	33%	29%	19%
2018	37%	37%	52%	-	-	-	-	34%	35%	16%
2019	36%	36%	44%	-	-	-	56%	35%	36%	10%
2022	33%	42%	51%	-	-	-	-	38%	42%	18%
Mathematics Target	31%	40%	59%	45%	82%	50%	54%	36%	40%	23%
2018	32%	32%	42%	-	-	-	-	31%	33%	10%
2019	33%	37%	40%	-	-	-	48%	36%	39%	14%
2022	24%	25%	42%	-	-	-	-	23%	25%	11%
Growth (Academic Growth)										
Reading Target	62	65	69	67	77	67	68	64	64	59
2018	75	74	75	-	-	-	-	74	77	61
2019	61	59	58	-	-	-	64	58	61	46
2022	77	74	70	-	-	-	-	71	75	61

	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EB/EL (Current & Monitored)[+]	Special Ed (Current)
Mathematics Target	67	69	74	71	86	74	73	68	68	61
2018	59	58	60	-	-	-	-	59	60	45
2019	56	57	57	-	-	-	60	57	57	52
2022	52	48	57	-	-	-	-	48	51	43
Student Success (Student Achievement Domain Score (STAAR Component Only))										
Target	36	41	58	46	73	48	55	38	37	23
2018	37	37	47	-	47	-	51	35	35	12
2019	38	38	44	-	73	-	52	37	38	15
2022	31	36	46	-	-	-	51	33	38	18

Student Learning Strengths

In the 2022 testing cycle, George Junior High students achieved at higher levels in ELAR than on past tests with 74% of students showing academic growth on STAAR. Algebra I performed in the top quartile of the campus comparison group for George Junior High.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Test scores in the 2022 increased in all areas except 8th grade math (52%). However, 7th grade math, 8th grade science, and 8th grade social studies all fell below 60% approaches. **Root Cause:** Students experienced interrupted schooling in 2019-2020 and a majority of our students were receiving online instruction in the 2020-2021 school year which widened learning gaps.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Meets and Masters levels on STAAR test are below the state average. **Root Cause:** Tier I instruction is not engaging students at high levels.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): All student groups, including ethnic demographic groups, Special Education, and Emergent Bilingual programs did not meet the state target for "Closing the Gaps" in mathematics and most student demographic groups including the two programs mentioned above did not meet the state target for academic achievement in ELAR. **Root Cause:** Tier I instruction is not engaging students at high levels.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Teachers are organized into Professional Learning Committees (PLCs) at George Junior High. Core subject PLCs planned as groups in the 2020-2021 school year but did not always have a full team of members present for planning including administrators in the PLC time. Teachers planned for two modes of teaching (online and face-to-face) often overcomplicating the planning conversations within teams. There is a need to go back to the basics of PLC processes and focus on a few high-yield strategies while planning. This may include teachers modeling instruction for each other, backward planning models, and common formative assessment development. "Ranger Round-Up" time was designed for instructional intervention for struggling students. A student who was identified as struggling in ELAR or math was placed in targeted tutorials two times per week. Based on 2021 data, this model may have been too limited in scope. Students struggling in multiple subject areas were only provided tutoring in the area of largest need. A small percentage of George Junior High School students demonstrated significant behaviors such as major campus disruptions, skipping class, and fighting last school year. Though the overall percentage of students demonstrating these behaviors was small, the effect of negative behaviors on campus was felt in hallways and classrooms. It would cause disruptions to classroom instruction. The effect of this is seen in our campus climate survey where only 10% of students "strongly agreed" with the statement "I feel safe at school." Conversely, 76% of staff members strongly agreed or agreed with the same statement. At the end of the 2020-2021 school year many George Junior High School teachers were transferred to Wright JH when rezoning reduced the number of students attending GJH by roughly 400 students.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

George Junior High has only three teachers new to the teaching profession this school year. This is a smaller percentage than in previous years. GJH utilizes a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports model on campus where teachers use an online program to award points to students demonstrating positive behaviors. There is an opportunity to extend the reach of this program by allowing students to buy into more positive experiences such as academic dances/pep rallies during school hours. George Junior High is undergoing significant change in its leadership team: A change in administrative staff assigned to George Junior High for the 2021-2022 school year has introduced new structures and ideas into the campus. However, there is a need for the new team to grow in their collaboration and professional learning as a team. Additionally, all department heads except one are new to their role this year.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): School-wide interventions were limited to one subject per student. **Root Cause:** Rigid structure and schedule of intervention did not allow for flexibility in student scheduling.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Two of the three administrators on campus are new to GJH this year: there is a need for the new team to grow in their collaboration and professional learning as a team **Root Cause:** Two of the three administrators on campus are new to GJH this year

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): All department heads except one are new to their role this year. **Root Cause:** Change in teaching population in 2021-2022 caused department wide change in most departments.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): PLC processes and planning are inconsistent by the core team. **Root Cause:** Lack of administrative guidance and team training on the PLC process.

