

International Leadership of Texas
Saginaw Elementary
2021-2022 Campus Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

Our mission at International Leadership of Texas is to prepare students for exceptional leadership roles in the international community by emphasizing servant leadership, mastering the English, Spanish, and Chinese Languages, and strengthening the body, mind and character.

Vision

Teachers, staff, and administrators together form a rich professional learning community where all are supported to hone our professional craft and improve our effectiveness. We cultivate lifelong learners.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	6
School Processes & Programs	8
Perceptions	11
Priority Problem Statements	12
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	13
Goals	15
Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.	16
Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.	27
Goal 3: The percent of students increasing at least one performance sub-level (low, mid, high) annually on the End of Year AAPPL or ACTFL assessment will increase from 50% to 70% by June 2022.	36
Goal 4: The percent of teachers retained annually will increase from 76% to 80% by June 2022.	38
Goal 5: To improve the culture and climate of our campuses by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.	42
Targeted Support Strategies	43
Campus Funding Summary	44
Addendums	45

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

International Leadership of Texas is a public charter school system with the mission of providing students with an exceptional leadership role in the international community by emphasizing servant leadership, mastering the English, Spanish, and Chinese languages, and strengthening the mind, body, and character. ILTexas Saginaw K-5 began serving the community of Saginaw in the school year 2017-2018. As an international school, ILTexas has attracted families from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds and socio-economic statuses. We also pride ourselves in surrounding our students with educators with a wide range of ethnic backgrounds and experiences.

School Population:

Kinder: 168 17.0%

1st Grade: 169 17.0%

2nds Grade: 166 16.7%

3rd Grade: 164 16.5%

4th Grade: 160 16.1%

5th Grade: 165 16.6%

Total: 992

Gender:

Male: 467 46.79%

Female: 531 53.21%

Ethnicity:

Hispanic: 567 56.81%

Native American: 2 .20%

Asian: 34 3.41%

Black: 146 14.63%

White: 199 19.94%

Two or more: 50 5.01

Student Programs:

Free lunch: 113 11.32%

Reduced lunch: 143 14.33%

Economically Disadvantaged: 574 57.52%

Limited English Proficiency: 239 23.95%

Gifted and talented: 59 5.91%

Title 1 participation: 998 100%

Homeless: 8 .8%

Staff Information:

Principal: 1

Assistant Principal: 3

Dean: 1

Instructional Coaches: 2

Counselors: 3

Male: 25

Female: 85

Total: 110

Staff Ethnicity:

White: 21

Black: 25

Hispanic: 36

Asian: 8

Staff Education

Bachelors: 74

Masters: 14

Doctorate: 0

Demographics Strengths

We use a number of sources to find high caliber staff such as our campus website, the Teacher Job Network (TJN), and Region 10 and 11 job fairs. The majority of core and LOTE teachers are at a highly qualified status in accordance with ESSA. We have 84 staff members who hold a teaching position with 31 having a Texas certification. Our interview process clearly outlines the mission, philosophy, and expectations for our campus. We have recruited teachers from Spain and China to teach our trilingual model. The International Leadership of Texas, Saginaw campus will continue to work with regions 10 & 11 and the district to actively find qualified teacher candidates to fill positions within the school. Teachers have the professional freedom to be innovative and creative. They have opportunities to have input into decision making on campus. We will continue to have ethnic diversity in our faculty/staff population, we are truly international. We have faculty/staff from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Spain, China, and more. Finding highly qualified teachers to teach our trilingual model has required us to look outside of the US for teachers. This year we have the recruitment of teachers from Spain and China. This year we have also increased the number of teachers that meet certified status. There have also been salary increases for teachers, making our salary a little more competitive with local Independent School Districts.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. **Root Cause:** Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

From the 2021 STAAR test, Saginaw K-8 lagged behind the state in all contents and all grades. The largest gap was in math.

