

Ector County Independent School District

Edward K. Downing Elementary

2019-2020 Campus Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- Comprehensive Needs Assessment 3
 - Demographics 3
 - Student Achievement 6
 - School Culture and Climate 13
 - Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 14
 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 15
 - Parent and Community Engagement 16
 - School Context and Organization 17
 - Technology 18
- Priority Problem Statements 19
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation 21
- Goals 23
 - Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024. 23
 - Goal 2: Edward K. Downing Elementary will work to retain and recruit highly qualified employees who demonstrate the ability to work together to meet District goals and improve student learning. 36
 - Goal 3: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize technology to enhance instruction, create efficient processes, and increase communication and collaboration within the district and with all stakeholders. 38
 - Goal 4: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize financial resources in a responsible and data-driven manner to support student learning. 41
 - Goal 5: Edward K. Downing Elementary will provide and promote a safe climate that is conducive to learning. 42
 - Goal 6: Edward K. Downing Elementary will establish and maintain strong partnerships with parents, the community, businesses, and local partnerships. 44
- Comprehensive Support Strategies 47
- Plan Notes 48
- Campus Based Leadership Team 53
- Campus Funding Summary 54

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Edward K. Downing Elementary (EKD Elementary) was built in 2015. It is located at 1480 N. Knox Ave. Odessa TX. It is located in West Odessa. This is the school's third school year. Edward K. Downing Elementary (EKD Elementary) current enrollment is 780 K-5 students. This is a difference of 70 student increase from the school year of 2018-2019. EKD Elementary is a Title One school.

The account for the increase is due the fact the campus was the influx of growth in West Odessa. The campus is currently closed to enrollment due to the high number of increase of students. The campus was designed and built for 650 students. All students who were enrolled last year were asked to reserve their enrollment at the end of 2016- 2017 school year. All new to Edward K. Downing Elementary were placed on a waiting list until room became available. EKD Elementary as of the 2016-2017 school year has:

- 453 (65%) students listed as AT-RISK.
- 491 (75%) students listed as Economically Disadvantaged.
- 270 (38%) students listed as LEP and 256 95% of the total LEP population) are being served in a late exit bilingual program. 6 of the LEP students are being served through the ESL program. The remainder of the LEP students were parent denials to the bilingual program.
- 48 (6%) students listed as Special Education
- 40 (6%) students listed as GT
- 30 (3%) students listed as immigrants
- 0 students listed as Migrants
- 55 (8%) White students
- 637 (92%) Hispanic students
- 2 (0.2%) African American students
- 1 (0.1%) Pacific Islander students

Total Enrollment 708

- Total Membership 708
- Kindergarten 110
- 1 Grade 106
- Grade 2 129
- Grade 3 111

- Grade 4 132
- Grade 5 120

Ethnic Distribution

- White 44
- Hispanic / Latino 656
- Black or African American 2
- American Indian or Alaska Native 10
- Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander 21
- Two or More 33

Based on the last 4 years the trend seems to be that Edward K. Downing Elementary has a high number of Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students that seem to be consistent and correlates to the population in West Odessa.

At-risk students are identified using the 13 state indicators. All students identified for at-risk will be identified as what needs are needing to be addressed through interventions. Such interventions will be tutoring throughout the school day, mentoring through WATCH DOG program, and parent workshops, parent meetings, attendance incentives.

Special Ed: Last year approximately 50 students were served in the special ed program by speech, learning disability, and/or intellectual disability. Students who qualified for a learning disability/intellectual disability qualified due to quality response to intervention strategies that were done by our staff or other schools. These students possessed strengths in which to build upon for their instruction. Those that did not qualify held very low IQ without any strengths in which to build upon for instruction. These students were placed in an intervention program throughout the school year.

The special ed program is a majority of inclusion practices for most of our students identified as learning disabled/intellectually disabled.

Student Attendance: Last year our yearly attendance average was 95%. Our goal for this year is to maintain 96% or higher. A campus attendance committee was developed and used to identify students with high attendance issues. Parent conferences were held to discuss reasons for high attendance and provide intervention for parents. The EKD classroom teachers call parents after 3 absences to visit with parents about reasons for student absences and catching up with student work. After 5 absences the EKD attendance clerk calls parents to discuss the purpose for the high number of absences and offer any assistance the school can provide to prevent any further unnecessary absences. After 10 absences the attendance committee meets with the parents. Most of the absences are excused due to doctor appt., or students who are called in ill.

English Language Learners:

Most of our ELL learners are served through a late exit bilingual program. Each grade level has 2 certified bilingual teachers with the exception of 5th grade where they have 3 bilingual teachers. A small number of students are served through our ESL program in which they are placed with a teacher who is ESL certified. All other ELL students are listed as parent denials of the bilingual program. All denials must meet with the principal to discuss the benefits of their child being in the bilingual program. If the parent still denies the program then he/she must meet with the Director of Bilingual/ESL services.

Staff Demographics:

Total Staff 48.4

- Teachers 38.5
- Professional Support 4.8
- Campus Administration 2.0
- Educational Aides 3.0
- Beginning Teachers 7.0
- 1-5 Years Experience 14.0
- 6-10 Years Experience 4.0
- 11-20 Years Experience 4.5
- Over 20 Years Experience 7.0

Average class size is about 24 students.

