Lamar Consolidated Independent School District

Huggins Elementary

2022-2023 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: A

Distinction Designations:
Academic Achievement in English Language Arts/Reading
Top 25 Percent: Comparative Academic Growth

Mission Statement

Huggins Elementary will provide each student with an educational experience that is rigorous, relevant, and rooted in relationship.

Vision

The vision of Huggins Elementary School is to provide a friendly, supportive atmosphere where all students are encouraged to maximize their learning potential and explore, achieve, and develop a better understanding of our ever-changing world.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Revised/Approved: June 13, 2022

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Huggins Elementary has been serving the greater Fulshear area since 1979. As one of the fastest growing cities in the state of Texas, Huggins Elementary has experienced exponential growth over the past several years. For the 2022-2023 school year, Huggins will provide instruction for Pre-Kindergarten through Fifth Grade students. There are 2 pre-k teachers, 6 kindergarten teachers, 6 first grade teachers, 7 second grade teachers, 7 third grade teachers, 6 fourth grade teachers, and 5 fifth grade teachers. Students attend art, music, PE, and library for specials 50 minutes per day. Effective September 22, 2022, Huggins Elementary is a frozen campus. Students that move to the area will attend Morgan Elementary due to the high growth and capacity of the campus. Huggins Elementary services special populations including Emergent Bilingual Students and students that receive special education. In addition to students that receive Inclusion/Resource Support, Huggins has two new special programs, including a Structured Learning Classroom for students in kindergarten through fifth grade and Early Childhood Special Education Classroom for students between the ages of three and five.

A review of demographic data for the 2021-2022 school year (682 students) indicates the following breakdown: .73% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 3.67% Asian, 12.76% Black, 57.62% White, 21.70% Hispanic/Latino, and 3.37% Multiracial. 13.34% of student received special education services and 6.89% received 504 support. 6.74% were Emergent Bilingual. 28% of students were identified at-risk. 18.91% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged.

Demographics Strengths

Census data reveals that Fulshear is the fastest growing city in the state of Texas with an annual growth rate of 11%. The current population exceeds 19,000 and continues to grow. With the increase in population, development of new residential communities continues. The greater Fulshear area (Fulshear, Brookshire, and Simonton) has attracted an increase in business development along the I-10 corridor, bringing families to the area. The current poverty rate is 3.13% and the average household income is $177,571.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: Students that are new to Huggins come with varying levels of academic experience, exposure, and limited data. **Root Cause:** Students are enrolling at Huggins from various places, both domestically and internationally, and from a variety of educational settings including homeschool, private, charter, and virtual.

Problem Statement 2: The Emergent Bilingual population at Huggins Elementary is increasing. At the beginning of the 2021 school year, the campus had 22 EB students, and the year ended with 39 EB students. Two of the students are Non-English Speakers. **Root Cause:** The growth in the EB population mirrors that of the growing community.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

	May 2022 STAAR Mathematics, Grade 3				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	107	70.42%	83.18%	59.81%	33.64%
	May 2022 STAAR Mathematics, Grade 4				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	102	68.89%	80.39%	56.86%	36.27%
	May 2022 STAAR Mathematics, Grade 5				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	103	67.26%	83.50%	56.31%	27.18%

	May 2022 STAAR Reading, Grade 3				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	107	76.43%	87.85%	69.16%	47.66%
	May 2022 STAAR Reading, Grade 4				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	102	80.25%	92.16%	75.49%	50.98%
	May 2022 STAAR Reading, Grade 5				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	103	79.35%	84.47%	73.79%	58.25%

	May 2022 STAAR Science, Grade 5				
	Total Students	Percent Score	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	103	69.68%	76.70%	39.81%	19.42%

	2021 GRADE 3 READING				2022 GRADE 3 READING				DIFFERENCE		
	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	145	87%	66%	44%	108	87%	69%	47%	0%	3%	3%
DISTRICT	**2506**	**80%**	**52%**	**29%**	**2731**	**84%**	**64%**	**40%**	**4%**	**12%**	**11%**

	2021 GRADE 4 READING				2022 GRADE 4 READING				DIFFERENCE		
	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	151	79%	58%	31%	103	91%	75%	50%	12%	17%	19%
DISTRICT	**2476**	**75%**	**48%**	**24%**	**2694**	**86%**	**67%**	**40%**	**11%**	**19%**	**16%**