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): A small percentage of George Junior High School students demonstrated significant behaviors such as major campus disruptions, skipping class, and fighting last school year. Though the overall percentage of students demonstrating these behaviors was small, the effect of negative behaviors on campus was felt in hallways and classrooms. **Root Cause:** Needed more proactive structures to prevent negative student behaviors.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Due to an increase in disruptive classroom and hallway behaviors in the 2020-2021 school year, teachers expressed frustration with discipline. Systems were put in place in the 2021-2022 school year which decreased the rate of hallway discipline infractions. There is still a need to set up proactive systems to prevent student behavior problems such as more adult presence in the hallway and more careful monitoring of problem areas.

Perceptions Strengths

The GJH staff and families take pride in being one family supporting our students. This close-knit community provides support for each other and camaraderie

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Due to an increase in disruptive classroom and hallway behaviors in the 2021-2022 school year, teachers expressed frustration with discipline. **Root Cause:** Lack of proactive systems to prevent behavior problems.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Campus climate surveys highlighted a communication breakdown between families and GJH staff. **Root Cause:** Communication expectations were not clearly outlined for staff and systems were not developed to systematically keep parents up-to-date on school activities.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: As a campus with a high rate of economically disadvantaged students, GJH provides for student's basic needs while also challenging students to reach their full academic potential.
Root Cause 1: Poverty in our area
Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Test scores in the 2022 increased in all areas except 8th grade math (52%). However, 7th grade math, 8th grade science, and 8th grade social studies all fell below 60% approaches.
Root Cause 2: Students experienced interrupted schooling in 2019-2020 and a majority of our students were receiving online instruction in the 2020-2021 school year which widened learning gaps.
Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: School-wide interventions were limited to one subject per student.
Root Cause 5: Rigid structure and schedule of intervention did not allow for flexibility in student scheduling.
Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 9: Due to an increase in disruptive classroom and hallway behaviors in the 2021-2022 school year, teachers expressed frustration with discipline.
Root Cause 9: Lack of proactive systems to prevent behavior problems.
Problem Statement 9 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Meets and Masters levels on STAAR test are below the state average.
Root Cause 3: Tier I instruction is not engaging students at high levels.
Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 11: Two of the three administrators on campus are new to GJH this year: there is a need for the new team to grow in their collaboration and professional learning as a team
Root Cause 11: Two of the three administrators on campus are new to GJH this year
Problem Statement 11 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 10: Campus climate surveys highlighted a communication breakdown between families and GJH staff.
Root Cause 10: Communication expectations were not clearly outlined for staff and systems were not developed to systematically keep parents up-to-date on school activities.
Problem Statement 10 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 4: All student groups, including ethnic demographic groups, Special Education, and Emergent Bilingual programs did not meet the state target for "Closing the Gaps" in mathematics and most student demographic groups including the two programs mentioned above did not meet the state target for academic achievement in ELAR.

Root Cause 4: Tier I instruction is not engaging students at high levels.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 6: All department heads except one are new to their role this year.

Root Cause 6: Change in teaching population in 2021-2022 caused department wide change in most departments.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 7: PLC processes and planning are inconsistent by the core team.

Root Cause 7: Lack of administrative guidance and team training on the PLC process.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 8: A small percentage of George Junior High School students demonstrated significant behaviors such as major campus disruptions, skipping class, and fighting last school year. Though the overall percentage of students demonstrating these behaviors was small, the effect of negative behaviors on campus was felt in hallways and classrooms.

Root Cause 8: Needed more proactive structures to prevent negative student behaviors.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: 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
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Covid-19 Factors and/or waivers for Assessment, Accountability, ESSA, Missed School Days, Educator Appraisals, etc.
- 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
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification 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
- Student failure and/or retention rates
- Observation Survey results

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
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Discipline records
- Student surveys and/or other feedback
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Professional development needs assessment data
- Equity data

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices

Goals

Goal 1: By June 2023, the number of 7th and 8th-grade students meeting the approaches, meets, and masters on STAAR assessments will increase by 10 percent in each when compared to the 21-22 STAAR tests.

Performance Objective 1: By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, all core departments will follow the 4Qs PLC model and will utilize both Common Formative and Common Summative Assessments to collect classroom data as demonstrated in PLC meetings and on PLC documentation forms.