2021 STAAR Math

		Approaches	Meets	Masters
3rd Grade	Campus	37.93	8.05	4.60
	State	61.00	30.0	14.0
4th Grade	Campus	44.57	17.39	7.61
	State	58.00	35.00	21.00
5th Grade	Campus	39.81	16.50	6.80
	State	69.00	43.00	24.00

2021 STAAR Reading

		Approaches	Meets	Masters
3rd Grade	Campus	52.08	26.04	8.33
	State	68.00	38.0	19.0
4th Grade	Campus	56.12	22.45	10.20
	State	63.00	36.00	18.00
5th Grade	Campus	58.00	24.00	15.00
	State	72.00	45.00	30.00

2021 STAAR Science

5th Grade	Campus	43.00	16.00	4.00
	State	61.00	30.00	12.00

Student Learning Strengths

In past years the campus was above the state average in reading. This year reading scores were below the state average in approaches, meets, and masters. However, the gap was the lowest in 4th grade reading, with the campus below the state by 5.88 percentage points. Fourth grade reading also had a gap of 7.8 in the masters category, which was the smallest gap.

Our teachers, students, parents, and community members work well to support the learning for all students. Parents work in collaboration with the school community to support the efforts to ensure that every child reaches their full potential. We celebrate our student's academic success, character development, and putting "Others Before Self". We also recognize the staff in displaying the characteristics of putting "Others Before Self" as well.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. **Root Cause:** Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. **Root Cause:** PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

We use a number of sources to find high caliber staff such as our campus website, the Teacher Job Network (TJN), and Region 10 and 11 job fairs. The majority of core and LOTE teachers are at a highly qualified status in accordance with NCLB. Our interview process clearly outlines the mission, philosophy and expectations for our school. We have recruited teachers from Columbia, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, Spain, and China to teach our trilingual model. ILTexas will continue to work with region 10 & 11 and the district to actively find qualified teacher candidates to fill positions within the school. Teachers have professional freedom to be innovative and creative. They have opportunities to have input into decision making on campus.

Finding highly qualified teachers to teach our trilingual model has required us to look outside of the US for teachers. This year we have recruitment of teachers from Spain, Columbia, Venezuela and China. This year we have also increased the number of teachers that meet highly qualified status. There has also been a significant salary increase for teachers, making our salary a little more competitive with local ISDs.

We have wonderful ethnic diversity in our faculty/staff population, we are truly international. We have faculty/staff from Columbia, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, Spain and China.

The Campus Leadership, Grade Level Administrators, Instruction Coach and District Coordinators will work with staff to develop a course of action so that all students have the opportunity to successfully meet grade level academic performance gains and STAAR performance gains. Teachers will teach the TEKS following the TEKS RS Scope and Sequence and curriculum programs for all core subject areas, as well as participate in activities designed to analyze data based on the state, district and local assessments. All classroom instruction will be data driven.

K-2 will take Istation monthly in both English and Spanish. 2nd graders take MAP math three times a year. K-2 uses Imagine Math Facts.

Third grade students will take STAAR Reading and Math Tests. Fourth graders will take STAAR Reading, Math and Writing Tests. Fifth Graders will take STAAR Reading, Math, and Science Tests. Sixth graders will take STAAR Math and Reading. Seventh Graders will take STAAR Math, Reading and Writing. Eighth graders will take STAAR Math, Reading, Social Studies, Science, English 1 and Algebra 1. Students will take Math and Reading MAP testing in 3rd-8th Grades three times a year. Istation reading ISIP is taken in grades K-8th. In addition, all 2nd-8th grade students will take district ECAs. The student's language proficiency is holistically rated using the ACTFL Proficiency for Spanish and Chinese for grades 3rd-8th. Every six weeks students in K-8 are rated in Spanish and Chinese levels. Grades 5th & 8th take the AAPPL test at the end of the year to determine their levels. Grades 3rd-8th take the Interim STAAR for each tested subject.

Critical thinking and problem solving skills will be emphasized in all core subject areas. Service learning is also an important component of our K-8 curriculum and culminates into an End Of Year service learning project for each grade level.

Economically disadvantaged, LEP, and at risk student population groups who have established a pattern of non-mastery will be targeted for remediation. Small group instruction, tutorials during extended day enrichment, parent-teacher conferences and consistent written and oral communication between home and school. This will ensure that home and school work together to provide the necessary support for student success. ILTexas-Saginaw will provide student support services as outlined in IEPs and 504 accommodations for qualifying students.

