International Leadership of Texas

College Station Middle School

2023-2024 Campus Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

The mission of 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

ILTexas College Station Middle School will grow and nurture students while guiding them as they reach their academic capacity. While attending ILTexas College Station Middle School, students will build relationships and excel academically. At the same time, learners will develop a love for serving others and a desire to live a healthy lifestyle.

Value Statement

All students have value. All students have potential. All students have the right to high expectations, caring teachers and a loving learning environment. Our job is to receive students as they are, then move them forward as much as possible. School and parent collaboration is paramount.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

See Addendum

Demographics Strengths

We have a diverse population of learners on our campus with a growing number of ELLs. Our ELLs support the language growth of their peers, as our teachers intentiaonally create seating charts to encourage peer tutoring.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): We will need to continue to plan for the diverse population of students we receive as we have a high rate of mobility   **Root Cause:** Students are coming to us from over 20 campuses in the surrounding area. This creates inconsistency in their experience with languages, curriculum and expectations.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): There is inconsistency in student learning gaps and needs.   **Root Cause:** We are seeing some growth with our ELLs but will continue to focus our efforts here.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

See addendums

Student Learning Strengths

We did see some growth in TELPAS scores in our students grades 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): There is inconsistency in student learning gaps and needs.   **Root Cause:** We are seeing some growth with our ELLs but will continue to focus our efforts here.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): We will need to continue to plan for the diverse population of students we receive as we have a high rate of mobility   **Root Cause:** Students are coming to us from over 20 campuses in the surrounding area. This creates inconsistency in their experience with languages, curriculum and expectations.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): 65% of teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience, 97% of teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher, and our teachers have and average of about 3.6 years of experience.   **Root Cause:** Surrounding districts have a competitive salary, contracts, and benefits/insurance that makes hiring process challenging.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

International leadership of Texas College Station MS employs highly qualified staff in all areas. Teachers hold a bachelor's degree from an accredited university, furthermore bilingual and special education teachers are required to be fully certified by TEA. We aim to recruit teachers with diverse backgrounds and experiences to incorporate into the classroom. Teachers and staff are recruited throughout the US, Spain, China, and other countries. ILTexas recruitment efforts extend to multiple countries offering teachers J1 international visas. Our international educators provide students multicultural world experiences through learning. The recruitment incentives include stipends in the areas of math, science, bilingual, and special education. In addition, our goal is to attract and retain certified experienced educators to build a strong foundation at our lower grade levels. Our experienced educators have an opportunity to lead within their grade level and participate in our aspiring administrators academy. We strive to develop our educators and encourage them to transition into leadership roles. Staff retention is our highest priority and employees participate in extensive professional development sessions that provide ongoing guidance and support. The retention rate for 2019-2020 has steadily increased throughout the years. See addendum for additional data.

ILTexas CS curriculum is TEKS based and is required to follow a scope and sequence rooted in state standards. Teachers are required to use these resources to guide their planning, instruction and assessment. Planning, instruction and assessment willed be aligned - horizontally and vertically. Curriculum, instruction and assessment will be at the heart of all PLC meetings. Planning and instruction will be driven by and responsive to student data.

The school organizational structure provides support at many level for teachers, students and parents. Teachers have planning/meeting time built into their school day to meet and plan with grade level. Teachers also have dedicated data days built into the school year calendar. Professional development opportunities are also available to teachers. Each grade level has a grade level administrator (GLA) to oversee the grade and to support the teacher in the day to day operations. Each grade level has a teacher assistant.

Technology is the heartbeat of our campus - as exemplified during COVID-19 forcing remote learning, we were able to pivot and students continued learning virtually.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

As of last year: 65% of teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience, 97% of teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher, and our teachers have and average of about 3.6 years of experience.

See addendum related to Campus Staff Information for additional data.

Instruction will be driven by a range of data points Data days will allow for teachers to review and plan to be responsive to student data Two-way immersion program structure Daily PLC with each grade level team TEKS-based resources Academic tools, including Learning A-Z, STEMScopes, Leveled Reading, etc. Use of creativity in lesson design Pearson Envision is a useful tool, closely aligned to the TEKS Dual Language structure will improve student outcomes across languages and contents Chromebooks will allow teachers to support technological literacy and incorporate various medias into their instruction Students K-8 will utilize technology daily for their instruction and learning Texas A&M partnership with Dr. Wijekumar, ELA strategies. Further, we will be using the Dean and a staff of remediation teachers and instructional aides to focus on instructional GAPS created

during the global pandemic.

- Horizontal (grade level) PLC built into workday

- Teacher support structure - Grade Level Administ

SMART DISPLAY in all classrooms

Chromebook ratio 1:1 in Kindergarten to 8th Grade

Laptops for all teachers

Teachers utilize technology daily in their instruction.

rators, APs, Principal

- Regular updates and newsletters to parents and faculty/staff

- District calendar includes Data Dive Days

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 65% of teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience, 97% of teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher, and our teachers have and average of about 3.6 years of experience.   **Root Cause:** Surrounding districts have a competitive salary, contracts, and benefits/insurance that makes hiring process challenging.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): We will need to continue to plan for the diverse population of students we receive as we have a high rate of mobility   **Root Cause:** Students are coming to us from over 20 campuses in the surrounding area. This creates inconsistency in their experience with languages, curriculum and expectations.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): There is inconsistency in student learning gaps and needs.   **Root Cause:** We are seeing some growth with our ELLs but will continue to focus our efforts here.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

ILTexas College Station MS prides itself in a positive learning and working environment for students and staff. The culture of our campus is rooted in "what is best for students" as it relates to student academic achievement and safety. All decisions are based on what is best for the students and teachers, exhibiting our motto of Other's Before Self. Our goal as a campus 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 mind, body, and character. We continue to put relationships first, with our 51/49 motto, as instruction can only occur effectively when you have a connectiong with students, parents, teachers, and administrator.

ILTexas CSMS encourages parents via our extensive PTO, WATCH DOGS dads, and several volunteer initatives that are marketed through these vehicles. We have dozens of community partners ranging from resturants to local stores and businesses in our local community.

Perceptions Strengths

The culture of our campus is rooted in "what is best for students" as it relates to student academic achievement and safety. All decisions are based on what is best for the students and teachers, exhibiting our motto of Other's Before Self.

ILTexas CSES PTO is the top organization in our area that works hard to collaborate and raise funds to support our students and teachers.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Limited parents/community were involved in campus events   **Root Cause:** COVID-19 protocols did not allow for visitors or even volunteers at the school

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): 65% of teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience, 97% of teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher, and our teachers have and average of about 3.6 years of experience.   **Root Cause:** Surrounding districts have a competitive salary, contracts, and benefits/insurance that makes hiring process challenging.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: We will need to continue to plan for the diverse population of students we receive as we have a high rate of mobility

Root Cause 1: Students are coming to us from over 20 campuses in the surrounding area. This creates inconsistency in their experience with languages, curriculum and expectations.

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

Problem Statement 2: There is inconsistency in student learning gaps and needs.

Root Cause 2: We are seeing some growth with our ELLs but will continue to focus our efforts here.

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

Problem Statement 3: 65% of teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience, 97% of teachers have a bachelor's degree or higher, and our teachers have and average of about 3.6 years of experience.

Root Cause 3: Surrounding districts have a competitive salary, contracts, and benefits/insurance that makes hiring process challenging.