    Evaluation Data Sources: PLC meetings and on PLC documentation forms.

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Teacher teams will meet once per week to discuss student data (summative and formative) and make plans for the following weeks that address student data-based strengths and weaknesses. Discussions will be TEKS driven and teachers will utilize PLC protocols and the 4 guiding questions	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By June 2023, the number of 7th and 8th grade students meeting the STAAR progress measure (Domain II) will increase by 10 percent when comparing the 21-22 to the 22-23 7th and 8th grade STAAR tests.
 	
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Department heads and administrators
 	
    TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: District coaches, Academic Facilitator, Instructional Coordinators, ESL Facilitator, and Department Chair to train teachers in research-backed student engagement strategies, relationship building, classroom management. This will include some teams traveling to professional development to bring strategies back and train other staff members.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased alignment of student engagement strategies from classroom to classroom as measured by walkthrough data with 75% in December and 100% by April.
 	
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration
 	
    Funding Sources: Travel - administrators - 211 Title I, Part A - $7,519, Travel - Employee - 211 Title I, Part A - $7,000			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 3: Math and Social Studies teachers will receive coaching on designing and implementing formative assessments. This will include in-classroom coaching as well as teachers videoing their lessons and reviewing them with the consultant.	Formative		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Math and social studies teachers will increase their use of formative assessment as demonstrated through walkthrough data to 100% of classrooms with students providing feedback to teachers and peers using academic language. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administration **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Funding Sources:** Technology - 211 Title I, Part A - $3,000			

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 4: PLCs will utilize various data (such as MAP, STAAR, District Assessment, and Classroom Assessment) to identify students in need of Tier I or Tier II intervention and design common interventions using high-yield instructional strategies.	Formative		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Number of students failing one or more classes will reduce to 10% or less per semester **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, PLCs, Administrators **Funding Sources:** Supplies - 211 Title I, Part A - $10,943, Technology Online Relate - Reading acceleration program - 211 Title I, Part A - $16,000, Technology - 211 Title I, Part A - $3,000			

Strategy 5 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 5: All subjects will include lessons which require students to read and write about their subject matter at least twice per six weeks and this assessment data will be used to identify subject matter needs and literacy needs across campus. This may include novel learning experiences such as field trips.	Formative		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students will write short answer responses to reading passages 84 times this school year at a minimum to increase writing stamina on subjects other than ELAR. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Department heads, admin **Funding Sources:** Student travel - 211 Title I, Part A - $7,000, Student travel - busses - 211 Title I, Part A - $3,000			

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✗ Discontinue

Goal 1: By June 2023, the number of 7th and 8th-grade students meeting the approaches, meets, and masters on STAAR assessments will increase by 10 percent in each when compared to the 21-22 STAAR tests.

Performance Objective 2: Implement backward design planning in PLCs

    Evaluation Data Sources: Assessments, lesson plans, rubrics, PLC minutes

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: STAAR tested teams will have two full-day PLC planning days per semester and planning days in summer 2023 to dig into progress monitoring assessment and classroom assessment data. This time will be used to backward design upcoming instruction.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teams will create instructional plans for the next instructional unit which responds to the data analyzed as evidenced by lesson plans and completed data protocol documents **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, administrators, department heads			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: At the beginning of the school year all teachers will participate in backward planning training and will make plans as teacher teams to begin implementation in their PLC planning time.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All teachers will align summative assessments with plans for units of instruction and student activities will match the rigor level of the TEKS taught. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, administrators, department heads			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 3: All teacher teams will backward plan 100% of their units by the 5th six weeks, starting with designing tests at the level of rigor designated in TEKS.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive instruction to match the level of TEKS rigor, resulting in a 10% increase of students meeting the STAAR progress measure.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals, department heads
 	
    TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 4: Administration and instructional support staff will review teacher lesson plans and provide feedback on rigor, formative assessment, student engagement, and learning targets.	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2023, 100% of teacher lesson plans will match TEKS rigor, include formative assessment, and define clear learning targets. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrator, Instructional Facilitator **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning			
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✖ Discontinue			

Goal 2: GJH will meet 50% of the closing the gaps indicators on the TAPR report.

Performance Objective 1: Utilize student data tracking in PLCs to identify sub-population needs and design targeted Tier I interventions.

   Evaluation Data Sources: MAP data, classroom assessment data, STAAR data.