	2021 GRADE 5 READING				2022 GRADE 5 READING				DIFFERENCE		
	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	119	86%	67%	44%	103	84%	74%	58%	-1%	7%	15%
DISTRICT	**2453**	**81%**	**56%**	**39%**	**2663**	**89%**	**70%**	**50%**	**8%**	**14%**	**11%**

	2021 GRADE 5 SCIENCE				2022 GRADE 5 SCIENCE				DIFFERENCE		
	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	117	87%	55%	28%	103	77%	40%	19%	-10%	-15%	-9%
DISTRICT	**2450**	**72%**	**40%**	**18%**	**2674**	**77%**	**48%**	**24%**	**5%**	**8%**	**6%**

	Kinder GRA -- EOY 2022			
	Total Students	Overall		
		Below Grade Level	On Grade Level	Above Grade Level
Huggins Elementary	109	21.10%	39.45%	39.45%

	1st Grade GRA -- EOY 2022			
	Total Students	Overall		
		Below Grade Level	On Grade Level	Above Grade Level
Huggins Elementary	97	10.31%	22.68%	67.01%

	2nd Grade GRA -- EOY 2022			
	Total Students	Overall		
		Below Grade Level	On Grade Level	Above Grade Level
Huggins Elementary	112	12.50%	16.07%	71.43%

Spring 2022 – MAP Reading Scores – Grade 1					
Campus	Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins	92	20%	30%	27%	23%

Spring 2022 – MAP Math Scores – Grade 1					
Campus	Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins	87	18%	41%	20%	21%

Spring 2022 – MAP Reading Scores – Grade 2					
Campus	Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins	109	14%	27%	31%	28%

Spring 2022 – MAP Math Scores – Grade 2					
Campus	Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins	109	17%	30%	39%	14%

	2nd Grade EOY Assessment Major #2			
	Total Students	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Huggins Elementary	109	96.33%	57.80%	24.77%

Student Learning Strengths

Huggins Elementary Met Standard and received a B rating in the Texas Accountability System for the 2018-2019 school year. Huggins was not rated in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 due to the state accountability waiver for COVID-19. For the 2021-2022 school year, Huggins received an A rating and 2 campus distinctions in Academic Achievement in English Language Arts/Reading and Top 25 Percent: Comparative Academic Growth.

A review of 2021-2022 STAAR Data indicates the following strengths:

- The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring Meets and Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 3%.
- The percentage of 3rd grade SPED students scoring Approaches, Meets, and Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 23%, 27%, and 16% respectively.
- The percentage of 3rd grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Approaches on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 28%.
- The percentage of 3rd grade EB students scoring Approaches and Meets on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 100% and 33% respectively.
- The percentage of 3rd grade students who scored meets in the Economically Disadvantaged subpopulation increased from 44% to 52.9%.

- The percentage of 4th grade students scoring Approaches, Meets, and Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 12%, 17%, and 19% respectively.
- The percentage of 4th grade economically disadvantaged students scoring Approaches, Meets, and Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 15%, 30%, and 45% respectively.
- The percentage of 4th grade EB students scoring Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 17%.
- The percentage of 4th grade SPED students scoring Approaches, Meets, and Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 38%, 33%, and 8% respectively.
- The percentage of fourth grade students that scored Approaches on the Math STAAR increased by 5%.
- The percentage of fourth grade students that scored Masters on the Math STAAR increased by 4%.
- The percentage of 4th grade students who scored meets in the Economically Disadvantaged subpopulation increased from 22.2% to 40% and increased in the masters category from 0% to 10%.

- The percentage of 5th grade students Meets or Masters on the Reading STAAR Test increased by 7% and 15% respectively

A review of the 2021-2022 End of Year Reading Levels in Kindergarten through Fourth Grade indicates the following strengths:

- 79% of Kindergarten students were reading on or above grade level at the end of the year.
- 89% of 1st grade students were reading on or above grade level at the end of the year.
- 87% of 2nd grade students were reading on or above grade level at the end of the year.
- 81% of 3rd grade students were reading on or above grade level at the end of the year.
- 78% of 4th grade students were reading on or above grade level at the end of the year.