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

Problem Statement 4: Limited parents/community were involved in campus events

Root Cause 4: COVID-19 protocols did not allow for visitors or even volunteers at the school

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Perceptions

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 CCMR goals
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)

Accountability Data

- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR released test questions
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- ASPIRE
- Texas approved 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

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- School safety data

Employee Data

- Staff surveys and/or other feedback

Parent/Community Data

- Community surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data

Goals

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 30% of all ILTexas students will perform at the meets level of achievement on STAAR Reading/Language Arts and 25% of EB students will perform at the meets level of achievement on STAAR Reading/Language Arts.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Providing all teachers in Grades 6-8 with a resource binder aligned to TEKS/STAAR approved resources	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve student test scores and understanding of TEKS **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers/APs/GLAs **Title I:** 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math - **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Funding Sources:** Instructional Coaching - 211 - Title I School Improvement	**Nov**	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy 2 Details	**Reviews**			
Strategy 2: Providing all teachers in Grades 6-8 with a resource binder aligned to TELPAS to address ELL achievement gap	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve TELPAS growth scores, especially grade 4 to meet district goal of 33%	**Nov**	**Jan**	**May**	**June**

or greater
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers

Title I:
2.5
 - **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
 -
Funding Sources: Instructional Coaching - 211 - Title I School Improvement

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

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 2: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 30% of all ILTexas students will perform at the meets level of achievement on STAAR Math and 25% of EB students will perform at the meets level of achievement on STAAR Math.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Students will be taught using Carnegie Learning curriculum at a high level	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase test scores due to high rigor in curriculum	**Nov**	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Math Teachers 6-8 **Title I:** 2.4, 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math -				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide additional and focused Carnegie Learning training for new and existing teachers	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved teacher effectiveness	**Nov**	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Math Teachers Grades 6-8 **Title I:** 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math -				

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

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 3: The percent of graduates that demonstrate College, Career, and/or Military Readiness will increase from 74% to 77% by June 2024.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: SAT, AP, DUAL CREDIT, CTE

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Frequently communicate with our partners Aggieland High School and Texas A&M University to secure partnerships for our students. Provide parental support to parents by providing training and holding meetings that model best practices for parents in helping their child in being successful at school. Provide online access to CNA/CIP.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Informational meetings, assemblies, keynote speakers, and professional instructional partnerships in the classroom to help better prepare our students.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration/Counselors/Teachers
 	
    Title I:
    4.1, 4.2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide before school, during school, after school, and Saturday tutorials for students' opportunities for enrichment, remediation, and intervention. Provide instructional resources to increase student achievement such as: calculators, headphones, leveled readers, classroom novels, etc.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved Learning
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, and Teachers
 	
    Title I:
    2.4, 2.5, 2.6
    Funding Sources: - 211 - Title 1-A				

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

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 4: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 30% of all ILTexas students will perform at the meets level of achievement on STAAR Social Studies and 25% of EB students will perform at the meets level of achievement on STAAR Social Studies.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: We are currently at 25% of ILTexas College Station MS students who are performing at the meets level. To increase this to 30% or above, our campus will increase focus on the readiness standards through project based learning, and other hands on activities that are student-led by the end of the 2023-24 school year.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: This strategy will ensure that students internalize the concepts and are ready to answer STAAR/EOC questions aligned to the content. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers **Title I:** 2.5, 2.6 **- TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction				
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✕ Discontinue				

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 5: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 70% of ILTexas students will increase performance on traditionally low standards on 5th grade STAAR Science and 8th grade STAAR Science. 50% of ILTexas high school freshmen will increase performance on traditionally low standards on G9 Bio STAAR EOC

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: ILTexas College Station MS is currently performing at 38% of 5th Grade students at the Meets level in Science and at 50% of 8th Grade students at the Meets level in Science. For the 23-24 SY, our Dean of instruction and Instructional Coaches will be modeling exemplar lessons in the area of Science in these targeted grade levels. These lessons will include hands on labs to increase student understanding of Science concepts.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will better grasp the TEKS when they perform labs and experiment with their peers to problem solve and discover. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, Deans, ICs, and APs **Title I:** 2.5, 2.6 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools -				

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

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 6: By the end of the 23-24 school year, ILTexas students enrolled in the Special Education program will maintain a Meets achievement standard at a 9% rate for Math and a 10% rate for English Language Arts and Reading state assessments.

    Evaluation Data Sources: MAP, Interim assessments, STAAR

Strategy 1 Details			Reviews			

Strategy 1: Newly appointed Special Education Coordinator will oversee instruction, revisit and schedule ARDs, and regularly observe teaching and learning to maintain and grow our students classified in Special Education.
    Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students in SPED will get support from ILTexas CSMS staff in class, in resource setting, and via small group.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: SPED Coordinator
 	
    Title I:
2.4, 2.5
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
			Formative			**Summative**

			Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
0% No Progress		100% Accomplished		Continue/Modify		Discontinue

Goal 1: By the end of the 23-24 school year, 85% of ILTexas campuses will receive an overall rating of C or higher for their statewide accountability rating, an increase from 75% achieving a C or higher.

Performance Objective 7: By the end of the 23-24 school year, students' learning readiness indicator as measured by Rhithm, will increase 10% 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.

    Evaluation Data Sources: Rhithm Insight reports and assessments compared to 2021-2022 data.

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Bring in subject matter experts (such as but not limited to Youth Equipped to Succeed) and purchase resources (such as but not limit to SEL and mental health curriculum for counselors) aimed at improving school safety (physical safety, cybersecurity, internet safety and addressing the social emotional health of our students) to improve students' readiness to learn.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve students' learning readiness **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, AP, Counselors **Title I:** 2.5							
0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	Continue/Modify		Discontinue			

Goal 2: By the end of the 23-24 school year, at least 75% of students graduate meeting their language goals (students enrolled at ILTexas 7 years or more are at least at Intermediate or above), 95% of students will have completed their service hour requirements and 75 % of graduates will have met their Interactive Health Technology goals.

Performance Objective 1: By the end of 23-24 school year, at least 50% of 8th grade students who have been with ILTexas for more than 4 years will reach a Novice Mid proficiency in Chinese and Novice High in Spanish.

Evaluation Data Sources: AAPPL and ACTFL rating.

Strategy 1 Details			Reviews		
Strategy 1: Additional support through observation, feedback, and professional development from HQ on strategies to increase student growth in Chinese language through developing both K-5 instructors and MS LOTE instructors.		**Formative**			**Summative**
		Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Chinese teachers (K-5 and MS LOTE) and students will be proficient in teaching and learning respectively **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** HQ **Title I:** 2.4, 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **Funding Sources:** Instructional Resources - 211 - Title I School Improvement					

Strategy 2 Details			Reviews		
Strategy 2: Hire and be allotted an instructional coach to focus strictly on developing our LOTE program and assisting our students in Mastering Spanish and Chinese		**Formative**			**Summative**
		Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved language proficiency and increase in TELPAS scores and overall learning with our EB students **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Dean **Title I:** 2.4, 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Funding Sources:** Instructional Coaching - 211 - Title I School Improvement					

Strategy 3 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 3: Purchase additional headphones as an instructional resource for Middle School students to learn language other than English		**Formative**			**Summative**
		Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: To enhance LOTE instruction and have students acquire necessary skills in Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing in languages other than English. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers of MS **Title I:** 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Funding Sources:** - 211 - Title 1-A - 11 6399 00 ORG 3 30 850 - $2,499					

Strategy 4 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 4: Attend national conferences (TABE, La Cosecha) that support bi-lingual education and biliteracy with our students and encourage growth in our DLI teachers.		**Formative**			**Summative**
		Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, AP, teachers **Title I:** 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction					

Strategy 5 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 5: Utilize specific and focused observation feedback from a DLI instructional coach		**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact student learning through development of DLI teachers.		**Nov**	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, AP, IC, Dean					

Title I:
2.4
 - **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 5: Effective Instruction
Funding Sources: - 211 - Title I School Improvement

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

Goal 2: By the end of the 23-24 school year, at least 75% of students graduate meeting their language goals (students enrolled at ILTexas 7 years or more are at least at Intermediate or above), 95% of students will have completed their service hour requirements and 75 % of graduates will have met their Interactive Health Technology goals.