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Special Education master list teachers will use PLC protocols at weekly department meetings to track student progress on IEP goals and classroom progress toward mastery of objectives.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Special Education will demonstrate mastery of course objectives with a goal of 70% as measured by grades. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Master list teachers and Special Education administrators.			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Special Education students will be provided with additional support from their Master List teacher in the small group setting during Ranger Round-Up which will focus on tracking student improvement, organization, progress monitoring assessment data, and homework assistance.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Special Education will demonstrate mastery of course objectives with a goal of 70% as measured by grades. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Master list teachers and Special Education administrators. **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy**			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 3: EB facilitator will attend coaching training and will utilize EB facilitation to track EB student data, and provide training and coaching to teachers to support the implementation of EB linguistic accommodations.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: EB proficient scores will increase by 15% on all spring 2023 STAAR tests when compared with spring 2022 results. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** LPAC committee members **Targeted Support Strategy** **Funding Sources:** EB facilitator - 211 Title I, Part A - $85,462			

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 4: EB students identified with high achievement on the STAAR results but stagnant linguistic levels on TELPAS will receive support during Ranger Round-Up which will focus on the use of academic language in Social Studies and Science classes.	Formative		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: EB meets and masters scores will increase by 5% on all spring 2023 STAAR tests when compared with spring 2022 results. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** LPAC committee members. **Funding Sources:** Supplemental ESL Personnel - 199 PIX 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - $31,743.56			

Strategy 5 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 5: MTSS team will utilize student data tracking to identify at-risk students, design targeted Tier I interventions, and designate necessary Tier II, or Tier III interventions.	Formative		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 80% of students identified as at-risk will pass all classes in the second semester **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** MTSS team **Title I:** 2.6 **Funding Sources:** Extra Duty Pay - 211 Title I, Part A - $14,000			

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✕ Discontinue

Goal 2: GJH will meet 50% of the closing the gaps indicators on the TAPR report.

Performance Objective 2: During Ranger Round-Up students will receive 45 additional minutes per week in math, science, ELAR, and social studies. During this time they will receive high-quality acceleration and instruction.

Evaluation Data Sources: : Ranger Round Up attendance data and teacher lesson plans

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Core PLC teams will plan one 45-minute lesson for Ranger Round-Up per week which utilizes student engagement strategies and collects formative assessment data on student knowledge.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 60% of students will demonstrate growth on MAP data for the 2021-2022 school year.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PLCs, Department heads
 	
     Title I:
 2.4			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Student group assignments in Ranger Round-Up will be determined using MAP data and STAAR data to address the requirements of HB 4545.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: GJH will meet 50% of the closing the gaps indicators on the TAPR report.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Guiding Coalition Team members
 	
     Targeted Support Strategy			

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✗ Discontinue

Goal 2: GJH will meet 50% of the closing the gaps indicators on the TAPR report.

Performance Objective 3: ELAR teachers will sponsor Project Lit activities designed to engage students in activities to increase literacy and a love of reading.

    Evaluation Data Sources: Project lit attendance rosters, MAP data on students who attend Project Lit

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Project Lit teachers will set up lending libraries in their classrooms and Book Nooks around the campus to increase student access to books.	**Formative**		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students in Project Lit will read 5 books of their choice during the school year	**Nov**	**Feb**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ELAR teachers			
Funding Sources: Reading materials - 211 Title I, Part A - $8,000			
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✕ Discontinue			

Goal 2: GJH will meet 50% of the closing the gaps indicators on the TAPR report.

Performance Objective 4: The leadership team will utilize learning walks and increased frequency of classroom walkthroughs to monitor rigor and student engagement levels in classrooms

   Evaluation Data Sources: Classroom walkthrough and learning walk data

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: The administrative team will participate walkthrough calibration in September for the purpose of calibrating look-fors in the classroom	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased consistency in instructional practices as measured by walkthrough data. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Administrators will provide walkthrough data and professional development to department heads and PLCs to assist teams in planning.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: With frequent feedback, PLC teams will adjust lessons to address student needs **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principals **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning - **Targeted Support Strategy**			

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✗ Discontinue

Goal 3: By June 2023, the percentage of students who report experiencing negative social/emotional outcomes as measured by the Social Emotional EOY Screener will be 25% or fewer in each indicator.

Performance Objective 1: Redesign the school wide PBIS system, which will include a token economy system, tiered discipline forms in the classroom, and explicit behavior expectation lessons.