A review of the 2021-2022 2nd Grade End of Year Math Assessment (campus-based cumulative) indicates the following strength:

- 96.3% of Second Graders scored Approaches, 57.8% scored Meets, and 24.77% scored Masters

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): The percentage of Fifth Grade students that scored Meets or Masters on the Math STAAR Test reduced by 10%. **Root Cause:** Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade math teacher mid-year. 23% of students received Special education services (of which only 43% scored Approaches or better).

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Third Grade Reading and Math STAAR Data does not reflect progress from the 2021 to the 2022 school year, as scores in Approaches, Meets, and Masters are within three-five percentage points. **Root Cause:** Third Grade Math Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. Students continued to demonstrate numeracy gaps from the school shut down and virtual learning the past two years. 19% of students were reading below grade level.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): 55.19% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Math STAAR test. **Root Cause:** Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): 43.94% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Reading STAAR Test. **Root Cause:** Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): 53.33% of Special Education Students in Kindergarten-Second Grade were reading below level at the end of the 2021-2022 school year. **Root Cause:** Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized): Scores in all performance categories (approaches, meets, and masters) decreased by 10% or more on the 5th Grade Science STAAR test. **Root Cause:** Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade science teacher mid-year, resulting in inconsistent instruction. There was lack of hands-on opportunities in the science lab due to Covid Protocols and the use of the lab as a classroom for Morgan Elementary. Students demonstrated gaps in science objectives from the previous school years (2020 and 2021).

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Huggins Elementary supports students in Pre-Kindergarten through Fifth Grade. Grade levels are divided by teams. For the 22-23 school year, Kindergarten will be self-contained and first through fifth grade will be departmentalized. The Instructional Leadership team includes the principal, assistant principal, Literacy Coach, Math/Science Coach, ESL Coach, Special Education Team Leader, GT Facilitator, and Reading Interventionist.

Teams use the district roadmaps to long-range plan each nine-weeks. Teams meet weekly to plan for instruction. A variety of assessment types are created in collaboration with the Instructional Leadership Team and used to gauge student progress. Emphasis has been placed on providing high-quality TIER I instruction. This includes the implementation of Reading, Writing, and Math Workshop with differentiation delivered through small group instruction.

Through the MTSS process, student progress is measured and opportunities for remediation, intervention, and enrichment are provided to meet the diverse needs of students. The Master Schedule includes extended learning time for all grade levels. During this 30 minute duration, all new instruction stops and students participate in differentiated learning opportunities to meet individual needs. Students are also provided opportunities for accelerated instruction before school during Cranium Club. Progress is monitored and reviewed with parents that receive TIER II intervention or TIER III remediation.

Through the Social Emotional Support Classroom, Huggins provides special education services to qualifying students. Many students in the program receive behavior and academic support. Huggins also supports special education students through resource instruction, as well as in-class support and speech. Huggins Elementary will be adding a Structured Learning Classroom and Early Childhood Special Education Classroom this school year. Students that qualify for 504 receive instruction in the general education classroom with accommodations in place as needed. GT students are supported through a pullout program by the GT Facilitator for 1.5 hours per week.

There will be a total of 38 classroom teachers, 3 specials teachers, 1 librarian, 5 special education teachers, 12 paraprofessionals, 1 nurse, and 2 front office staff members.

The Core Team includes the following: Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, Administrative Assistant, Literacy Coach, Math/Science Coach, ESL Coach, Special Education Team Leader, GT Facilitator, and Reading Interventionist and meets weekly to collaborate regarding campus needs.

Huggins Elementary has a strong connection with parents and community stakeholders through partnership with the Friends of Huggins (parent organization).

For the 22-23 school year, Huggins will continue to participate in the Campus Leadership Program through The Holdsworth Center.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- Huggins Elementary has established a cohesive Core Team that shares the same vision and goals.
- Through a defined instructional planning model, grade level teams work collaboratively with instructional coaches.
- The MTSS Process provides opportunities to analyze student data to ensure growth for all students.
- Friends of Huggins supports students and staff through fundraising, donations, volunteer efforts, and community outreach.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1: Time constraints and staffing limited the support the instructional leadership team was able to provide for TIER I instruction. **Root Cause:** The instructional leadership team is overextended due to multiple duties including Accelerated Learning, Intervention/Remediation during Extended Learning time, serving as testing coordinator, MTSS Coordinator, 504 Coordinator, At-Risk Coordinator, etc.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Huggins Elementary prides itself on maintaining a close-knit community. Several generations of family members have attended Huggins for elementary school. As the community grows, stakeholders place particular interest in maintaining small-town charm.