In order for students to be successful and maximize academic achievement, they must attend school on a regular basis. Student absences will be closely monitored by homeroom teachers, school registrar and school counselors. Parents will be contacted by their teacher if they are absent more than 2 consecutive days. Students with perfect attendance for the year will be recognized at the end of the year during our award's program. We also award students for other academic achievements including A, AB Honor roll, Eagle of the Year for each grade level, leadership trait, most improved and citizenship awards. Continuous monitoring and recognition of high achievement is a high priority supported in every area.

All staff members have been provided a laptop. We have document cameras and Interactive/whiteboards in all classrooms.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Professional Development on an ongoing basis is key to the success of our school programs. District and campus professional development and trainings have/will be provided in the following areas:

- Dual Language Program
- Two Way SIOP
- Strategies for meeting needs of Limited English Proficient Students
- Data Disaggregation and Test Analysis
- TEKS RS Scope and Sequence
- District Data Management System
- Differentiated Instruction
- PE/Character Development Program
- Curriculum Programs in ELA/Reading & Math
- Federal & State Mandated Trainings

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. **Root Cause:** Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. **Root Cause:** PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): ILTexas Saginaw is not inclusive of all constituents in campus decision making **Root Cause:** System for increasing campus leadership not followed with consistency to increase participation and empowerment of staff.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root**

Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.

Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized): Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

We will have a learning community and atmosphere of collegiality. Our grade level teams plan together to work towards common goals. Our staff members are able to rely on each other for support; during the school day as well as afterschool professional development, suggestions and assistance.

Our parents work in partnership with teachers, by engaging in open communication through weekly newsletter, emails, and phone calls. PTO will assist in gaining parent involvement to assist in various volunteer opportunities.

PTO will organize events and fund raising activities throughout the school year with assistance from staff. The school partners with the PTO to organize major events such as Hispanic Heritage celebrations, Black History Month Presentation, Chinese New Year, National Neighborhood Night Out, and Spirit Nights. The PTO will also hold monthly meetings.

The student council, the voice of the students, will engage in monthly meetings with the principal for an open discussion about the school. These conversations allow the students to highlight the positive as well as identify areas of improvement within the school.

According to our campus survey, the majority of responders feel supported by their campus teams, administrators and coaches.

Perceptions Strengths

Our teachers, students, parents and community members work well to support the learning for all. Parents work in collaboration with the school community to support the efforts to ensure that every child reaches their full potential. We celebrate our student's academic success, character development, and putting "Others Before Self". We also recognize the staff in displaying the characteristics of putting "Others Before Self" as well. We recognize our volunteers through various activities throughout the year for example, certificate of appreciation, appreciation breakfast to recognize parents and other community members for their support of our students.

Teachers plan with their grade level teams. Teachers have dedicated DATA days every 6 weeks to review student levels and instructional needs. They also have extended time daily to meet with grade level team or partner teachers. Teachers have the support of partners and team members, Teachers plan lessons, activities, and assessments together as a team, Several GLAs/teachers have attended TEKS RS Training, Teachers have access to several online programs: Study Island, Reading A-Z, Accelerated Reader, Brain Pop, Measuring Up, etc. Teachers utilize Eduphoria. The school will have in place several vehicles to facilitate parent communication to include: Campus Leadership Newsletter, Curriculum Night, PTO monthly meetings, Family Home-school Spirit Nights, Parent Portal, Parent-Teacher Conferences, School/Grade level/Teacher websites, School Messenger.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): ILTexas Saginaw is not inclusive of all constituents in campus decision making **Root Cause:** System for increasing campus leadership not followed with consistency to increase participation and empowerment of staff.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades.

Root Cause 1: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into an alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers.

Root Cause 2: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics - School Processes & Programs - Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters.

Root Cause 3: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters.

Root Cause 4: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices.

