Midland Independent School District

DeZavala Elementary

2023-2024 Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

The De Zavala staff, parents, and community are committed to providing an educational experience that will create lifelong learners.

Vision

We, the staff at De Zavala Elementary, will do "Whatever It Takes" to help each learner succeed while they are entrusted to us.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

We are a neighborhood school where the stakeholders attended this school and their parents attended this school as well.We are predominately Hispanic. Our school demographics are as shown in the table below:

Ethnicity		
Hispanic-Latino	639	91%
Race		
Asian	8	1%
Black - African American	32	5%
White	22	3%
Student Programs		
Dyslexia	7	1%
Gifted and Talented	0	0%
Regional Day School Program for the Deaf	0	0%
Section 504	5	1%
Special Education (SPED)	46	7%
Bilingual/ESL		
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	265	38%
Bilingual	179	25%
English as a Second Language (ESL)	81	12%
Student Indicators		
At-Risk	486	69%
Foster Care	2	0%
IEP Continue	0	0%
Immigrant	35	5%
Intervention Indicator	122	17%

Ethnicity		
Migrant	2	0%
Military Connected	7	1%
Economic Disadvantage		
Economic Disadvantage Total	604	86%
Free Meals	550	78%
Reduced-Price Meals	50	7%
Other Economic Disadvantage	4	1%

Office Discipline Referrals				
	Total Office discipline referrals	**Unique Students**	**Total Students**	**% of students with Office discipline referrals**
ALL	271	96	721	13%
SPED	29	13	73	18%
General Ed	242	83	648	13%

Teacher Demographics:

African American: 9.2%

Hispanic: 54.4%

White: 36.3%

Teacher years of Experience:

Beginning Teachers: 8.8%

1-5 Years Experience: 34.4%

6-10 Years Experience: 10.2%

11-20 Years Experience: 32.8%

21-30 Years Experience: 10.7%

Over 30 Years Experience: 3.1%

Demographics Strengths

Based on the 2021-2022 Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR), 56.8% of teachers have 6 or more years of experience.

6-10 Years Experience: 10.2%

11-20 Years Experience: 32.8%

21-30 Years Experience: 10.7%

Over 30 Years Experience: 3.1%

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): In the case of demographic problems, 43.2% of teachers have 0-5 years of experience.   **Root Cause:** The root cause is the growth and progress of teacher efficacy through training and retention of teachers at De Zavala. This is seen in the 2021-2022 TAPR on teacher demographics.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Chronic absenteeism is at 26.7% at De Zavala. African Americans are at 28%, Hispanics at 26.8%, and Special Education Students at 19.6%.
Root Cause: The root cause is seen where in the 2022-2023 school year, Skyward Report Manager shows that 141 students from grades KG-6th grade had 10 or more unexcused absences.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Student achievement is taken from the Spring MAP Growth Reports.

Math:

DEZAVALA ELEMENTARY

Grade	Median Percentile	Achievement Percentiles	SPRING 2022-2023 ACHIEVEMEN
K	42nd	27%	23%
Grade 1	37th	34%	23%
Grade 2	34th	38%	19%
Grade 3	53rd	27% — 9%	24%
Grade 4	55th	21% — 16%	18%
Grade 5	27th	40%	20%
Grade 6	33rd	37%	19%

Percentiles Key: ● 1st to 20th ● 21st to 40th ● 41st to 60th ● 61st to 80th ● >80th

Reading:

DEZAVALA ELEMENTARY

Grade	Median Percentile	Achievement Percentiles	SPRING 2022-2023 ACHIEVEMENT
K	40th	16%	36%
Grade 1	19th	51%	
Grade 2	16th	55%	
Grade 3	29th	45%	1
Grade 4	46th	23%	18%
Grade 5	47th	15%	26%
Grade 6	24th	45%	

Percentiles Key: ● 1st to 20th ● 21st to 40th ● 41st to 60th ● 61st to 80th ● >80th

Student Learning Strengths

Student learning strengths and trends are seen in the Spring 2023 MAP Growth Reports.

Math: De Zavala shows strengths in Numerical Representation and Relationships across most grade levels.

Reading: De Zavala shows strengths in knowing and understanding Author's Purpose and Craft across most grade levels.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): In the area of NWEA MAP Math, De Zavala students show a weakness in Geometry and Measurement and Computation and Algebraic Relationships.   **Root Cause:** Grade 2: 53% of students were low on geometry and measurement. Grade 3: 35% of students were low on numerical representation and relationships. Grade 4: 29% of students were low on geometry and measurement Grade 5: 47% of students were low on geometry and measurement Grade 6: 38% of students were low on geometry and measurement

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): In the area of NWEA MAP Reading, De Zavala students show a weakness in foundational language skills for primary grades and multiple genres for intermediate grades.   **Root Cause:** 2nd Grade: 55% of students are low on all categories (Author's purpose and craft, multiple genres, foundational language skills: Vocabulary) 3rd Grade: 46% of students are low on author's purpose and craft 4th Grade: 23% of students are low on foundational language skills: vocabulary 5th Grade: 28% of students are low on multiple genres 6th Grade: 46% of students are low on multiple genres

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

De Zavala is creating a master schedule to allow PLC time for teachers during the school day. This will be approved by the leadership team in order to best facilitate teacher growth, planning, and support.