Performance Objective 2: By the end of 23-24 school year, at least 50% of 8th grade students who have been with ILTexas for more than 4 years will reach an Intermediate Low proficiency level in Chinese and Spanish.

    Evaluation Data Sources: AAPPL, ACTFL rating, and teacher created assessments.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will be provided additional teaching strategies by HQ and the LOTE department to effectively grow student's proficiency in Chinese and Spanish through the development of the K-5 teachers.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Chinese and Spanish teachers (K-5 and MS LOTE) will be proficient in teaching rigorous content for student growth and learning.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: HQ LOTE department, AP's and principals.
 	
    Title I:
2.4, 2.5
 - TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
    Funding Sources: Instructional Coaching - 211 - Title I School Improvement				

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

Goal 3: By the end of the 23-24 school year ILTexas will retain 75% of teachers, an increase from 70% achieved in the previous school year.

Performance Objective 1: By the End of 23-24 school year ILTexas will provide onboarding training for all new teachers in the classroom.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			**Summative**
Strategy 1: The grade level administrator will provide 1 on 1 support for new hires within their grade level to increase new hires understanding and implementation of the ILTexas systems.	**Nov**	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will stay employed at ILTexas due to better understanding of systems through increased communication. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** New teacher mentor, AP over new hires, and GLA **Title I:** 2.5, 2.6 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture				
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✖ Discontinue				

Goal 3: By the end of the 23-24 school year ILTexas will retain 75% of teachers, an increase from 70% achieved in the previous school year.

Performance Objective 2: We will increase the percent retention of our special education, math and reading teachers by 1% by the end of the 2023-24 school year.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: ILTexas College Station MS will increase teacher retention in the above areas by increasing observation feedback from various sources (IC, Dean, AP, and Principal) to support teacher growth	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Jan**	**May**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 1% or more of teachers in these high needs arenas will stay with the ILTexas charter. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** IC, Dean, AP, and Principal **Title I:** 2.5 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **Funding Sources:** Instructional Coach - 211 - Title I School Improvement				
0% No Progress　　100% Accomplished　　→ Continue/Modify　　✗ Discontinue				

Campus Funding Summary

211 - Title 1-A					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	3	2			$0.00
2	1	3		11 6399 00 ORG 3 30 850	$2,499.00
				Sub-Total	$2,499.00
211 - Title I School Improvement					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	1	Instructional Coaching		$0.00
1	1	2	Instructional Coaching		$0.00
2	1	1	Instructional Resources		$0.00
2	1	2	Instructional Coaching		$0.00
2	1	5			$0.00
2	2	1	Instructional Coaching		$0.00
3	2	1	Instructional Coach		$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00

Addendums

Campus : Iltexas College Station Middle

1820 N Glenville Dr Ste 100
Richardson, TX 75081
(979) 704-6027 Phone
(979) 704-5332 Fax

Administration ⓘ (2021 - 2022 Fall PEIMS file loaded)

Principal	Zachary Bolzan

School Population (2021 - 2022 Summer PEIMS file loaded 05/31/2022)

	Count	Percent
Student Total	**483**	**100%**
6th Grade	166	34.37%
7th Grade	166	34.37%
8th Grade	151	31.26%

Student Demographics (2021 - 2022 Summer PEIMS file loaded 05/31/2022)

	Count	Percent
Gender		
Female	290	60.04%
Male	193	39.96%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic-Latino	198	40.99%
Race		
American Indian - Alaskan Native	2	0.41%
Asian	25	5.18%
Black - African American	37	7.66%
Native Hawaiian - Pacific Islander	0	0.00%
White	193	39.96%
Two-or-More	28	5.80%

Special Services (2021 - 2022 Summer PEIMS file loaded 05/31/2022)

	Count	Percent
Instructional Settings		
Speech Therapy	12	2.48%
Homebound	0	0.00%
Hospital Class	0	0.00%
Resource Room	19	3.93%
VAC	0	0.00%
Off Home Campus	0	0.00%
State School	0	0.00%
Residential Care	0	0.00%
Self Contained	2	0.41%
Full-Time Early Childhood	0	0.00%
Mainstream	8	1.65%

Student by Program (2021 - 2022 Summer PEIMS file loaded 05/31/2022)

	Count	Percent
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	76	15.73%
Gifted and Talented	89	18.43%
Special Education (SPED)	35	7.25%
Title I Participation	483	100.00%
Pregnancy Related Services	0	0.00%
Career and Technical		
CTE V Code	0	0.00%
CTE Service ID	0	0.00%
CTE Auto Calculation	0	0.00%
Dyslexia		
Dyslexia Risk Code	0	0.00%
Dyslexia Services Code	24	4.97%
Economic Disadvantage		
Economic Disadvantage Total	207	42.86%
Free Meals	0	0.00%
Reduced-Price Meals	1	0.21%
Other Economic Disadvantage	206	42.65%
Homeless Statuses		
Homeless Status Total	0	0.00%
Shelter	0	0.00%
Doubled Up	0	0.00%
Unsheltered	0	0.00%

Other Student Information (2021 - 2022 Summer PEIMS file loaded 05/31/2022)

	Count	Percent
Title I Homeless	0	0.00%
Migrant	3	0.62%
Military Connected	34	7.04%
Foster Care	0	0.00%
Section 504	63	13.04%
Intervention Indicator	1	0.21%
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0.00%
IGC Reviewed	0	0.00%
Transfer In Students	0	0.00%

| Hotel/Motel | 0 | 0.00% |

Reporting

Performance Distribution, By Program: INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS (ILTEXAS), 2021-2022

Filtered By **Test Administrations:** All Test Administrations | **Sorted By:** Date Last Taken

STAAR Summative Mathematics

Grades Tested: **3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, EOC**

Tests Taken: **12.6K**   Date Last Taken: **05/20/2022**

	Percent	Count
	46%	5.8K
	31%	3.9K
	14%	1.7K
	10%	1.2K

STAAR Summative Reading

Grades Tested: **3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, EOC**

Tests Taken: **13.8K**   Date Last Taken: **05/20/2022**

	Percent	Count
	33%	4.6K
	24%	3.3K
	23%	3.2K
	20%	2.7K

STAAR Summative Social Studies

Grades Tested: **8, EOC**

Tests Taken: **2.5K**   Date Last Taken: **05/20/2022**

	Percent	Count
	39%	985
	27%	685
	16%	393
	18%	463

STAAR Summative Science

Grades Tested: **5, 8, EOC**

Tests Taken: **5K**   Date Last Taken: **05/20/2022**

	Percent	Count
	38%	1.9K
	30%	1.5K
	21%	1K
	12%	590

TELPAS Composite

Grades Tested: **KG, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12**

Tests Taken: **6.9K**   Date Last Taken: **04/01/2022**

	Percent	Count
	1%	45
	8%	520
	39%	2.7K
	39%	2.7K
	14%	985

TELPAS Alternate Composite

Grades Tested: **2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12**

Tests Taken: **22**   Date Last Taken: **03/31/2022**

	Percent	Count
	23%	5
	32%	7
	14%	3
	18%	4
	14%	3

Average Score and Performance Distribution, by Assessment:
INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS (ILTEXAS), 2021-2022