Root Cause 5: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: ILTexas Saginaw is not inclusive of all constituents in campus decision making

Root Cause 6: System for increasing campus leadership not followed with consistency to increase participation and empowerment of staff.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs - Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Domain 1 - Student Achievement
- Student Progress Domain
- Domain 2 - Student Progress
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Domain 3 - Closing the Gaps
- Effective Schools Framework data
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
- Targeted support Identification data
- Accountability Distinction Designations
- Federal Report Card Data

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- 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 Success Initiative (SSI) data for Grades 5 and 8
- SSI: Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) accelerated reading assessment data for Grades 3-5 (TEA approved statewide license)
- SSI: Think Through Math assessment data for Grades 3-8 and Algebra I (TEA approved statewide license)
- Running Records results
- Observation Survey results
- Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) reading assessment data for Grades PK-2

Student Data: Student Groups

- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically Disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance, progress, and participation data
- 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
- EL/non-EL or LEP data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, gender, etc.
- Section 504 data
- Gifted and talented data

- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Mobility rate, including longitudinal 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
- TTESS 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

Goals

Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.





Performance Objective 1: Based on HB3 Board Goal requirement. The percent of 3rd grade students that score on grade level or above in Reading will increase from 42% to 47% by June 2022 using iStation Indicator Progress Monitor tool - ISIP. The percent of 3rd grade students that grow one grade level in Spanish Reading (Spanish ISIP) will increase from 30% to 48% by June 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: ISIP English and Spanish

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Bring in (or send our faculty/staff to) subject matter experts and consultants (to ILTexas or at a conference/Ed Service Center/Off campus) to help ILTexas teachers, administrators, and district support staff strengthen their ability to support all of our students, including our ESL, DLI and other programs that will increase student achievement, with particular attention to English learners and with focus on increasing the Meets Target goal on the STAAR Reading assessment</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Deputy Superintendent of Academics & Student Services, Director of EL K-12, Academic Directors, Instructional Technologist, Campus Principals, campus instructional coaches</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 4, 5 - Perceptions 2</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 263 - Title III</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Send campus (teachers/coaches/principals/assistant principals) and district staff to conferences (e.g. Title III Summit, La Cosecha, TESOL, TASA, Charter Summer Summit) to assist ILTexas teachers, administrators, and district support staff strengthen their ability to support our students, including and in particular our ESL, DLI and other programs that will increase student achievement of all students (particularly our special populations).</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of EL K-12, Deputy Superintendent of Academics & Student Services, Academic Directors, Instructional Technologist, Campus Principals, Campus textbook coordinators, campus instructional coaches, campus media specialists</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - 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 - Targeted Support Strategy</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 4, 5, 6 - Perceptions 2</p> <p>Funding Sources: PD through conferences - 263 - Title III</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Purchase supplemental technology (such as Chromebooks), instructional materials evaluation/assessment/data analysis resources (and subsequent related PD) and . This includes hardcopies as well as online tools/software to scaffold instruction (i.e. ,Study Island, Peoples Education-Measuring Up, Lead4ward data modules, All In Learning, Sped Evaluation kits, bilingual dictionaries, leveled readers etc). Purchase professional books for staff to increase their knowledge of DLI/ESL programs.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased Student Achievement. Build a foundation in reading and math.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Deputy Superintendent of Academics & Student Services, Academic Directors, Instructional Technologist, Campus Principals, Campus textbook coordinators, campus instructional coaches, campus media specialists</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 5, 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: All In Learning - 211 - Title 1-A, Technology and other instructional resources, Study Island, All In Learning - 263 - Title III</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 4: Provide enrichment summer school to English learners to develop and strengthen their knowledge base as well as their English language proficiency in all four domains.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: CAO, Director of EL K-12, Academic Directors, Instructional Technologist, Campus Principals, Campus textbook coordinators, campus instructional coaches, campus media specialists</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 5, 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: Summer enrichment - 263 - Title III</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
Strategy 5 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 5: Campuses that have newcomer ESL students will receive support in the form of professional learning opportunities for staff, supplemental resources for students, extending learning time for students, and parental engagement. Initiate community and parent communication. Conduct parent meetings and trainings to promote student growth. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Campus Improvement Plan are made available to parents.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Deputy Superintendent of Academics & Student Services, Director of EL K-12, Academic Directors, Instructional Technologist, Campus Principals, Campus textbook coordinators, campus instructional coaches, campus media specialists</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 5, 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: Resources - 263 - Title III</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.

Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Perceptions





Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 2: The percent of 2nd grade students that score on grade level or above in Reading will increase from 41% to 47% by June 2021 using iStation Indicator Progress Monitor tool - ISIP. The percent of 2nd grade students that grow one grade level in Spanish Reading (Spanish ISIP) will increase from 30% to 48% by June 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: ISIP (English and Spanish)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Provide PD and instructional resources to help language teachers deliver instruction in the target language</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement in Spanish and Chinese language</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, CIC, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 5, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Develop curriculum resources and lesson plans (including targeted plans to meet the needs of our special populations) during the school year and during the address high priority TEKS.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement, increased rigor, more closely aligned instruction.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal APs, GLAs, Dean, CIC</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 5, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. **Root Cause:** PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.

Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.





Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 3: The percent of 1st grade students that score on grade level or above in Reading will increase from 36% to 48% by June 2022 using iStation Indicator Progress Monitor tool - ISIP. The percent of 1st grade students that grow one grade level in Spanish Reading (Spanish ISIP) will increase from 30% to 48% by June 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: ISIP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: By the end of the first six weeks of the 2021-2022 school year, Tier 3 students will be receive targeted intervention for in reading during small group instruction.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 5</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:





Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>

Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 4: The percent of Kindergarten students that score on grade level or above in Reading will increase from 29% to 45% by June 2022 using iStation Indicator Progress Monitor tool - ISIP. The percent of Kindergarten students that grow one grade level in Spanish Reading (Spanish ISIP) will increase from 30% to 48% by June 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: ISIP (English & Spanish)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: By the end of the first six weeks of the 2021-2022 school year, Tier 3 students will be receive targeted intervention for in reading during small group instruction.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 5</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>





Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 5: The percent of English learners that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 34% (2019) to 39% by June 2022 considering also the COVID gap.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Reading, English EOC

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Bring in (or send our faculty/staff to) subject matter experts and consultants (to ILTexas or at a conference/Ed Service Center/Off campus) to assist campus teachers, administrators, and support staff to strengthen their ability to support all of our students, including our English learners, DLI, and other programs that will increase student achievement with particular attention to English learners and with focus on increasing the Meets Target goal on the STAAR Reading assessment.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement on the STAAR/EOC Meets level.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1, 4 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June

 No Progress
 Accomplished
 Continue/Modify
 Discontinue

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Perceptions





Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Goal 1: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Reading will increase from 43% to 48% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 6: By June 2022, EL students at ILTexas will increase the TELPAS performance level from 31% (2019) to, at least, 36% in 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 2021 TELPAS

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: All teachers of ELs know their students' English language proficiency as reflected in TELPAS and are using linguistic accommodations routinely to increase their students' English language proficiency.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in EL students' English proficiency level.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CIC</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 4, 5 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.

Perceptions





Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 1: The percent of 3rd grade students that score on grade level or above in math will increase from 12% to 30% by June 2022 using the MAP tool.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Develop/utilize curriculum resources and lesson plans (including targeted plans to meet the needs of our special populations) during the school year and during the address high priority TEKS.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement, increased rigor, more closely aligned instruction.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal APs, GLAs, CIC</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Math teachers for 5th grade will review MAP scores and responses after the BOY and MOY MAP test with the campus coaches and campus administrators and will develop reteach plan and small groups based on the data.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will understand the data from the MAP test and develop targeted lessons to address students proficiency gaps.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> No Progress</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Accomplished</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Continue/Modify</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Discontinue</div> </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p> <p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. **Root Cause:** PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.





Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 2: The percent of 2nd grade students that score on grade level or above in math will increase from 9% to 30% by June 2022 using the MAP tool.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Teachers will preview curriculum taught before every cycle as provided by the curriculum department. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers content knowledge and pedagogy will improve. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Math teachers will review MAP scores and responses after the BOY and MOY MAP test with the campus coaches and campus administrators and will develop reteach plan and small groups based on the data. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will understand the data from the MAP test and develop targeted lessons to address students proficiency gaps. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p> <p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. **Root Cause:** PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.





Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 3: The percent of 1st grade students that score on grade level or above in math will increase from 6% to 30% by June 2022 using the Imagine Math tool.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Imagine Math

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Teachers will preview curriculum taught before every cycle as provided by the curriculum department. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers content knowledge and pedagogy will improve. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, CICs, GLAs Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:





Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>

Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 4: The percent of K students that score on grade level or above in math will increase from 4% to 30% by June 2022 using the Imagine Math tool.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Imagine Math

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Teachers will preview curriculum taught before every cycle as provided by the curriculum department. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers content knowledge and pedagogy will improve. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>





Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 5: The percent of English learners that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Math will increase from 35% (2019) to 40% by June 2022 taking also into consideration the COVID gaps that need to be addressed.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Math

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Bring in (or send our faculty/staff to) subject matter experts and consultants (to ILTexas or at a conference/Ed Service Center/Off campus) to assist campus teachers, administrators, and support staff to strengthen their ability to support all of our students, including our English learners, DLI, and other programs that will increase student achievement with particular attention to English learners and with focus on increasing the Meets Target goal on the STAAR Reading assessment.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement on the STAAR/EOC Meets level.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 4, 6 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June

 No Progress
 Accomplished
 Continue/Modify
 Discontinue

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. **Root Cause:** Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.


Goal 2: The percent of students that score "Meets Grade Level" on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 15% to 30% by June 2022.


Performance Objective 6: By the end of the school year, ILTexas campuses identified as in need of comprehensive support will score a at least 60% on their Domain III from the current average of 30% for these campuses.


Targeted or ESF High Priority


Evaluation Data Sources: MAP, STAAR, Imagine Math

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Exit tickets will be given 3-5 times each week to gauge student mastery of weekly TEKS taught. Teachers will review data with CIC and administration during PLCs to develop a plan to reteach TEKS not mastered through mini-lesson or small group or tutoring.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 5, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June

 No Progress

 Accomplished

 Continue/Modify

 Discontinue

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:





Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>

Goal 3: The percent of students increasing at least one performance sub-level (low, mid, high) annually on the End of Year AAPPL or ACTFL assessment will increase from 50% to 70% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 1: Elementary DLI and Elementary FLES students will complete language performance assessments to demonstrate language proficiency as documented in their Seesaw language portfolio by the end of June 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: ACTFL

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Bring in (or send our faculty/staff to) subject matter experts and consultants (to ILTexas or at a conference/Ed Service Center/Off campus) to assist campus teachers, administrators, and support staff to strengthen their ability to support all of our students, including our English learners, DLI, and other programs.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement with particular attention to English learners and with focus on increasing the Meets Target goal on the STAAR Reading assessment</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 5, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:





Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>

Goal 3: The percent of students increasing at least one performance sub-level (low, mid, high) annually on the End of Year AAPPL or ACTFL assessment will increase from 50% to 70% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 2: Secondary LOTE classes students will complete language performance assessments to demonstrate language proficiency as documented in their Seesaw language portfolio by the end of June 2022.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: AAPPL

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Well developed plans with differentiation to address various language levels.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student engagement and academic progress in second language</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 5, 6</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 3: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 4: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 2: PD/PLC is not targeted toward data analysis, reteach, and school-wide instructional practices. Root Cause: PD/PLC is not followed up with support, check on implementation, and there is long time gaps between follow-up PD sessions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 5: Campus Reading STAAR scores were 10-12 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lack of consistency in implementation of balanced literacy and small group instruction.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 6: Campus Math STAAR scores were 10-30 percentage points below the state in categories of Approaches, Meets, and Masters. Root Cause: Lesson planning and data analysis did not happen consistently during PLC to ensure lessons were rigorous to address student needs.</p>





Goal 4: The percent of teachers retained annually will increase from 76% to 80% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 1: By June 2022, ILTexas will coordinate a frequent and robust professional development plan for mentor teachers and APs over mentor teachers with a 25% greater time for training than previous year.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Track Frequency of Scheduled trainings for Mentors and Mentee teachers
Track survey responses for ongoing Mentor sessions

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: New teachers and APs to IL Texas will be assigned a mentor teacher to provide professional support. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 80% or above of new teacher's response on climate survey will be that they feel supported to do their job successfully Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1, 4 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June

 0% No Progress
 100% Accomplished
 Continue/Modify
 Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 1: 27 teachers were lacking full certification in K-5 grades. Root Cause: Lack of incentive to pursue a teacher certification. Passing the state exams and getting into a alternative certification program. With dual language in grades K-5, there is a need for half the teachers to be bilingual Spanish and all others with ESL certification. Many of our teachers coming from outside the US have to pass certification here although they were certified in their own country.</p>

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Perceptions





Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. **Root Cause:** Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.