Option 1:

	PK	Kinder	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Specials	Sped
7:30 - 7:45	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
7:45 - 8:00	P.E. with TA	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	
8:00-8:15	P.E. with TA	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	
8:15-8:30	P.E. with TA	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	Possible RTI/PLC	
8:30-8:45						Specials				
8:45-9:00						Specials				
9:00-9:15						Specials				
9:15-9:30					Specials					
9:30-9:45					Specials					
9:45-10:00	Recess				Specials					
10:00-10:15	Recess						Specials			
10:15-10:30	Lunch		Recess				Specials			
10:30-10:45	Lunch	Lunch	Recess				Specials			
10:45-11:00		Lunch	Lunch						Specials Lunch	
11:00-11:15		Recess	Lunch	Lunch					Specials Lunch	
11:15-11:30		Recess		Lunch				Specials		
11:30-11:45				Recess	Lunch			Specials		
11:45-12:00				Recess	Lunch			Specials		
12:00-12:15				Specials	Recess	Lunch				
12:15-12:30				Specials	Recess	Lunch				
12:30-12:45				Specials		Recess	Lunch			
12:45-1:00			Specials			Recess	Lunch			

	PK	Kinder	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Specials	Sped
1:00-1:15			Specials				Recess	Lunch		
1:15-1:30			Specials				Recess	Lunch		
1:30-1:45		Specials						Recess		
1:45-2:00		Specials						Recess		
2:00-2:15		Specials								
2:15-2:30									Specials Conference.	
2:30-2:45									Specials Conference.	
2:45-3:00									Specials Conference.	
3:00-3:30										
3:30-4:00										

Option 2:

	PK	Kinder	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Specials	Sped
7:30 - 7:45	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast	Breakfast		
7:45 - 8:00	P.E. with TA								Specials Conference.	
8:00-8:15	P.E. with TA								Specials Conference.	
8:15-8:30	P.E. with TA								Specials Conference.	
8:30-8:45						Specials				
8:45-9:00						Specials				
9:00-9:15						Specials				
9:15-9:30					Specials					
9:30-9:45					Specials					
9:45-10:00	Recess				Specials					
10:00-10:15	Recess						Specials			
10:15-10:30	Lunch		Recess				Specials			

		PK	Kinder	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	Specials	Sped
10:30-10:45		Lunch	Lunch	Recess				Specials			
10:45-11:00			Lunch	Lunch						Specials Lunch	
11:00-11:15			Recess	Lunch	Lunch					Specials Lunch	
11:15-11:30			Recess		Lunch				Specials		
11:30-11:45					Recess	Lunch			Specials		
11:45-12:00					Recess	Lunch			Specials		
12:00-12:15					Specials	Recess	Lunch				
12:15-12:30					Specials	Recess	Lunch				
12:30-12:45					Specials		Recess	Lunch			
12:45-1:00				Specials			Recess	Lunch			
1:00-1:15				Specials				Recess	Lunch		
1:15-1:30				Specials				Recess	Lunch		
1:30-1:45			Specials						Recess		
1:45-2:00			Specials						Recess		
2:00-2:15			Specials								
2:15-2:30			Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	
2:30-2:45			Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	
2:45-3:00			Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	Possible RTI/ PLC	
3:00-3:30											
3:30-4:00											

School Processes & Programs Strengths

The new master schedule will address transitions, instructional time, and professional learning communities for primary and intermediate grade levels. The biggest strength is that a PLC time will be implemented during the school day so teachers can focus on lesson planning, intervention/ enrichment, and data driven instruction.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1: Even though the master schedule does addresses a PLC time reserved during the school day, there is a concern of not having enough staff members to provide coverage to teachers for PLC. **Root Cause:** The root causes include resignations and having vacancies on the campus that need to be filled.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus. **Root Cause:** Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments. **Root Cause:** Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): The campus has implemented Amplify and Eureka as High quality instructional materials, but it still resulted in low campus performance in reading and math. **Root Cause:** There are no systems or protocols in place to monitor the internalization of HQIM. No exemplars of student work and exit tickets were created by teachers to show there was preparation for the lesson.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

The 2022-2023 School Quality Survey for De Zavala show as an overall comparison by respondent type. The question asked in the survey: How would you rate the overall quality of the education at this campus?

Parents/ Guardians: Excellent 48%, Good 31%, Fair 14%, Poor 7%

Campus Based Staff: Excellent 13%, Good 44%, Fair 38%, Poor 6%

Students Grades 6-12: Excellent 26%, Good 40%, Fair 29%, Poor 5%

Students Grades 3-5: Excellent 43%, Good 39%, Fair 16%, Poor 3%

Perceptions Strengths

The 2022-2023 School Quality Survey shows that the majority of parents and students rate the overall quality of education of De Zavala as excellent and good.

<u>**Campus Strengths from Parent Perceptions:**</u>

86% of parents/guardians feel staff members and families treat each other with respect.

84% of parents/guardians feel this school is a supportive place for students to learn.

84% of parents/guardians feel staff members treat students with respect.