Filtered By **Campus:** All Campuses | **Test Administrations:** All Test Administrations
|

Assessment Name	Program	Test Grade	Test Administration	Student Count	Average Score	Performance Distribution	Date Last Taken
May 2022 STAAR Grade 3 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	3	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1837	1365	Percent: 51% 29% 12% 8% / Count: 928 529 226 154	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 7 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	7	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1699	1597	Percent: 52% 28% 12% 9% / Count: 877 469 206 147	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	8	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1434	1603	Percent: 49% 34% 14% 3% / Count: 696 486 207 45	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 6 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	6	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1905	1565	Percent: 43% 36% 15% 6% / Count: 819 689 277 120	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 4 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	4	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1822	1472	Percent: 53% 24% 11% 12% / Count: 962 441 207 212	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 5 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	5	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1853	1547	Percent: 41% 29% 17% 12% / Count: 764 546 322 221	05/19/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 4 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	4	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	31	1414	Percent: 71% 16% 13% / Count: 22 5 4	05/18/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 3 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	3	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	44	1305	Percent: 61% 32% 7% / Count: 27 14 3	05/12/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 5 Mathematics	STAAR Summative	5	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	27	1464	Percent: 67% 33% / Count: 18 9	05/12/2022
May 2022 STAAR Algebra I	STAAR Summative	EOC	STAAR EOC May 2022	1579	3902	Percent: 27% 36% 16% 21% / Count: 430 566 245 338	05/12/2022
December 2021 STAAR Algebra I	STAAR Summative	EOC	December 2021	363	3463	Percent: 63% 33% 3% 1% / Count: 229 118 11 5	12/14/2021

Average Score and Performance Distribution, by Assessment:
INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS (ILTEXAS), 2021-2022
Filtered By **Campus:** All Campuses | **Test Administrations:** All Test Administrations
|

Assessment Name	Program	Test Grade	Test Administration	Student Count	Average Score	Performance Distribution		Date Last Taken
May 2022 STAAR Grade 3 Reading	STAAR Summative	3	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1827	1410	Percent	34% 628 27% 486 18% 327 21% 386	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 7 Reading	STAAR Summative	7	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1844	1666	Percent Count	26% 475 24% 446 16% 300 34% 623	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Reading	STAAR Summative	8	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1434	1675	Percent Count	23% 336 32% 463 18% 264 26% 371	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 4 Reading	STAAR Summative	4	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1800	1502	Percent Count	34% 606 24% 435 21% 377 21% 382	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 5 Reading	STAAR Summative	5	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1845	1566	Percent Count	29% 528 25% 466 19% 346 27% 505	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 6 Reading	STAAR Summative	6	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1911	1546	Percent Count	44% 834 27% 524 16% 313 13% 240	05/19/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 5 Reading	STAAR Summative	5	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	37	1461	Percent Count	54% 20 30% 11 14% 5 3% 1	05/18/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 4 Reading	STAAR Summative	4	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	54	1364	Percent Count	67% 36 17% 9 9% 5 7% 4	05/18/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 3 Reading	STAAR Summative	3	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	52	1270	Percent Count	65% 34 15% 8 12% 6 8% 4	05/17/2022
April 2022 STAAR English II	STAAR Summative	EOC	STAAR EOC April 2022	1109	4082	Percent Count	26% 284 15% 164 53% 592 6% 69	04/08/2022
April 2022 STAAR English I	STAAR Summative	EOC	STAAR EOC April 2022	1459	3971	Percent Count	35% 517 17% 249 40% 579 8% 114	04/08/2022
December 2021 STAAR English II	STAAR Summative	EOC	December 2021	146	3555	Percent Count	74% 108 17% 25 8% 12 1% 1	12/10/2021
December 2021 STAAR English I	STAAR Summative	EOC	December 2021	300	3619	Percent Count	71% 213 19% 56 10% 29 1% 2	12/10/2021

Average Score and Performance Distribution, by Assessment:
INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS (ILTEXAS), 2021-2022
Filtered By **Campus:** All Campuses | **Test Administrations:** All Test Administrations
|

Assessment Name	Program	Test Grade	Test Administration	Student Count	Average Score	Performance Distribution	Date Last Taken
May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Science	STAAR Summative	8	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1707	3809	Percent / Count — 35% 594 / 31% 531 / 18% 315 / 16% 267	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Grade 5 Science	STAAR Summative	5	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1852	3635	Percent / Count — 47% 874 / 27% 507 / 15% 271 / 11% 200	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR Spanish Grade 5 Science	STAAR Summative	5	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	27	3181	Percent / Count — 93% 25 / 7% 2	05/17/2022
May 2022 STAAR Biology	STAAR Summative	EOC	STAAR EOC May 2022	1230	3942	Percent / Count — 22% 270 / 33% 404 / 35% 434 / 10% 122	05/12/2022
December 2021 STAAR Biology	STAAR Summative	EOC	December 2021	158	3492	Percent / Count — 66% 105 / 27% 43 / 6% 9 / 1% 1	12/16/2021

Average Score and Performance Distribution, by Assessment:
INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF TEXAS (ILTEXAS), 2021-2022
Filtered By **Campus:** All Campuses | **Test Administrations:** All Test Administrations
|

Assessment Name	Program	Test Grade	Test Administration	Student Count	Average Score	Performance Distribution	Date Last Taken
May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Social Studies	STAAR Summative	8	STAAR 3-8 May 2022	1706	3568	Percent: 53% 30% 9% 8% / Count: 901 506 155 144	05/20/2022
May 2022 STAAR U.S. History	STAAR Summative	EOC	STAAR EOC May 2022	772	4288	Percent: 7% 22% 30% 41% / Count: 56 168 230 318	05/12/2022
December 2021 STAAR U.S. History	STAAR Summative	EOC	December 2021	48	3587	Percent: 58% 23% 17% 2% / Count: 28 11 8 1	12/10/2021

Ranking	Campus	May 2022 STAAR Grade 3 Reading EOC Preli			
		Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets
	All Students	**1815**	**34.49%**	**65.51%**	**39.06%**
1	ILTexas Keller Elem	150	15.33%	84.67%	65.33%
2	**ILTexas Katy Elem**	**150**	**18.00%**	**82%**	**56%**
3	**ILTexas College Station Elem**	**149**	**21.48%**	**79%**	**53%**
4	**ILTexas Westpark Elem**	**140**	**22.14%**	**78%**	**61%**
5	ILTexas Garland Elem	121	28.10%	71.90%	40.50%
6	ILTexas Saginaw Elem	149	35.57%	64.43%	36.91%
7	ILTexas East Ft. Worth Elem	120	37.50%	62.50%	20.83%
8	ILTexas Grand Prairie Elem	149	39.60%	60.40%	30.87%
9	ILTexas Arlington Elem	128	44.53%	55.47%	26.56%
10	**ILTexas Windmill Lakes Elem**	**144**	**45.14%**	**55%**	**32%**
11	**ILTexas Orem Elem**	**148**	**45.95%**	**54%**	**26%**
12	ILTexas North Richland Hills Ele	141	48.94%	51.06%	26.95%
13	ILTexas Lancaster Elem	126	50.00%	50%	23.81%