Huggins Elementary focuses on growing the whole child, which includes not only academic growth but the social/emotional well-being of student as well. Teachers facilitate class meetings to build community within the classroom. The counselor work in tandem with teachers to deliver Character Counts lessons. Emphasis is placed on positive behavior reinforcement through the use of PBIS and campus-wide House System. An array of strategies that support positive behavior include PBIS Rewards, PBIS Celebrations, and Golden Paw Awards for students, staff, and community members.

According to the 21-22 Campus Climate Survey, each group "graded" Huggins Elementary on the overall qualify of the school as follows:

Staff: 38% - A, 31% - B, 31% - C, 0% - D, 0% - F

Students: 40% - A, 46% - B, 13% - C, 2% - D, 0% - F

Parents: 46% - A, 32% - B, 14% - C, 6% - D, 2% - F

Perceptions Strengths

- Relationships between staff and community remains an integral part of the Huggins culture.
- There is a significant focus on the social-emotional well-being of students.
- The majority of survey participants indicated a positive perception of the campus as a whole.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: The percentage of parents that reported the overall quality of Huggins Elementary as an "A" decreased by 13%. **Root Cause:** Increased population on the Huggins Campus due to accommodating Morgan and Hubenak students led to logistical challenges.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: The percentage of Fifth Grade students that scored Meets or Masters on the Math STAAR Test reduced by 10%.

Root Cause 1: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade math teacher mid-year. 23% of students received Special education services (of which only 43% scored Approaches or better).

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 6: Third Grade Reading and Math STAAR Data does not reflect progress from the 2021 to the 2022 school year, as scores in Approaches, Meets, and Masters are within three-five percentage points.

Root Cause 6: Third Grade Math Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. Students continued to demonstrate numeracy gaps from the school shut down and virtual learning the past two years. 19% of students were reading below grade level.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: 55.19% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Math STAAR test.

Root Cause 2: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: 43.94% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Reading STAAR Test.

Root Cause 3: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: 53.33% of Special Education Students in Kindergarten-Second Grade were reading below level at the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Root Cause 5: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: Scores in all performance categories (approaches, meets, and masters) decreased by 10% or more on the 5th Grade Science STAAR test.

Root Cause 4: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade science teacher mid-year, resulting in inconsistent instruction. There was lack of hands-on opportunities in the science lab due to Covid Protocols and the use of the lab as a classroom for Morgan Elementary. Students demonstrated gaps in science objectives from the previous school years (2020 and 2021).

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning

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)
- 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
- Effective Schools Framework data
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
- Accountability Distinction Designations
- RDA 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
- Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Tejas LEE, or other alternate early reading assessment results
- Student failure and/or retention rates
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Local benchmark or common assessments data
- Running Records results
- Observation Survey results
- Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- Texas approved Prekindergarten and Kindergarten assessment data
- Other PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- Grades that measure student performance based on the TEKS

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
- Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- Gifted and talented data
- Dyslexia data
- 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
- School safety data
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio
- State certified and high quality staff data
- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Professional development needs assessment data
- Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact
- T-PESS data

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other 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 May 2023, students in fifth grade will increase performance in Meets to 60% and Masters to 30% on the Math STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 1: Ensure all fifth grade math teachers implement each component of the math workshop.

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson Plans, Classroom Observations

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Utilize STEMscopes Math as a resource for lesson planning.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Engaging lessons that result in student mastery of learning objectives. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: All Fifth Grade Math teachers will participate in a minimum of one coaching cycle and two learning walks.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will develop a better understanding of math workshop components to effectively implement into the classrooms. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Strategy 3: All components of the math workshop will be outlined on the master schedule. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Each component will be implemented with fidelity. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Strategy 4: Provide instructional feedback of lesson plans and assessments. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Lesson plan activities and assessments will align to the rigor of the TEK, resulting in increased student performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coach **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb	June

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: The percentage of Fifth Grade students that scored Meets or Masters on the Math STAAR Test reduced by 10%. **Root Cause**: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade math teacher mid-year. 23% of students received Special education services (of which only 43% scored Approaches or better).