81% of parents/guardians feel teachers clearly explain learning standards and expectations to all students.

81% of parents/guardians feel teachers give helpful feedback about student work.

<u>**Campus Strengths from Campus Staff and Student Perceptions:**</u>

All school staff members are aware of the safety and security procedures: Campus Staff 97% and Students 92%

There is a teacher, counselor, or other staff member to whom a student can go for help with a school problem: Campus Staff 94% and Students 87%

There is a teacher, counselor, or other staff member to whom a student can go for help with a technology problem: Campus Staff 88% and Students 88%

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Campus staff, students, and parents feel the principal and assistant principal do not clearly communicate the school's goals for the upcoming school year.   **Root Cause:** Based on the 2022-2023 School Quality Survey, Parents/ Guardians and Campus staff both feel information about district programs and opportunities are not shared in a timely manner and no opportunities for input are provided.

Problem Statement 2: Campus staff, students, and parents feel discipline is not enforced fairly for all students. **Root Cause:** The 2022-2023 School Quality Survey shows that parents feel disciplinary actions should only be provided to students that deserve to get in trouble. There is a disagreement to provide negative consequences to a whole group rather than an individual. Campus staff feel that administrators and staff need to model and implement behavioral expectations.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Campus staff and students feel students do not treat staff members with respect. **Root Cause:** Discipline records taken from Skyward Report Manager for the 2022-2023 year show the top disciplinary offenses include disruptive behavior and profanity. In many cases these behaviors are geared toward campus staff. The report shows there are students with repetitive offenses.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Chronic absenteeism is at 26.7% at De Zavala. African Americans are at 28%, Hispanics at 26.8%, and Special Education Students at 19.6%.

Root Cause 1: The root cause is seen where in the 2022-2023 school year, Skyward Report Manager shows that 141 students from grades KG-6th grade had 10 or more unexcused absences.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus.

Root Cause 2: Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.

Root Cause 3: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: In the case of demographic problems, 43.2% of teachers have 0-5 years of experience.

Root Cause 4: The root cause is the growth and progress of teacher efficacy through training and retention of teachers at De Zavala. This is seen in the 2021-2022 TAPR on teacher demographics.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 5: The campus has implemented Amplify and Eureka as High quality instructional materials, but it still resulted in low campus performance in reading and math.

Root Cause 5: There are no systems or protocols in place to monitor the internalization of HQIM. No exemplars of student work and exit tickets were created by teachers to show there was preparation for the lesson.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: In the area of NWEA MAP Math, De Zavala students show a weakness in Geometry and Measurement and Computation and Algebraic Relationships.

Root Cause 6: Grade 2: 53% of students were low on geometry and measurement. Grade 3: 35% of students were low on numerical representation and relationships. Grade 4: 29% of students were low on geometry and measurement Grade 5: 47% of students were low on geometry and measurement Grade 6: 38% of students were low on geometry and measurement

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 7: In the area of NWEA MAP Reading, De Zavala students show a weakness in foundational language skills for primary grades and multiple genres for intermediate grades.

Root Cause 7: 2nd Grade: 55% of students are low on all categories (Author's purpose and craft, multiple genres, foundational language skills: Vocabulary) 3rd Grade: 46% of students are low on author's purpose and craft 4th Grade: 23% of students are low on foundational language skills: vocabulary 5th Grade: 28% of students are low on multiple genres 6th Grade: 46% of students are low on multiple genres

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 8: Campus staff and students feel students do not treat staff members with respect.

Root Cause 8: Discipline records taken from Skyward Report Manager for the 2022-2023 year show the top disciplinary offenses include disruptive behavior and profanity. In many cases these behaviors are geared toward campus staff. The report shows there are students with repetitive offenses.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 9: Campus staff, students, and parents feel the principal and assistant principal do not clearly communicate the school's goals for the upcoming school year.

Root Cause 9: Based on the 2022-2023 School Quality Survey, Parents/ Guardians and Campus staff both feel information about district programs and opportunities are not shared in a timely manner and no opportunities for input are provided.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: Perceptions

Goals

Goal 1: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading STAAR assessment will increase from 36% to 44% by SY 2024 (Baseline: SY 2021 36%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 32% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2021 32%)

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of Pre-Kindergarten students on track to develop understanding on a standards-based phonological awareness assessment will be 82% or above by the end of school year 2024

    Evaluation Data Sources: BOY, MOY, and EOY CLI

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Campus instructional leaders will provide training and support so that teachers consistently implement research based best practices for delivering rigorous instruction in any content.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and campus leaders will use a framework for instruction that contains high leverage practices relevant in any content (independent practice, monitoring student work, strategies that place cognitive lift on students such as wait time, encouraging discourse, and requiring evidence to support claims). CLI data will result in standards based phonological awareness to be at 82% or above by the end of school year 2024.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators and Pre-Kindergarten Teachers
 	
    TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
    Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders have clear, written, and transparent roles and responsibilities, and core leadership tasks are scheduled on weekly calendars (observations, debriefs, team meetings).	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators and Multi classroom leaders will comprehend their list of responsibilities, including teachers assigned for supervision. Weekly calendars show scheduled time for observations/ feedback of classroom instruction, PLCs, and key data meetings. CLI data will result in standards based phonological awareness to be at 82% or above by the end of school year 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators and Pre-Kindergarten Teachers **Title I:** 2.4, 2.6 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2 **Funding Sources:** Professional Salaries - 211 Title 1 - $74,703.50, Para-Professional Salaries - 211 Title 1 - $120,000				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Campus clearly outlines purpose of each assessment, when it is administered and how results are used to support student learning.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Formative assessments will be used to measure progress towards mastery of specific grade level standard(s) and support instructional decision making in alignment with the curriculum design. CLI data will result in standards based phonological awareness to be at 82% or above by the end of school year 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administrators and Pre-Kinder Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Teachers and classroom instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and classroom instructional facilitators will acquire instant data from student work. Impact: Student misunderstandings will be corrected immediately based on exit tickets and independent practice. Students that understood the concepts will be pushed to a higher rigor of practice. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators and MCLs. **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 5 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 5: Campus leaders will provide coaching and support of teachers is informed by data, including an analysis of student work samples to assess the level of rigor and the impact of instruction.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will learn how to create exemplar student work that helps establish an understanding of what is expected for students to master the concepts being taught. Impact: Teachers and instructional facilitators will analyze student work samples to see where misconceptions arise based on the exemplar work. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators, MCLs, Teachers, Instructional Facilitators **Title I:** 2.4, 2.6 - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2, 3, 4 **Funding Sources:** Professional Salaries (MCL) - 211 Title 1 - $74,703.50				

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus.   **Root Cause**: Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.
Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.   **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 4: The campus has implemented Amplify and Eureka as High quality instructional materials, but it still resulted in low campus performance in reading and math.   **Root Cause**: There are no systems or protocols in place to monitor the internalization of HQIM. No exemplars of student work and exit tickets were created by teachers to show there was preparation for the lesson.

Goal 1: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading STAAR assessment will increase from 36% to 44% by SY 2024 (Baseline: SY 2021 36%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 32% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2021 32%)

Performance Objective 2: The percentage of Kindergarten-2nd grade students who meet or exceed their individual growth goals in reading as measured by NWEA MAP will increase from 30% to 60% by the end of school year 2024.

Evaluation Data Sources: BOY, MOY, and EOY MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Instructional staff and administrators will recognize when weaknesses found in student MAP based on the growth reports such as the learning continuum, class breakdown by RIT or Achievement, and Achievement Status and Growth Summary. These three reports provide strengths and weaknesses based on student growth and progress in MAP. Most of the reports suggest which student expectation needs to be instructed in order to intervene or enrich student learning.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Developing an intervention or enrichment plan based on these reports will result in 60% of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth goals in reading as measured by NWEA MAP by the end of school year 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, instructional facilitators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and campus administrators. **Title I:** 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - **Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 3 **Funding Sources:** Extra Duty Pay and Tutorials - 211 Title 1 - $40,500				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders use consistent written protocols and processes to lead their department, grade level teams, or other areas of responsibility.	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Lead team members use agendas and tracking tools for their instructional responsibilities including observation/feedback cycles, PLCs, and data meetings. This will result in all teachers knowing individual student data and all instructional leaders to know teacher data. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administrators and Multi classroom leaders **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Campus leaders will provide resources, training, and support for teachers to implement adopted instructional materials through internalization protocols, teacher planning time, and monitoring the rigor of taught lessons.	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Teachers will be prepared to instruct students by studying and understanding the concepts presented in the students. Teachers will adapt the lesson in order to best serve students based on their current levels of learning. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators and MCLs. **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 4				

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

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: In the area of NWEA MAP Reading, De Zavala students show a weakness in foundational language skills for primary grades and multiple genres for intermediate grades.   **Root Cause**: 2nd Grade: 55% of students are low on all categories (Author's purpose and craft, multiple genres, foundational language skills: Vocabulary) 3rd Grade: 46% of students are low on author's purpose and craft 4th Grade: 23% of students are low on foundational language skills: vocabulary 5th Grade: 28% of students are low on multiple genres 6th Grade: 46% of students are low on multiple genres

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments. **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Problem Statement 4: The campus has implemented Amplify and Eureka as High quality instructional materials, but it still resulted in low campus performance in reading and math. **Root Cause**: There are no systems or protocols in place to monitor the internalization of HQIM. No exemplars of student work and exit tickets were created by teachers to show there was preparation for the lesson.

Goal 1: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading STAAR assessment will increase from 36% to 44% by SY 2024 (Baseline: SY 2021 36%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 32% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2021 32%)

Performance Objective 3: The percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level or above on a STAAR aligned district reading assessment will increase from 26% to 36% by the end of school year 2024.

    Evaluation Data Sources: District Reading Assessments and Interim STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers and classroom instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and instructional facilitators will know student data and learn how to anticipate student errors before instructing new concepts. In addition, teachers will learn how to aggressively monitor independent practice and exit tickets in order to quickly assess and create a plan to correct student misconceptions and fill student gaps. Impact: 3rd grade students scoring at the Meets grade level or above on STAAR reading will increase from 26% to 36% by the end of school year 2024.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administrators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Teachers.
 	
    TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments
 - **Targeted Support Strategy**
    Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders meet weekly to focus on student progress and formative data.	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Lead team meetings include written agendas, recorded meeting minutes and next steps captured along with follow-up techniques, with an emphasis on data analysis and progress monitoring. Impact: 3rd grade students scoring at the Meets grade level or above on STAAR reading will increase from 26% to 36% by the end of school year 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administrators and Multi classroom leaders **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2	**Nov**	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished ➡ Continue/Modify ✖ Discontinue				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus.   **Root Cause**: Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.
Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.   **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Goal 1: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading STAAR assessment will increase from 36% to 44% by SY 2024 (Baseline: SY 2021 36%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 32% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2021 32%)

Performance Objective 4: The percentage of Pre-Kindergarten students on track to develop understanding on a math standards-based math assessment will be 92% or above by the end of May 2024.

    Evaluation Data Sources: BOY, MOY, and EOY CLI

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Campus instructional leaders will provide training and support so that teachers consistently implement research based best practices for delivering rigorous instruction in any content.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and campus leaders will use a framework for instruction that contains high leverage practices relevant in any content (independent practice, monitoring student work, strategies that place cognitive lift on students such as wait time, encouraging discourse, and requiring evidence to support claims).   Impact: CLI results will show that students on track to develop understanding on a math standards-based math assessment will be 92% or above by the end of May 2024.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators and Pre-Kindergarten Teachers
 	
    TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
    Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders have clear, written, and transparent roles and responsibilities, and core leadership tasks are scheduled on weekly calendars (observations, debriefs, team meetings).	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus administrators and Multi classroom leaders will comprehend their list of responsibilities, including teachers assigned for supervision. Weekly calendars show scheduled time for observations/ feedback of classroom instruction, PLCs, and key data meetings. Impact: CLI results will show that students on track to develop understanding on a math standards-based math assessment will be 92% or above by the end of May 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators and Pre-Kindergarten Teachers **Title I:** 2.4, 2.6 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2 **Funding Sources:** Professional Salaries MCL - 211 Title 1 - $74,703.50, Para-Professional (Reach Associate) Salary - 211 Title 1 - $120,000				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Campus clearly outlines purpose of each assessment, when it is administered and how results are used to support student learning.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Formative assessments will be used to measure progress towards mastery of specific grade level standard(s) and support instructional decision making in alignment with the curriculum design. Impact: CLI results will show that students on track to develop understanding on a math standards-based math assessment will be 92% or above by the end of May 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators and Pre-Kindergarten Teachers **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

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

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus. **Root Cause**: Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.

Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments. **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Goal 1: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading STAAR assessment will increase from 36% to 44% by SY 2024 (Baseline: SY 2021 36%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 32% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2021 32%)

Performance Objective 5: The percentage of Kindergarten-2nd grade students who meet or exceed their individual growth goals in math as measured by NWEA MAP will increase from 36% to 60% by the end of school year 2024.

    Evaluation Data Sources: BOY, MOY, and EOY MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Instructional staff and administrators will recognize when weaknesses found in student MAP based on the growth reports such as the learning continuum, class breakdown by RIT or Achievement, and Achievement Status and Growth Summary. These three reports provide strengths and weaknesses based on student growth and progress in MAP. Most of the reports suggest which student expectation needs to be instructed in order to intervene or enrich student learning.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Developing an intervention or enrichment plan based on these reports will result in 60% of students meeting or exceeding their individual growth goals in reading as measured by NWEA MAP by the end of school year 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, instructional facilitators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Campus Administrators. **Title I:** 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **- Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 3 **Funding Sources:** Extra Duty Pay and Tutorials - 211 Title 1 - $40,500				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders use consistent written protocols and processes to lead their department, grade level teams, or other areas of responsibility.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Lead team members use agendas and tracking tools for their instructional responsibilities including observation/feedback cycles, PLCs, and data meetings. This will result in all teachers knowing individual student data and all instructional leaders to know teacher data. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administrators and Multi classroom leaders **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

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

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: In the area of NWEA MAP Math, De Zavala students show a weakness in Geometry and Measurement and Computation and Algebraic Relationships. **Root Cause**: Grade 2: 53% of students were low on geometry and measurement. Grade 3: 35% of students were low on numerical representation and relationships. Grade 4: 29% of students were low on geometry and measurement Grade 5: 47% of students were low on geometry and measurement Grade 6: 38% of students were low on geometry and measurement

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments. **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Goal 1: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading STAAR assessment will increase from 36% to 44% by SY 2024 (Baseline: SY 2021 36%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 32% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2021 32%)

Performance Objective 6: The percentage of 3rd grade students who demonstrate grade level mastery by scoring at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above on a STAAR aligned district math assessment will increase from 35% to 40% by the end of school year 2024.

    Evaluation Data Sources: District Math Assessments and Interim STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers and campus instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and instructional facilitators will know student data and learn how to anticipate student errors before instructing new concepts. In addition, teachers will learn how to aggressively monitor independent practice and exit tickets in order to quickly assess and create a plan to quickly correct student misconceptions and fill student gaps. Impact: 3rd grade students taking STAAR Math will score at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above will increase from 35% to 40% by the end of school year 2024.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administrators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Teachers.
 	