Ranking	Campus	May 2022 STAAR Grade 3 Mathematics EOC P			
		Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets
	All Students	**1823**	**50.30%**	**49.70%**	**20.84%**
1	ILTexas Keller Elem	150	22.67%	77.33%	45.33%
2	**ILTexas College Station Elem**	**149**	**30.20%**	**70%**	**32%**
3	**ILTexas Katy Elem**	**150**	**35.33%**	**64.67%**	**28.67%**
4	**ILTexas Westpark Elem**	**142**	**40.14%**	**59.86%**	**33.10%**
5	ILTexas Saginaw Elem	149	45.64%	54.36%	20.13%
6	ILTexas Garland Elem	125	53.60%	46.40%	18.40%
7	ILTexas East Ft. Worth Elem	121	56.20%	43.80%	13.22%
8	ILTexas Grand Prairie Elem	150	56.67%	43.33%	18.67%
9	**ILTexas Windmill Lakes Elem**	**144**	**56.94%**	**43.06%**	**18.06%**
10	**ILTexas Orem Elem**	**148**	**57.43%**	**42.57%**	**10.81%**
11	ILTexas North Richland Hills Ele	141	63.12%	36.88%	13.48%
12	ILTexas Arlington Elem	128	69.53%	30.47%	7.81%
13	ILTexas Lancaster Elem	126	75.40%	25%	5.56%

Masters	Ranking	Campus	May 2022 STAAR Grade 4 Readi		
			Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches
21.10%		**All Students**	**1800**	**33.67%**	**66.33%**
40.67%	1	ILTexas Garland Elem	137	15.33%	84.67%
27.33%	**2**	**ILTexas Katy Elem**	**150**	**21.33%**	**79%**
36.24%	3	ILTexas Keller Elem	153	24.18%	75.82%
41.43%	**4**	**ILTexas College Station Elem**	**153**	**27.45%**	**73%**
17.36%	5	ILTexas Arlington Elem	123	27.64%	72.36%
16.78%	**6**	**ILTexas Westpark Elem**	**142**	**30.28%**	**70%**
9.17%	7	ILTexas Grand Prairie Elem	151	32.45%	
16.78%	8	ILTexas Saginaw Elem	142	36.62%	63.38%
13.28%	9	ILTexas Lancaster Elem	134	39.55%	60.45%
13.89%	10	ILTexas East Ft. Worth Elem	109	43.12%	56.88%
11.49%	**11**	**ILTexas Windmill Lakes Elem**	**132**	**44.70%**	**55%**
12.77%	12	ILTexas North Richland Hills Ele	144	47.22%	52.78%
11.90%	**13**	**ILTexas Orem Elem**	**130**	**53.08%**	**47%**

Masters	Ranking	Campus	May 2022 STAAR Grade 4 Mathem		
			Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches
8.45%		**All Students**	**1822**	**52.80%**	**47.20%**
25.33%	1	ILTexas Keller Elem	153	16.34%	83.66%
17.45%	**2**	**ILTexas College Station Elem**	**153**	**35.95%**	**64.05%**
8.67%	3	ILTexas Garland Elem	155	43.23%	56.77%
14.08%	**4**	**ILTexas Westpark Elem**	**142**	**43.66%**	**56.34%**
5.37%	5	ILTexas Saginaw Elem	142	52.11%	47.89%
8.00%	6	ILTexas Grand Prairie Elem	150	53.33%	46.67%
4.13%	**7**	**ILTexas Katy Elem**	**151**	**53.64%**	**46.36%**
5.33%	8	ILTexas Arlington Elem	123	54.47%	45.53%
6.25%	9	ILTexas Lancaster Elem	137	61.31%	38.69%
4.05%	10	ILTexas North Richland Hills Ele	143	67.13%	32.87%
3.55%	**11**	**ILTexas Windmill Lakes Elem**	**132**	**68.18%**	**31.82%**
4.69%	**12**	**ILTexas Orem Elem**	**130**	**68.46%**	**31.54%**
0.00%	13	ILTexas East Ft. Worth Elem	111	82.88%	17%

ng EOC Preliminary / May 2022 STAAR G...

Meets	Masters	Ranking	Campus	Total Students	Did Not Meet
42.17%	**21.22%**		**All Students**	**1845**	**28.62%**
57.66%	31.39%	1	ILTexas Keller Elem	155	10.97%
55%	**31.33%**	2	ILTexas Garland Elem	141	12.77%
53.59%	26.14%	**3**	**ILTexas Katy Elem**	**149**	**16.78%**
52%	**30.07%**	**4**	**ILTexas Westpark Elem**	**142**	**22.54%**
47.15%	25.20%	**5**	**ILTexas College Station Elem**	**140**	**23.57%**
47%	**26.76%**	6	ILTexas Arlington Elem	128	27.34%
43.05%	21.19%	7	ILTexas Saginaw Elem	151	31.79%
42.25%	23.24%	8	ILTexas Lancaster Elem	134	33.58%
27.61%	12.69%	9	ILTexas North Richland Hills Ele	139	34.53%
32.11%	11.01%	10	ILTexas Grand Prairie Elem	150	35.33%
30%	**10.61%**	**11**	**ILTexas Windmill Lakes Elem**	**139**	**39.57%**
31.25%	13.19%	12	ILTexas East Ft. Worth Elem	132	42.42%
23%	**7.69%**	**13**	**ILTexas Orem Elem**	**145**	**43.45%**

natics EOC Preliminary / May 2022 STAAR Grad...

Meets	Masters	Ranking	Campus	Total Students	Did Not Meet
23.00%	**11.64%**		**All Students**	**1853**	**41.23%**
60.78%	35.95%	1	ILTexas Keller Elem	155	12.90%
39.87%	**23.53%**	**2**	**ILTexas Katy Elem**	**150**	**27.33%**
29.68%	16.13%	3	ILTexas Garland Elem	149	27.52%
35.92%	**21.13%**	**4**	**ILTexas College Station Elem**	**140**	**27.86%**
21.83%	8.45%	**5**	**ILTexas Westpark Elem**	**142**	**34.51%**
21.33%	6.67%	6	ILTexas Grand Prairie Elem	150	42.00%
18.54%	**9.27%**	7	ILTexas Lancaster Elem	134	43.28%
17.89%	8.94%	8	ILTexas Saginaw Elem	151	44.37%
11.68%	3.65%	**9**	**ILTexas Windmill Lakes Elem**	**139**	**48.92%**
8.39%	3.50%	10	ILTexas North Richland Hills Ele	139	49.64%
9.85%	**3.79%**	**11**	**ILTexas Orem Elem**	**145**	**59.31%**
7.69%	**2.31%**	12	ILTexas Arlington Elem	128	59.38%
3.60%	0.90%	13	ILTexas East Ft. Worth Elem	131	66.41%