Goal 4: The percent of teachers retained annually will increase from 76% to 80% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 2: Human Resources department will develop and maintain robust onboarding procedures to ensure a supportive school environment(May 2022). The onboarding plan of action will discuss in depth; policies, procedures, and protocols to support teachers and staff.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: New teachers to IL Texas will be go through on-boarding to receive information during this process and on campus will be assigned a mentor teacher to provide professional support.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 80% or above of new teacher's response on climate survey will be that they feel supported to do their job successfully</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Dean, CICs, GLAs</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June





 No Progress
 Accomplished
 Continue/Modify
 Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Perceptions
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>

Goal 4: The percent of teachers retained annually will increase from 76% to 80% by June 2022.

Performance Objective 3: ILTexas comprehensive salary analysis to be completed by March 2022 will incentivize teacher and staff retention.





Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Human Resources department will utilize new compensation analysis to recruit, attract, and retain teachers and staff.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Recruit, support, retain teachers and staff.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Ex. Director of HR</p> <p>Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 4: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>
Perceptions
<p>Problem Statement 2: The campus is experiencing difficulty retaining teachers. High percentage of staff has 2 years, or less, as classroom teachers. Root Cause: Teachers and staff do not get paid equal to the surrounding ISD's. The teaching job market is competitive where ISD's are able to pay higher salaries.</p>

Goal 5: To improve the culture and climate of our campuses by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Performance Objective 1: The culture and climate of our campuses will improve with the help of subject matter experts and specialized programs/resources aimed at improving the social emotional health of our students with a focus on safety and security from 50% to 75% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Bring in subject matter experts (such as but not limited to AIM for Success) and purchase resources (such as but not limited to purchasing kits for counselors) aimed at improving school safety (physical safety, cybersecurity, interent safety and addressing the social emotional health of our students).	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	May	June
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Targeted Support Strategies

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	Bring in (or send our faculty/staff to) subject matter experts and consultants (to ILTexas or at a conference/Ed Service Center/Off campus) to help ILTexas teachers, administrators, and district support staff strengthen their ability to support all of our students, including our ESL, DLI and other programs that will increase student achievement, with particular attention to English learners and with focus on increasing the Meets Target goal on the STAAR Reading assessment
1	1	2	Send campus (teachers/coaches/principals/assistant principals) and district staff to conferences (e.g. Title III Summit, La Cosecha, TESOL, TASA, Charter Summer Summit) to assist ILTexas teachers, administrators, and district support staff strengthen their ability to support our students, including and in particular our ESL, DLI and other programs that will increase student achievement of all students (particularly our special populations).
1	1	3	Purchase supplemental technology (such as Chromebooks), instructional materials evaluation/assessment/data analysis resources (and subsequent related PD) and . This includes hardcopies as well as online tools/software to scaffold instruction (i.e. ,Study Island, Peoples Education-Measuring Up, Lead4ward data modules, All In Learning, Sped Evaluation kits, bilingual dictionaries, leveled readers etc). Purchase professional books for staff to increase their knowledge of DLI/ESL programs.
1	1	4	Provide enrichment summer school to English learners to develop and strengthen their knowledge base as well as their English language proficiency in all four domains.
1	1	5	Campuses that have newcomer ESL students will receive support in the form of professional learning opportunities for staff, supplemental resources for students, extending learning time for students, and parental engagement. Initiate community and parent communication. Conduct parent meetings and trainings to promote student growth. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Campus Improvement Plan are made available to parents.

Campus Funding Summary

211 - Title 1-A					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	3	All In Learning		\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
263 - Title III					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1			\$0.00
1	1	2	PD through conferences		\$0.00
1	1	3	Technology and other instructional resources, Study Island, All In Learning		\$0.00
1	1	4	Summer enrichment		\$0.00
1	1	5	Resources		\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Grand Total					\$0.00

Addendums