     TEA Priorities:
 Improve low-performing schools
  - ESF Levers:
 Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments
     Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders meet weekly to focus on student progress and formative data.	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Lead team meetings include written agendas, recorded meeting minutes and next steps captured along with follow-up techniques, with an emphasis on data analysis and progress monitoring. Impact: 3rd grade students taking STAAR Math will score at the Meets Grade Level Performance or above will increase from 35% to 40% by the end of school year 2024. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Teachers. **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2	**Nov**	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

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

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus.   **Root Cause**: Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.
Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.   **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Goal 2: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or accelerate their Reading STAAR Progress Measure will increase from 55% to 70% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2019 55%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or exceed their Math STAAR Progress Measure will increase from 55% to 70% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2019 55%)

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or exceed their Reading STAAR Progress Measure on a STAAR aligned district formative assessment will increase from 59% to 70% by the end of school year 2024.

    Evaluation Data Sources: District Reading Assessments and Interim STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers and campus instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and instructional facilitators will know student data and learn how to anticipate student errors before instructing new concepts. In addition, teachers will learn how to aggressively monitor independent practice and exit tickets in order to quickly assess and create a plan to quickly correct student misconceptions and fill student gaps. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Teachers. **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments - **Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus leaders will provide resources, training, and support for teachers to implement adopted instructional materials through internalization protocols, teacher planning time, and monitoring the rigor of taught lessons.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: The percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or exceed their Reading STAAR Progress Measure on a STAAR aligned district formative assessment will increase from 59% to 70% by the end of school year 2024.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators and Multi classroom leaders
 	
     TEA Priorities:
 Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
  - **ESF Levers:**
 Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments
     Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: High-quality instructional materials are consistently used across classrooms, including resources intentionally designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities and English learners, along with other student groups with diverse needs.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Teachers will use the high quality instructional materials as a resource to create plans to best support students with learning disabilities based on their level of learning. Emergent bilingual students will receive support by making language connections between lessons as they transition between English and Spanish.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Special Education Teachers, and Emergent Bilingual Teachers
 	
     TEA Priorities:
 Improve low-performing schools
  - **ESF Levers:**
 Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments
     Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4				

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.   **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: The campus has implemented Amplify and Eureka as High quality instructional materials, but it still resulted in low campus performance in reading and math.   **Root Cause**: There are no systems or protocols in place to monitor the internalization of HQIM. No exemplars of student work and exit tickets were created by teachers to show there was preparation for the lesson.

Goal 2: Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or accelerate their Reading STAAR Progress Measure will increase from 55% to 70% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2019 55%)

Through the Student Experience, Growing & Developing Staff, and Engaging & Acting, the percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or exceed their Math STAAR Progress Measure will increase from 55% to 70% by the end of school year 2024. (Baseline: SY 2019 55%)

Performance Objective 2: The percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or exceed their Math STAAR Progress Measure on a STAAR aligned district formative assessment will increase from 56% to 66% by the end of school year 2024.

    Evaluation Data Sources: District Reading Assessments and Interim STAAR

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews		
Strategy 1: Teachers and campus instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.		**Formative**		**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and instructional facilitators will know student data and learn how to anticipate student errors before instructing new concepts. In addition, teachers will learn how to aggressively monitor independent practice and exit tickets in order to quickly assess and create a plan to quickly correct student misconceptions and fill student gaps. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Teachers. **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus leaders will provide resources, training, and support for teachers to implement adopted instructional materials through internalization protocols, teacher planning time, and monitoring the rigor of taught lessons.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: The percentage of 4th-8th grade students who meet or exceed their Math STAAR Progress Measure on a STAAR aligned district formative assessment will increase from 56% to 66% by the end of school year 2024.				
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administrators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Teachers.				
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments				
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4				
Funding Sources: Professional Salary (MCL) - 211 Title 1 - $74,703.50, Para-Professional Salary (Reach Associates) - 211 Title 1 - $120,000				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: High-quality instructional materials are consistently used across classrooms, including resources intentionally designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities and English learners, along with other student groups with diverse needs.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Teachers will use the high quality instructional materials as a resource to create plans to best support students with learning disabilities based on their level of learning. Emergent bilingual students will receive support by making language connections between lessons as they transition between English and Spanish.				
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Special Education Teachers, and Emergent Bilingual Teachers				
TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments				
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4				

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

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.   **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Problem Statement 4: The campus has implemented Amplify and Eureka as High quality instructional materials, but it still resulted in low campus performance in reading and math.   **Root Cause**: There are no systems or protocols in place to monitor the internalization of HQIM. No exemplars of student work and exit tickets were created by teachers to show there was preparation for the lesson.

Goal 3: Through the Student Experience we will foster safe and innovative learning spaces where students engage in rigorous and relevant experiences, preparing them for meaningful opportunities post graduation

Performance Objective 1: Strengthen instructional practices to improve student academic performance across all grades, cultivating a culture of continuous improvement.