| Grade 5 Reading EOC Preliminary | | | Ranking | Campus | May 20 |
Approaches	Meets	Masters			Total Students
71.38%	46.12%	27.37%		All Students	1910
89.03%	68.39%	41.94%	1	ILTexas Keller MS	146
87%	67%	41.84%	2	ILTexas College Station MS	147
83%	64%	42.95%	3	ILTexas Katy MS	148
77%	58%	38.03%	4	ILTexas Garland MS	150
76%	51%	40.00%	5	ILTexas Westpark MS	145
72.66%	42.97%	20.31%	6	ILTexas Grand Prairie MS	152
68.21%	39.07%	22.52%	7	ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS	154
66.42%	41.04%	18.66%	8	ILTexas Saginaw MS	136
65.47%	35.25%	17.99%	9	ILTexas Lancaster MS	151
64.67%	39.33%	21.33%	10	ILTexas Arlington MS	136
60%	29%	15.83%	11	ILTexas North Richland Hills M	154
57.58%	28.79%	14.39%	12	ILTexas Orem MS	145
57%	31%	16.55%	13	ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS	146

| Grade 5 Mathematics EOC Preliminary | | | Ranking | Campus | May 2022 |
Approaches	Meets	Masters			Total Students
58.77%	29.30%	11.93%		All Students	1904
87.10%	56.13%	27.74%	1	ILTexas College Station MS	139
72.67%	40.67%	14.67%	2	ILTexas Katy MS	149
72.48%	30.20%	11.41%	3	ILTexas Keller MS	146
72.14%	41.43%	22.14%	4	ILTexas Garland MS	150
65.49%	45.07%	20.42%	5	ILTexas Saginaw MS	135
58.00%	28.00%	12.67%	6	ILTexas Westpark MS	145
56.72%	23.88%	6.72%	7	ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS	154
55.63%	25.83%	7.95%	8	ILTexas North Richland Hills M	154
51.08%	20.14%	7.91%	9	ILTexas Grand Prairie MS	153
50.36%	19.42%	7.19%	10	ILTexas Lancaster MS	151
40.69%	14.48%	5.52%	11	ILTexas Arlington MS	136
40.62%	18.75%	4.69%	12	ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS	145
34%	11.45%	3.05%	13	ILTexas Orem MS	145

22 STAAR Grade 6 Reading EOC Preliminary				Ranking	Campus
Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters		
43.66%	56.34%	28.90%	12.51%		All Students
21.92%	78.08%	48.63%	23.29%	1	ILTexas Westpark MS
31.29%	69%	44%	25.17%	2	ILTexas Keller MS
31.76%	68%	34%	12.84%	3	ILTexas College Station MS
35.33%	64.67%	42.00%	17.33%	4	ILTexas Katy MS
42.07%	58%	31%	13.10%	5	ILTexas Grand Prairie MS
45.39%	54.61%	21.05%	9.87%	6	ILTexas Arlington MS
46.10%	54%	25%	6.49%	7	ILTexas Garland MS
47.79%	52.21%	23.53%	8.82%	8	ILTexas North Richland Hills M
49.01%	50.99%	22.52%	11.92%	9	ILTexas Saginaw MS
50.74%	49.26%	22.79%	8.82%	10	ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS
51.95%	48.05%	24.03%	10.39%	11	ILTexas Lancaster MS
57.24%	43%	23%	8.28%	12	ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS
57.53%	42%	13.70%	6.16%	13	ILTexas Orem MS

STAAR Grade 6 Mathematics EOC Preliminary				Ranking	Campus
Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters		
43.01%	56.99%	20.85%	6.30%		All Students
20.86%	79.14%	48.20%	16.55%	1	ILTexas Keller MS
21.48%	78.52%	32.21%	11.41%	2	ILTexas Grand Prairie MS
24.66%	75.34%	45.89%	15.07%	3	ILTexas Katy MS
28.67%	71.33%	38.00%	11.33%	4	ILTexas Westpark MS
35.56%	64.44%	22.22%	5.93%	5	ILTexas Garland MS
37.93%	62.07%	23.45%	8.28%	6	ILTexas Saginaw MS
42.86%	57.14%	8.44%	0.65%	7	ILTexas North Richland Hills M
51.30%	48.70%	12.34%	3.25%	8	ILTexas Arlington MS
52.29%	47.71%	10.46%	3.92%	9	ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS
54.97%	45.03%	9.27%	2.65%	10	ILTexas Orem MS
59.56%	40.44%	10.29%	0.74%	11	ILTexas Lancaster MS
61.38%	38.62%	4.83%	0.69%	12	ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS
67.59%	32.41%	6.21%	0.69%	13	ILTexas College Station MS

May 2022 STAAR Grade 7 Reading EOC Preliminary					Ranking
Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters	
1844	25.76%	74.24%	50.05%	33.79%	
143	13.29%	87%	59%	42.66%	1
140	14.29%	86%	72%	52.14%	2
145	17.93%	82%	64%	47.59%	3
152	18.42%	82%	57%	40.13%	4
156	19.23%	80.77%	55.13%	38.46%	5
123	21.95%	78.05%	52.85%	38.21%	6
147	24.49%	75.51%	55.10%	38.10%	7
141	26.95%	73.05%	48.23%	34.04%	8
134	32.84%	67.16%	47.76%	29.85%	9
143	34.27%	66%	38%	20.28%	10
142	35.21%	64.79%	29.58%	19.01%	11
128	37.50%	62.50%	39.06%	18.75%	12
150	40.00%	60%	31%	18.67%	13

May 2022 STAAR Grade 7 Mathematics EOC Preliminary					Ranking
Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters	
1699	51.62%	48.38%	20.78%	8.65%	
140	20.71%	79.29%	50.71%	25.00%	1
156	37.82%	62%	27%	11.54%	2
152	41.45%	58.55%	28.95%	13.82%	3
143	46.15%	53.85%	25.87%	14.69%	4
147	46.26%	53.74%	27.21%	14.29%	5
135	52.59%	47.41%	17.04%	7.41%	6
141	56.74%	43.26%	19.15%	5.67%	7
123	56.91%	43.09%	13.01%	1.63%	8
143	60.84%	39.16%	11.89%	4.20%	9
149	62.42%	37.58%	11.41%	0.67%	10
142	69.72%	30.28%	5.63%	0.70%	11
128	71.88%	28.12%	8.59%	2.34%	12
-	-	-	-	-	13

Campus	May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Reading EOC Preliminary				
	Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters
All Students	**1434**	**23.43%**	**76.57%**	**44.28%**	**25.87%**
ILTexas College Station MS	**135**	**8.89%**	**91%**	**62%**	**51.11%**
ILTexas Keller MS	87	10.34%	90%	53%	35.63%
ILTexas Garland MS	131	13.74%	86.26%	49.62%	32.82%
ILTexas Katy MS	**100**	**15.00%**	**85%**	**49%**	**24.00%**
ILTexas Grand Prairie MS	130	19.23%	80.77%	48.46%	29.23%
ILTexas Arlington MS	88	20.45%	79.55%	51.14%	32.95%
ILTexas Lancaster MS	111	21.62%	78.38%	40.54%	21.62%
ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS	**123**	**28.46%**	**72%**	**43%**	**21.14%**
ILTexas Orem MS	**126**	**30.95%**	**69%**	**28%**	**9.52%**
ILTexas Saginaw MS	105	32.38%	67.62%	39.05%	22.86%
ILTexas Westpark MS	**122**	**33.61%**	**66%**	**39%**	**19.67%**
ILTexas North Richland Hills M	100	36.00%	64.00%	36.00%	14.00%
ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS	76	39.47%	61%	32.89%	17.11%