Goal 1: By May 2023, students in fifth grade will increase performance in Meets to 60% and Masters to 30% on the Math STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 2: Extended Learning Time will be implemented in the grade level to provide enrichment, intervention, and remediation for students in the area of math.

Evaluation Data Sources: Master schedule, Data Spreadsheets, Rosters, Calendar of dates, Success Ed RTI Documentation

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Utilize professional resources to develop targeted lessons for Extended Learning Time.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase mathematical understanding and ability. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Implement Accelerated Learning to target students that did not meet expectation on the 21-22 Math STAAR Test in Fourth Grade.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase mathematical understanding and ability **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 3: Utilize additional staff to support Extended Learning Time.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased differentiation within small groups **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1 **Funding Sources:** Tutorials - 199 PIC 24 State Compensatory Ed (SCE) Accelerated - $6,171	Nov	Feb	June

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: The percentage of Fifth Grade students that scored Meets or Masters on the Math STAAR Test reduced by 10%. **Root Cause**: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade math teacher mid-year. 23% of students received Special education services (of which only 43% scored Approaches or better).

Goal 1: By May 2023, students in fifth grade will increase performance in Meets to 60% and Masters to 30% on the Math STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 3: Fifth Grade Math Teachers will collect and analyze student data to develop targeted instructional groups.

Evaluation Data Sources: Math Binders, AWARE, Grades in Skyward

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Data meetings will be conducted after each Major grade, and guided math groups will be arranged accordingly.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: High-quality, differentiated learning opportunities will be provided to each student.	Nov	Feb	June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Each math teacher will create and utilize a Guided Math Notebook for data collection and small group lesson planning.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: High-quality, differentiated learning opportunities will be provided to each student.	Nov	Feb	June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 3: Each fifth grade student will utilize an Interactive Math Notebook.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase mathematical understanding and ability.	Nov	Feb	June
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers			

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math
- ESF Levers:
Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: The percentage of Fifth Grade students that scored Meets or Masters on the Math STAAR Test reduced by 10%. **Root Cause**: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade math teacher mid-year. 23% of students received Special education services (of which only 43% scored Approaches or better).

Goal 2: By May 2023, students in third, fourth, and fifth grade special education will increase performance in Approaches to 67% on the Reading STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 1: Ensure all special education teachers and paraprofessionals receive the support they need to implement Guided Reading Workshop.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson plans, classroom observations, professional development schedule, and teacher feedback.

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 1: ELAR general education and special education teachers will collaborate with Instructional Coaches to engage in the coaching cycle. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** The teachers will seek feedback, receive coaching, and benefit from the support of the Instructional Coach in the classroom through modeling of best practices to improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Literacy Coach, general education teachers, special education teachers, and administrators. **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 2: Special education teachers will work with general education teachers to create a schedule to maximize instructional time and for in-class support and resource. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Maximizing use of instructional time to provide co-teaching in the general education classroom and effective instruction in the resource classroom. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 3: Special Education Teachers will participate in data meetings that will be conducted after each Major grade, and guided reading groups will be arranged accordingly. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Expected Result/Impact High-quality, differentiated learning opportunities will be provided to each student **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4			

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 4: Special Education teachers will work with Instructional Coaches to set up the resource classroom to support a guided reading workshop. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students that receive resource instruction will have an environment conducive to all components of reading workshop. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Special Education teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4			

Strategy 5 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 5: Special Education teachers will participate in instructional planning within the grade levels they support. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Special Education teachers will have a focused insight into the lessons provided during Inclusion, develop aligned small group plans for inclusion, and will be able to develop modified lessons for Resource aligned to the objectives being taught in the classroom. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coach **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4			

Strategy 6 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 6: Provide instructional feedback of lesson plans and assessments. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Lesson plan activities and assessments will align to the rigor of the TEK, resulting in increased student performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coach **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 3: 55.19% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Math STAAR test. **Root Cause**: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.
Problem Statement 4: 43.94% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Reading STAAR Test. **Root Cause**: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Goal 3: By May 2023, 60% of students in Kindergarten through second grade special education will read on or above grade level expectation on the Guided Reading Assessment.