    Evaluation Data Sources: Data tracking through data boards by grade level and content and Individual goal setting by students to track progress

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Instructional staff will monitor and track data through data boards in common areas for each class and grade level. This data will be based on Common formative assessments, district assessments, and NWEA MAP While in the classroom, students will set personal growth goals	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Tracking data and goal setting will make instructional staff and students aware of gaps, but also encourage students to perform better during assessments. This will also help instructional staff know student misconceptions and address those misconceptions immediately. Impact: There will be an improvement in student academic performance across all grade levels due to a culture of continuous improvement.				
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Classroom Instructional Facilitators, Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Campus Administrators.				
TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus instructional leaders have clear, written, and transparent roles and responsibilities, and core leadership tasks are scheduled on weekly calendars (observations, debriefs, team meetings).	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Weekly calendars show scheduled time for observations/ feedback of classroom				

instruction, PLCs, and key data meetings. Impact: There will be an improvement in student academic performance across all grade levels due to a culture of continuous improvement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Multi-Classroom Leaders, and Campus Administrators.

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
 - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: There was a lack of student progress and growth due to the lack of structure with the coaching model established by the campus.   **Root Cause**: Multi classroom leaders were used to help whole grade levels rather than coach one to three mentees. There was no structure to Multi classroom leaders on which coaching points were needed to help mentees continually improve.
Problem Statement 3: Teachers do not have systems to collect and analyze immediate student data from exit tickets and common formative assessments.   **Root Cause**: Systems are not in place to aggressively monitor student progress immediately and during independent practice. Data analysis and interventions do not occur immediately after recognizing student misconceptions.

Goal 3: Through the Student Experience we will foster safe and innovative learning spaces where students engage in rigorous and relevant experiences, preparing them for meaningful opportunities post graduation

Performance Objective 2: Research, plan and implement new school safety infrastructure, facility updates and transportation operations that maximize instructional time.

    Evaluation Data Sources: The safety and efficiency of school arrival, dismissal, and safety drills.

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			

Strategy 1: Staff implement clear school-wide procedures and provide opportunities for practice that ensure safe and efficient student transitions and gatherings.
 	
    Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: School wide routines include steps for students that are clear, action- oriented, and easy to remember. Impact: School wide routines will create a safe environment during all transitions including arrival, dismissal, and safety drills.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators
 	
    ESF Levers:
Lever 3: Positive School Culture
				Formative			**Summative**

				Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy 2 Details				Reviews			

Strategy 2: Safety drills will be practiced and documented monthly by practicing the standard response protocol. The safety team will provide immediate feedback to staff on what was done well and how to improve in other areas.
    Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Students and staff will foster a safe learning environment and campus.
    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators
 	
    ESF Levers:
Lever 3: Positive School Culture
				Formative			**Summative**

				Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

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

Goal 3: Through the Student Experience we will foster safe and innovative learning spaces where students engage in rigorous and relevant experiences, preparing them for meaningful opportunities post graduation

Performance Objective 3: Cultivate nurturing and supportive environments for student well-being, providing comprehensive support systems and effective discipline strategies to promote a positive student experience for every child.

Evaluation Data Sources: Skyward Report Manager: Disciplinary Offenses and Actions

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Campus instructional leaders provide clear expectations, training and support so that teachers implement best practices for establishing and maintaining a productive classroom learning environment throughout the school.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and campus leaders use a framework for classroom management that features high leverage practices to maximize instruction and facilitate a productive learning environment (setting clear behavioral expectations, routines and procedures, physical classroom layout, and student engagement strategies). **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administrators and Staff **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus leaders establish and ensure all staff and students understand a system of incentives and consequences and consistently implement the system with fidelity.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The campus will have a system in place that positively reinforces students who model expectations and demonstrate behaviors that reflect campus values. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administrators and Staff **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 3				
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✕ Discontinue				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Campus staff and students feel students do not treat staff members with respect. **Root Cause**: Discipline records taken from Skyward Report Manager for the 2022-2023 year show the top disciplinary offenses include disruptive behavior and profanity. In many cases these behaviors are geared toward campus staff. The report shows there are students with repetitive offenses.

Goal 3: Through the Student Experience we will foster safe and innovative learning spaces where students engage in rigorous and relevant experiences, preparing them for meaningful opportunities post graduation

Performance Objective 4: Increase Attendance percentage from 92.4% to 97%.

    Evaluation Data Sources: Skyward Attendance Daily Balancing Summary

Strategy 1 Details			Reviews			
Strategy 1: The De Zavala Attendance Committee will meet weekly to discuss to student attendance, average weekly attendance, and students of concern.			**Formative**			**Summative**
			Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Increase Attendance percentage from 92.4% to 97%.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Data Clerk, Parent Liaisons, and Teachers
 	
 TEA Priorities:
 Improve low-performing schools
  - **ESF Levers:**
 Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture
 Problem Statements: Demographics 2						

Strategy 2 Details			Reviews			
Strategy 2: The campus data clerk and parent liaisons will call the families of absent students daily after the reported ADA time. They will document the calls or communication with families about attendance.			**Formative**			**Summative**
			Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Increase Attendance percentage from 92.4% to 97%.
     Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Data Clerk, and Parent Liaisons
 	
 TEA Priorities:
 Improve low-performing schools
  - **ESF Levers:**
 Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture
 Problem Statements: Demographics 2						

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

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Chronic absenteeism is at 26.7% at De Zavala. African Americans are at 28%, Hispanics at 26.8%, and Special Education Students at 19.6%. **Root Cause**: The root cause is seen where in the 2022-2023 school year, Skyward Report Manager shows that 141 students from grades KG-6th grade had 10 or more unexcused absences.