Campus	May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Mathematics EOC Preliminary				
	Total Students	Did Not Meet	Approaches	Meets	Masters
All Students	**1434**	**48.54%**	**51.46%**	**17.57%**	**3.14%**
ILTexas Garland MS	128	26.56%	73.44%	33.59%	6.25%
ILTexas Keller MS	88	27.27%	73%	34%	1.14%
ILTexas Katy MS	**98**	**32.65%**	**67.35%**	**35.71%**	**11.22%**
ILTexas College Station MS	**152**	**36.84%**	**63.16%**	**32.24%**	**11.84%**
ILTexas Arlington MS	98	37.76%	62.24%	27.55%	4.08%
ILTexas Saginaw MS	104	47.12%	52.88%	14.42%	0.00%
ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS	82	54.88%	45.12%	6.10%	0.00%
ILTexas Grand Prairie MS	124	55.65%	44.35%	11.29%	0.81%
ILTexas Lancaster MS	101	57.43%	42.57%	9.90%	0.00%
ILTexas Westpark MS	**120**	**57.50%**	**42.50%**	**5.83%**	**0.83%**
ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS	**118**	**58.47%**	**41.53%**	**9.32%**	**0.85%**
ILTexas Orem MS	**117**	**66.67%**	**33.33%**	**4.27%**	**0.00%**
ILTexas North Richland Hills M	104	73.08%	27%	0.96%	0.00%

	Total Students	Scale Score	May 2022 STAAR Grade
			District Defined Field A
ILTexas Arlington MS	121	4095	
ILTexas College Station MS	135	4027	
ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS	96	3686	
ILTexas Garland MS	157	3917	
ILTexas Grand Prairie MS	147	3804	
ILTexas Katy MS	125	4026	
ILTexas Keller MS	133	4212	
ILTexas Lancaster MS	119	3596	
ILTexas North Richland Hills MS	127	3577	
ILTexas Orem MS	141	3569	
ILTexas Saginaw MS	126	3593	
ILTexas Westpark MS	145	3771	
ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS	135	3608	

e 8 Science EOC Preliminary

District Defined Field B	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Total Students	Scale Score
	81.82%	54.55%	28.93%	110	3720
	77.04%	50.37%	28.89%	96	4064
	60.42%	30.21%	8.33%	64	3526
	73.89%	40.13%	20.38%	101	3692
	62.58%	31.97%	12.24%	88	3648
	76%	48.80%	27.20%	67	4058
	82.71%	57.89%	38.35%	96	4057
	56.30%	24.37%	7.56%	49	3541
	50.39%	17.32%	4.72%	81	3860
	51.06%	16.31%	5.67%	123	3371
	54.76%	19.05%	7.14%	89	3704
	67.59%	31.72%	8.28%	125	3817
	51.11%	20%	4.44%	121	3500

May 2021 STAAR Science, Grade 8				
District Defined Field A	District Defined Field B	Approaches	Meets	Masters
		54.55%	31.82%	17.27%
		83.33%	52.08%	26.04%
		50%	15.62%	4.69%
		55.45%	30.69%	16.83%
		61.36%	28.41%	12.50%
		83.58%	52.24%	23.88%
		78.12%	48.96%	31.25%
		46.94%	10.20%	6.12%
		66.67%	44.44%	22.22%
		31.71%	13.01%	0.81%
		64.04%	29.21%	6.74%
		62.40%	36%	15.20%
		47.11%	17.36%	5.79%

	Total Students	Scale Score	District Defined Field A
			May 2022 STAAR Grade
ILTexas Arlington MS	123	1682	
Asian	3	1701	
Black/African American	30	1702	
Hispanic	82	1663	
Two or More Races	3	1695	
White	5	1856	
ILTexas College Station MS	**145**	**1705**	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	**1**	**1826**	
Asian	**10**	**1731**	
Black/African American	**12**	**1681**	
Hispanic	**54**	**1678**	
Two or More Races	**7**	**1852**	
White	**61**	**1710**	
ILTexas East Ft. Worth MS	128	1610	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	1621	
Asian	2	1769	
Black/African American	61	1589	
Hispanic	51	1607	
Two or More Races	8	1674	
White	4	1749	
ILTexas Garland MS	147	1687	
Asian	10	1717	
Black/African American	28	1715	
Hispanic	95	1673	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	1826	
Two or More Races	4	1767	
White	9	1662	
ILTexas Grand Prairie MS	156	1690	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	-	-	-
Asian	7	1807	
Black/African American	43	1720	
Hispanic	98	1667	
Two or More Races	4	1777	
White	4	1646	
ILTexas Katy MS	152	1688	
Asian	8	1748	
Black/African American	31	1699	
Hispanic	92	1670	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	1771	
Two or More Races	6	1766	
White	14	1707	
ILTexas Keller MS	140	1736	
Asian	19	1812	

Black/African American	24	1735	
Hispanic	57	1693	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	1611	
Two or More Races	9	1777	
White	30	1764	
ILTexas Lancaster MS	142	1605	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	-	-	-
Asian	1	1387	
Black/African American	69	1610	
Hispanic	70	1598	
Two or More Races	2	1769	
White	-	-	-
ILTexas North Richland Hills MS	141	1668	
Asian	6	1696	
Black/African American	26	1671	
Hispanic	89	1658	
Two or More Races	9	1647	
White	11	1748	
ILTexas Orem MS	150	1604	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	1913	
Black/African American	69	1581	
Hispanic	76	1618	
Two or More Races	3	1655	
White	1	1695	
ILTexas Saginaw MS	134	1647	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	-	-	-
Asian	4	1837	
Black/African American	16	1617	
Hispanic	90	1628	
Two or More Races	5	1779	
White	19	1687	
ILTexas Westpark MS	143	1703	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	1497	
Asian	6	1769	
Black/African American	72	1747	
Hispanic	60	1656	
Two or More Races	2	1630	
White	1	1501	
ILTexas Windmill Lakes MS	143	1633	
Asian	-	-	-
Black/African American	13	1701	
Hispanic	127	1627	
White	3	1629	

District Defined Field B	Approaches	Meets	Masters	Total Students	Scale Score
	78.05%	52.85%	38.21%	98	1627
	100%	66.67%	33.33%	2	1801
	86.67%	63.33%	36.67%	15	1583
	73.17%	45.12%	35.37%	75	1628
	66.67%	66.67%	33.33%	4	1623
	100%	100%	100%	2	1750
	82.07%	**64.14%**	**47.59%**	**152**	**1653**
	100%	**100%**	**100%**	**1**	**1766**
	90%	**80%**	**60%**	**15**	**1804**
	75%	**66.67%**	**50%**	**13**	**1658**
	77.78%	**53.70%**	**37.04%**	**54**	**1606**
	100%	**100%**	**85.71%**	**7**	**1748**
	83.61%	**65.57%**	**49.18%**	**62**	**1643**
	62.50%	39.06%	18.75%	82	1579
	50%	50%	50%	1	1499
	100%	100%	50%	-	-
	54.10%	36.07%	19.67%	25	1559
	64.71%	35.29%	13.73%	53	1584
	87.50%	62.50%	25%	2	1678
	100%	50%	25%	1	1749
	75.51%	55.10%	38.10%	128	1652
	80%	70%	40%	7	1730
	82.14%	64.29%	39.29%	13	1676
	72.63%	50.53%	38.95%	92	1642
	100%	100%	100%	-	-
	100%	100%	25%	3	1672
	66.67%	33.33%	22.22%	13	1654
	80.77%	55.13%	38.46%	124	1588
-	-	-	-	1	1640
	100%	85.71%	71.43%	-	-
	86.05%	67.44%	46.51%	23	1565
	76.53%	45.92%	32.65%	95	1592
	100%	100%	50%	2	1700
	75%	50%	25%	3	1552
	81.58%	57.24%	40.13%	98	1663
	100%	75%	62.50%	2	1922
	83.87%	58.06%	38.71%	21	1620
	78.26%	53.26%	34.78%	66	1673
	100%	100%	100%	1	1553
	100%	50%	50%	4	1609
	78.57%	71.43%	57.14%	4	1662
	85.71%	72.14%	52.14%	88	1651
	94.74%	89.47%	73.68%	9	1675