Performance Objective 1: Ensure all special education teachers and paraprofessionals receive the support they need to implement Guided Reading Workshop.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Professional Development Schedule, Classroom Observations, Teacher Feedback

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 1: All general education and special education teachers that teach reading will participate in a Guided Reading Assessment Training, including strategy groups and running records. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teacher's will develop a better understanding of how to administer and interpret results of the Guided Reading Assessment. Student reading levels will accurately reflect level of ability. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, ESL Coach, Special Education Teachers, General Education Teachers, Administrators **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 2: The General Education and Special Education teacher will work together to complete the Oral Fluency and Reading Comprehension Rubric. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Accurately measure student progress. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, ESL Coach, Special Education Staff, General Education Teachers, Administrators **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 3: All Special Education Staff that provide in-class support and/or resource instruction will create a Guided Reading Binder that includes schedule, lesson plans, and student data. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will be able to differentiate small groups based on student data and provide detailed feedback on student progress. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Special Education Staff **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 5: 53.33% of Special Education Students in Kindergarten-Second Grade were reading below level at the end of the 2021-2022 school year. **Root Cause**: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Goal 3: By May 2023, 60% of students in Kindergarten through second grade special education will read on or above grade level expectation on the Guided Reading Assessment.

Performance Objective 2: Implement Units of Study in Phonics in all Kindergarten through second grade classes.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson Plans, classroom observations

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 1: Kindergarten through second grade general and special education staff will participate in professional development training to support the use of Units of Study in Phonics. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers and staff will develop an understanding of the Units of Study resources and be able to implement lessons with fidelity. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, ESL Coach, Special Education Staff, General Education Teachers, Administrators **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 2: Require phonics lessons to include all components of the phonics lesson cycle. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will have access to a gradual release module for implementation, resulting in increased understanding and implementation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, ESL Coach, Special Education Staff, General Education Teachers, Administrators **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 3: Utilize Coaches Corner or the Coaching Cycle to provide professional development regarding phonics instruction at the small group table. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will get a better understanding of how to develop small group lesson plans to address the individual phonics needs of students to supplement the whole-group phonics instruction to target skills to improve overall reading ability. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Literacy Coach, Reading Interventionist, ESL Coach, Special Education Staff, General Education Teachers, Administrators **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5			

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 4: Front-load phonics instruction in the pre-K classrooms to develop student understanding of basic phonics rules and phonemic awareness. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Pre-K students will be better prepared for kindergarten learning **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 5 **Funding Sources:** Pre-K Aide - 199 PIC 24 State Compensatory Ed (SCE) Accelerated - $28,813.88			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 5: 53.33% of Special Education Students in Kindergarten-Second Grade were reading below level at the end of the 2021-2022 school year. **Root Cause**: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Reading Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in Reading was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Goal 4: By May 2023, students in third, fourth, and fifth grade special education will increase performance in Approaches to 55% on the Math STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 1: Ensure all special education teachers and paraprofessionals receive the support they need to implement Guided Math Workshop.

Evaluation Data Sources: Professional Development Rosters, Observations, Lesson Plans

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 1: Special education teachers will work with general education teachers to create a schedule to maximize instructional time and for in-class support and resource. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Maximizing use of instructional time to provide co-teaching in the general education classroom and effective instruction in the resource classroom. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 2: Special Education Teachers will participate in data meetings that will be conducted after each Major grade, and guided math groups will be arranged accordingly. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Expected Result/Impact High-quality, differentiated learning opportunities will be provided to each student **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, General Education and Special Education teachers **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3			

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 3: Special Education teachers will work with Instructional Coaches to set up the resource classroom to support a guided math workshop. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students that receive resource instruction will have an environment conducive to all components of math workshop. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Special Education teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 3: 55.19% of special education students in third-fifth grade did not meet expectation on the Math STAAR test. **Root Cause**: Special Education Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. One-Teach, one-assist was frequently observed during in-class support. Paraprofessionals lacked instructional professional development.

Goal 5: By May 2023, 60% of Fifth Grade students will score Meets or Masters on the Science STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 1: Ensure access to engaging, rigorous, real-world learning opportunities that support high-quality, TIER I instruction.