Goal 4: Through Growing & Developing Staff we will build retention and recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards high-impact staff, improving student outcomes.

Performance Objective 1: Recruit & onboard highly-qualified staff that effectively serve all students and the broader community.

   Evaluation Data Sources: Texas Academic Performance Report

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: The campus will implement ongoing and proactive recruitment strategies that include many sources for high-quality candidates.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Develops and strategically deploys marketing materials that present the school as an attractive place to work. Impact: The development of staff will build recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards high-impact staff. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Campus leaders will implement targeted and personalized strategies to retain high- performing staff.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Nov	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: High-performing teachers will be identified based on improving student outcomes and willingness to learn and develop. Impact: Through Growing & Developing Staff we will build retention and recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards high-impact staff, improving student outcomes. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal **Title I:** 2.4, 2.6 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Perceptions 1 **Funding Sources:** Professional Salaries (MCL) - 211 Title 1 - $74,703.50				

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: In the case of demographic problems, 43.2% of teachers have 0-5 years of experience.   **Root Cause**: The root cause is the growth and progress of teacher efficacy through training and retention of teachers at De Zavala. This is seen in the 2021-2022 TAPR on teacher demographics.

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Campus staff, students, and parents feel the principal and assistant principal do not clearly communicate the school's goals for the upcoming school year. **Root Cause**: Based on the 2022-2023 School Quality Survey, Parents/ Guardians and Campus staff both feel information about district programs and opportunities are not shared in a timely manner and no opportunities for input are provided.

Goal 5: Through Engaging & Acting we will engage the entire Midland community through clear and actionable communication that cultivates trust and partnership.

Performance Objective 1: Increase family involvement in school activities and decision-making, empowering all parents to play an active role in holding students accountable and nurturing their educational journey.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Campus leaders will have a system for gathering family feedback and respond with transparency.	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: Family involvement will increase through decision making and empowering parents to play an active role in holding students accountable in their educational journey.	**Nov**	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: The campus will establish a strong and functional Parent Teacher Association.	**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Impact: More parent volunteers will join as active PTA members. This will allow for more families to play an active role in nurturing student and teachers' educational progress.	**Nov**	**Feb**	**Apr**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and PTA President **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				
0% No Progress 100% Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✖ Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Campus staff, students, and parents feel the principal and assistant principal do not clearly communicate the school's goals for the upcoming school year. **Root Cause**: Based on the 2022-2023 School Quality Survey, Parents/ Guardians and Campus staff both feel information about district programs and opportunities are not shared in a timely manner and no opportunities for input are provided.

Targeted Support Strategies

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	2	1	Instructional staff and administrators will recognize when weaknesses found in student MAP based on the growth reports such as the learning continuum, class breakdown by RIT or Achievement, and Achievement Status and Growth Summary. These three reports provide strengths and weaknesses based on student growth and progress in MAP. Most of the reports suggest which student expectation needs to be instructed in order to intervene or enrich student learning.
1	3	1	Teachers and classroom instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.
1	5	1	Instructional staff and administrators will recognize when weaknesses found in student MAP based on the growth reports such as the learning continuum, class breakdown by RIT or Achievement, and Achievement Status and Growth Summary. These three reports provide strengths and weaknesses based on student growth and progress in MAP. Most of the reports suggest which student expectation needs to be instructed in order to intervene or enrich student learning.
2	1	1	Teachers and campus instructional facilitators will learn how to analyze data and plan intervention and enrichment activities during weekly and vertical PLCs.

Campus Funding Summary

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">211 Title 1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Goal</td><td>Objective</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Resources Needed</td><td>Account Code</td><td>Amount</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>Para-Professional Salaries</td><td></td><td>$120,000.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>Professional Salaries</td><td></td><td>$74,703.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td>Professional Salaries (MCL)</td><td></td><td>$74,703.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>Extra Duty Pay and Tutorials</td><td></td><td>$40,500.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>Para-Professional (Reach Associate) Salary</td><td></td><td>$120,000.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>Professional Salaries MCL</td><td></td><td>$74,703.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>5</td><td>1</td><td>Extra Duty Pay and Tutorials</td><td></td><td>$40,500.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>Para-Professional Salary (Reach Associates)</td><td></td><td>$120,000.00</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>Professional Salary (MCL)</td><td></td><td>$74,703.50</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>Professional Salaries (MCL)</td><td></td><td>$74,703.50</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="right">Sub-Total</td><td>$814,517.50</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="right">Budgeted Fund Source Amount</td><td>$296,557.33</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="right">+/- Difference</td><td>-$517,960.17</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="right">Grand Total Budgeted</td><td>$296,557.33</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="right">Grand Total Spent</td><td>$814,517.50</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="right">+/- Difference</td><td>-$517,960.17</td></tr>
</table>