91.67%	79.17%	50%	26	1643
75.44%	59.65%	40.35%	36	1649
100%	0%	0%	-	-
88.89%	66.67%	66.67%	4	1654
93.33%	83.33%	60%	13	1653
64.79%	29.58%	19.01%	101	1563
-	-	-	1	1513
0%	0%	0%	1	1595
69.57%	34.78%	17.39%	43	1535
60%	22.86%	20%	51	1579
100%	100%	50%	4	1645
-	-	-	1	1603
73.05%	48.23%	34.04%	104	1548
83.33%	66.67%	33.33%	2	1609
76.92%	53.85%	30.77%	11	1505
71.91%	44.94%	31.46%	80	1556
44.44%	33.33%	33.33%	3	1539
90.91%	63.64%	63.64%	8	1517
60%	30.67%	18.67%	117	1550
100%	100%	100%	1	1468
52.17%	23.19%	14.49%	62	1544
64.47%	35.53%	22.37%	45	1560
100%	33.33%	0%	8	1567
100%	100%	0%	1	1451
67.16%	47.76%	29.85%	104	1594
-	-	-	1	1553
100%	75%	75%	3	1592
68.75%	37.50%	25%	22	1587
62.22%	44.44%	22.22%	69	1594
100%	80%	80%	-	-
73.68%	57.89%	47.37%	9	1616
86.71%	59.44%	42.66%	120	1583
50%	0%	0%	-	-
100%	66.67%	50%	2	1622
95.83%	70.83%	52.78%	49	1583
78.33%	48.33%	31.67%	62	1580
50%	50%	50%	5	1623
0%	0%	0%	2	1560
65.73%	38.46%	20.28%	118	1581
-	-	-	1	1540
69.23%	61.54%	30.77%	17	1610
66.14%	36.22%	18.90%	100	1576
33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	-	-

May 2022 STAAR Grade 8 Mathematics EOC Preliminary				
District Defined Field A	**District Defined Field B**	**Approaches**	**Meets**	**Masters**
		62.24%	27.55%	4.08%
		100%	100%	50%
		53.33%	13.33%	0%
		61.33%	28%	4%
		75%	0%	0%
		100%	100%	0%
		63.16%	**32.24%**	**11.84%**
		100%	**100%**	**0%**
		93.33%	**80%**	**46.67%**
		61.54%	**38.46%**	**15.38%**
		51.85%	**18.52%**	**3.70%**
		85.71%	**57.14%**	**28.57%**
		62.90%	**27.42%**	**8.06%**
		45.12%	6.10%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
-	-	-	-	-
		28%	8%	0%
		50.94%	3.77%	0%
		100%	0%	0%
		100%	100%	0%
		73.44%	33.59%	6.25%
		85.71%	57.14%	14.29%
		76.92%	53.85%	7.69%
		72.83%	28.26%	4.35%
-	-	-	-	-
		66.67%	66.67%	0%
		69.23%	30.77%	15.38%
		44.35%	11.29%	0.81%
		100%	0%	0%
-	-	-	-	-
		43.48%	4.35%	0%
		43.16%	12.63%	1.05%
		100%	50%	0%
		33.33%	0%	0%
		67.35%	35.71%	11.22%
		100%	100%	100%
		52.38%	23.81%	0%
		69.70%	40.91%	13.64%
		0%	0%	0%
		75%	0%	0%
		100%	25%	0%
		72.73%	34.09%	1.14%
		88.89%	44.44%	0%

		69.23%	30.77%	0%
		72.22%	33.33%	2.78%
-	-	-	-	-
		75%	25%	0%
		69.23%	38.46%	0%
		42.57%	9.90%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
		100%	0%	0%
		39.53%	6.98%	0%
		41.18%	11.76%	0%
		75%	25%	0%
		100%	0%	0%
		26.92%	0.96%	0%
		50%	0%	0%
		9.09%	0%	0%
		30%	1.25%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
		25%	0%	0%
		33.33%	4.27%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
		33.87%	0%	0%
		33.33%	8.89%	0%
		37.50%	12.50%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
		52.88%	14.42%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
		33.33%	33.33%	0%
		50%	18.18%	0%
		53.62%	11.59%	0%
-	-	-	-	-
		66.67%	22.22%	0%
		42.50%	5.83%	0.83%
-	-	-	-	-
		50%	0%	0%
		46.94%	6.12%	2.04%
		37.10%	4.84%	0%
		80%	20%	0%
		0%	0%	0%
		41.53%	9.32%	0.85%
		0%	0%	0%
		64.71%	11.76%	0%
		38%	9%	1%
-	-	-	-	-

College Station K-8

Campus Improvement Committee

June 2, 2022

AGENDA

- Welcome
- Purpose of CIP
- Campus Planning
  - Middle School
    - Review
    - Campus Improvement Plan
    - Reviewed and Updated Goals
    - Performance Objectives and Strategies
  - Elementary School
    - Review
    - Campus Improvement Plan
    - Reviewed and Updated Goals
    - Performance Objectives and Strategies
- Q & A
- Next Meeting
  - June 9th 10:00 am

College Station K-8

Campus Improvement Committee

July 2,2022

2:00 PM

Minutes

- **Welcome –** Principal Bolzan

Topic	Admin in Charge
Elementary School Review	Zach Bolzan
Campus Improvement Plan	Amanda Krueger
Review and Updated Goals	Erin Sparks
Performance Objectives	Zach Bolzan
Middle School Review	Zach Bolzan
Campus Improvement Plan	Mary Kelley
Review and Updated Goals	Erin Sparks
Performance Objectives	Zach Bolzan

- **Q & A-** Principal Bolzan
- **Next Meeting-**July 9th, 2022

College Station K-8

Campus Improvement Committee

July 9th, 2022

-Sign in Sheet-

Printed Name	Signature	Email	Staff/Parent/Community
ZACH BOLZAN	ZGBS	ZBOLZAN@iltexas.org	Principal
AMANDA KRUEGER	AmandaKrueger	akrueger@iltexas.org	Assistant Principal
Erin Whitney Sparks	EWhitney Sparks	esparks@iltexas.org	Dean of Instruction
Mary Michelle Kelley	M. Kelley	mkelley@ILTexas.org	Assistant Principal

College Station K-8

Campus Improvement Committee

July 2,2022

-Sign in Sheet-

Printed Name	Signature	Email	Staff/Parent/Community
ZACHARY BOLZAN	ZgBg	ZBOLZAN@iltexas.org	Principal
AMANDA KRUEGER	Amanda Krueger	akrueger@iltexas.org	Assistant Principal
Erin Whitney Sparks	EWhitney Spark	esparks@iltexas.org	Dean of Instruction
Mary Michelle Kelley	M.Kelley	mkelley@ILTexas.org	Assistant Principal