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Staff will be trained on CHAMPS program for teaching expected behaviors.	**Formative**		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All classroom and shared spaces will display and frequently review behavior expectations.	**Nov**	**Feb**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Staff will utilize PBIS rewards system and the PBIS rewards store to give positive reinforcement for prosocial behaviors.	**Formative**		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students will receive PBIS points for prosocial behaviors	**Nov**	**Feb**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: School staff and administration, PBIS committee			
Funding Sources: Token Economy System - 199 PIX 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - $5,000, Supplies - 199 PIX 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - 5,000 - $6,000			

| 0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✕ Discontinue

Goal 3: By June 2023, the percentage of students who report experiencing negative social/emotional outcomes as measured by the Social Emotional EOY Screener will be 25% or fewer in each indicator.

Performance Objective 2: Increase parent and community outreach to provide positive experiences for students and their families on campus.

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: A culture-building staff team will be created this school year and will design and promote positive school experiences for students, staff, and parents.	**Formative**		
	Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least two parent involvement activities will be developed per semester. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Culture building committee **Title I:** 4.1, 4.2 **Funding Sources:** Extra duty pay - support personel - 211 Title I, Part A - $1,000, Supplies - 199 PIX 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit - $6,160, PBIS store supplies - 211 Title I, Part A - $1,656			

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✗ Discontinue

Goal 3: By June 2023, the percentage of students who report experiencing negative social/emotional outcomes as measured by the Social Emotional EOY Screener will be 25% or fewer in each indicator.

Performance Objective 3: Provide character focused and solution focused lessons for students, which will include guidance for students when they make decisions that disrupt the learning environment.

Strategy 1 Details			Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: All students will meet with a mentor teacher during Ranger Round Up once per week and lessons will be developed for each week which will include character education and organizational strategies to provide well-rounded educational experiences to all students .			**Formative**		
			Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will participate in at least 25 character-building activities in the school year. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Instructional Coaches and counselors **Title I:** 2.5					
Strategy 2 Details			Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Solution-focused language will be used to guide students in restorative dialogue after a discipline incident. This may include counselor conversations, assistant principal conversations, and staff-led student restorative circles.			**Formative**		
			Nov	**Feb**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students involved in restorative and solution-focused practices will develop a plan for the future which sets goals for reduced conflicts. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Counselors, admin **Funding Sources:** Travel - counselor - 211 Title I, Part A - 3000					

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✖ Discontinue

Goal 3: By June 2023, the percentage of students who report experiencing negative social/emotional outcomes as measured by the Social Emotional EOY Screener will be 25% or fewer in each indicator.

Performance Objective 4: Develop classroom goal-setting processes for students, which include student planning for future success in high school and beyond.

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		

Strategy 1: The school's guiding coalition group will develop a student goal-setting process for students to complete in Ranger Round Up and monitor throughout the school year.
      Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students will monitor activities and progress toward a goal.
      Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Guiding Coallition
	Formative		

	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		

Strategy 2: Students will use SchooLinks in Ranger Round up to develop a post-junior high plan. This will include connecting with the high school to promote CTE pathways.
      Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students will explore career opportunities and high school endorsement pathways.
      Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Guiding Coalition and Mentor teacher group
	Formative		

	Nov	**Feb**	**June**

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✕ Discontinue

State Compensatory

Budget for George Junior High

Total SCE Funds:
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 1
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Personnel for George Junior High

Name	Position	FTE
Jill Morgan	ESL Facilitator	1

Title I Personnel

Name	Position	Program	FTE
Jill Morgan	EB Facilitator	Emergent Bilingual	1

Campus Funding Summary

			211 Title I, Part A		
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	2	Travel - administrators		$7,519.00
1	1	2	Travel - Employee		$7,000.00
1	1	3	Technology		$3,000.00
1	1	4	Technology		$3,000.00
1	1	4	Supplies		$10,943.00
1	1	4	Technology Online Relate - Reading acceleration program		$16,000.00
1	1	5	Student travel		$7,000.00
1	1	5	Student travel - busses		$3,000.00
2	1	3	EB facilitator		$85,462.00
2	1	5	Extra Duty Pay		$14,000.00
2	3	1	Reading materials		$8,000.00
3	2	1	PBIS store supplies		$1,656.00
3	2	1	Extra duty pay - support personel		$1,000.00
3	3	2	Travel - counselor	3000	$0.00
				Sub-Total	$167,580.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$167,580.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00
			199 PIX 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit		
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
2	1	4	Supplemental ESL Personnel		$31,743.56
3	1	2	Token Economy System		$5,000.00
3	1	2	Supplies	5,000	$6,000.00
3	2	1	Supplies		$6,160.00
				Sub-Total	$48,903.56
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$48,903.56
				+/- Difference	$0.00
				Grand Total Budgeted	$216,483.56

	199 PIX 30 State SCE Title I-A, Schoolwide Activit				
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
				Grand Total Spent	$216,483.56
				+/- Difference	$0.00