Evaluation Data Sources: Observations, Lesson Plans, Student Progress and Growth

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 1: Implement additional resources to supplement STEMscopes, including ThinkUp! Science and Science Penguin.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate mastery of science objectives. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 6	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 2: Each fifth grade student will utilize an Interactive Science Notebook.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase science understanding and ability **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 6	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Strategy 3: Fifth Grade Science Teachers will implement a small group rotation at the end of each unit to review and differentiate learning.	Formative		
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase science understanding and ability **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 6	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 4: Teachers will facilitate the following percentages of classroom and and outdoor investigations during instructional time: K-1st Grade: 80% 2nd-3rd Grade: 60% 4th-5th Grade: 50% **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will increase science understanding and ability. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Classroom teachers **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 6			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 6: Scores in all performance categories (approaches, meets, and masters) decreased by 10% or more on the 5th Grade Science STAAR test. **Root Cause**: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade science teacher mid-year, resulting in inconsistent instruction. There was lack of hands-on opportunities in the science lab due to Covid Protocols and the use of the lab as a classroom for Morgan Elementary. Students demonstrated gaps in science objectives from the previous school years (2020 and 2021).

Goal 5: By May 2023, 60% of Fifth Grade students will score Meets or Masters on the Science STAAR Test.

Performance Objective 2: Students will learn how to reflect on their progress and establish personal growth goals.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student growth charts, observations, teacher notes

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Strategy 1: Students will track their individual progress after each major assessment in the area of science. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will be able to determine areas of strength/needed improvement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 6	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Strategy 2: Students will create personal goals each nine weeks in the area of science and participate in goal-setting conferences with teachers. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will take ownership of their learning and invested in their success. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 6	Nov	Feb	June

Strategy 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 3: Students will track their individual progress after each major assessment in the areas of reading and math. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will be able to determine areas of strength/needed improvement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2			

Strategy 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 4: Students will create personal goals each nine weeks in the areas of reading and math, and participate in goal-setting conferences with teachers. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will take ownership of their learning and invested in their success. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Third Grade Reading and Math STAAR Data does not reflect progress from the 2021 to the 2022 school year, as scores in Approaches, Meets, and Masters are within three-five percentage points. **Root Cause**: Third Grade Math Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. Students continued to demonstrate numeracy gaps from the school shut down and virtual learning the past two years. 19% of students were reading below grade level.
Problem Statement 6: Scores in all performance categories (approaches, meets, and masters) decreased by 10% or more on the 5th Grade Science STAAR test. **Root Cause**: Staffing issues resulted in the loss of a fifth grade science teacher mid-year, resulting in inconsistent instruction. There was lack of hands-on opportunities in the science lab due to Covid Protocols and the use of the lab as a classroom for Morgan Elementary. Students demonstrated gaps in science objectives from the previous school years (2020 and 2021).

Goal 6: Third Grade Reading and Math STAAR Data will increase by 5% in Approaches, Meets, and Masters.

Performance Objective 1: Students will learn how to reflect on their progress and establish personal growth goals.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student growth charts, observations, teacher notes

Strategy 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 1: Students will track their individual progress after each major assessment in the areas of reading and math. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will be able to determine areas of strength/needed improvement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2			

Strategy 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Feb	June
Strategy 2: Students will create personal goals each nine weeks in the areas of reading and math, and participate in goal-setting conferences with teachers. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will take ownership of their learning and invested in their success. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administrators, Instructional Coaches, Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Third Grade Reading and Math STAAR Data does not reflect progress from the 2021 to the 2022 school year, as scores in Approaches, Meets, and Masters are within three-five percentage points. **Root Cause**: Third Grade Math Teachers were continuing to develop their understanding and implementation of Math Workshop. Utilization of small group, differentiated instruction in math was inconsistent. Students continued to demonstrate numeracy gaps from the school shut down and virtual learning the past two years. 19% of students were reading below grade level.

State Compensatory

Budget for Huggins Elementary

Total SCE Funds: $6,171.00
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 1
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

State Compensatory Education Funds will be used to support small group intervention/remediation for at-risk students.

Personnel for Huggins Elementary

Name	Position	FTE
Deanna Alamia	PreK Aide	1

Campus Funding Summary

199 PIC 24 State Compensatory Ed (SCE) Accelerated					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	2	3	Tutorials		$6,171.00
3	2	4	Pre-K Aide		$28,813.88
				Sub-Total	$34,984.88
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$34,984.88
				+/- Difference	$0.00
				Grand Total Budgeted	$34,984.88
				Grand Total Spent	$34,984.88
				+/- Difference	$0.00