Demographics Strengths

The number of Gifted and Talented students identified have exceed the recommended 2% by ECISD, but rather 6% of our students have been identified.

Our student population consists of mainly Hispanic students and about a 1/3 of the population is in bilingual classrooms.

The student population mirrors the district demographics, and enrollment is increasing. We have increased 70 more students since the our doors opened in 2015.

Economically Disadvantage is at a high 73%

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: Homeless students has increased from 3 to 7% **Root Cause:** Although our economy in Odessa is at an all time high with very low employment, the cost of living is very high and some housing is unaffordable to many of our families.

Problem Statement 2: Overall attendance rate 95% **Root Cause:** Attendance meetings were not held consistently, incentives were only done at the end of the year.

Student Achievement

Student Achievement Summary

2019 STAAR Performance Data Table

EDWARD K DOWNING EL (068901131) - ECTOR COUNTY ISD

Data Table

| | All Students | African American | Hispanic | White |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------|-------|
| All Subjects | | | | |
| Percent of Tests | | | | |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 56% | 100% | 55% | 69% |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 24% | 33% | 24% | 26% |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 10% | 33% | 10% | 10% |
| Number of Tests | | | | |
| # at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 527 | 3 | 476 | 47 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 227 | 1 | 208 | 18 |
| # at Masters GL Standard | 95 | 1 | 87 | 7 |
| Total Tests | 939 | 3 | 866 | 68 |
| ELA/Reading | | | | |
| Percent of Tests | | | | |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 61% | 100% | 60% | 74% |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 29% | 0% | 28% | 35% |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 12% | 0% | 12% | 17% |
| Number of Tests | | | | |
| # at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 213 | 1 | 195 | 17 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 100 | 0 | 92 | 8 |
| # at Masters GL Standard | 43 | 0 | 39 | 4 |
| Total Tests | 350 | 1 | 325 | 23 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| Mathematics | | | | |
| Percent of Tests | | | | |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 60% | 100% | 59% | 70% |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 26% | 100% | 26% | 22% |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 13% | 100% | 13% | 9% |
| Number of Tests | | | | |
| # at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 210 | 1 | 192 | 16 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 91 | 1 | 85 | 5 |
| # at Masters GL Standard | 44 | 1 | 41 | 2 |
| Total Tests | 349 | 1 | 324 | 23 |
| Writing | | | | |
| Percent of Tests | | | | |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 40% | 100% | 38% | 55% |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 9% | 0% | 7% | 27% |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 2% | 0% | 2% | 0% |
| Number of Tests | | | | |
| # at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 51 | 1 | 44 | 6 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 11 | 0 | 8 | 3 |
| # at Masters GL Standard | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Total Tests | 127 | 1 | 115 | 11 |
| Science | | | | |
| Percent of Tests | | | | |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 47% | - | 44% | 73% |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 22% | - | 23% | 18% |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 5% | - | 5% | 9% |
| Number of Tests | | | | |
| # at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 53 | - | 45 | 8 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 25 | - | 23 | 2 |
| # at Masters GL Standard | 6 | - | 5 | 1 |
| Total Tests | 113 | - | 102 | 11 |
| 2019 Academic Growth | | | | |

EDWARD K DOWNING EL (068901131) - ECTOR COUNTY ISD

Data Table

ELA/Reading and Mathematics

Current-Year Performance on STAAR

| Prior-Year Performance on STAAR | Did Not Meet | | | Approaches Grade Level | | | Meets Grade Level | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (0 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) |
| Did Not Meet | - | <u>50</u> | <u>66</u> | - | 0 | <u>47</u> | - | - |
| Approaches Grade Level | - | <u>31</u> | 0 | - | <u>30</u> | <u>36</u> | - | - |
| Meets Grade Level | <u>8</u> | - | - | <u>27</u> | - | - | - | <u>5</u> |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 | - | - | <u>8</u> | - | - | <u>19</u> | - |
| Total Number of Tests | <u>8</u> | <u>81</u> | <u>66</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>83</u> | <u>19</u> | <u>5</u> |
| Total Points Score | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 15 | 83 | 0 | 2.5 |

ELA/Reading

Current-Year Performance on STAAR

| Prior-Year Performance on STAAR | Did Not Meet | | | Approaches Grade Level | | | Meets Grade Level | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (0 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) |
| Did Not Meet | - | <u>16</u> | <u>32</u> | - | 0 | <u>29</u> | - | - |
| Approaches Grade Level | - | <u>10</u> | 0 | - | <u>11</u> | <u>15</u> | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Meets Grade Level | 0 | - | - | <u>7</u> | - | - | - | <u>2</u> |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 | - | - | <u>5</u> | - | - | <u>9</u> | - |
| Total Number of Tests | 0 | <u>26</u> | <u>32</u> | <u>12</u> | <u>11</u> | <u>44</u> | <u>9</u> | <u>2</u> |
| Total Points Score | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 5.5 | 44 | 0 | 1 |

Mathematics

Current-Year Performance on STAAR

| Prior-Year Performance on STAAR | Did Not Meet | | | Approaches Grade Level | | | Meets Grade Level | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (0 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) |
| Did Not Meet | - | <u>34</u> | <u>34</u> | - | 0 | <u>18</u> | - | - |
| Approaches Grade Level | - | <u>21</u> | 0 | - | <u>19</u> | <u>21</u> | - | - |
| Meets Grade Level | <u>8</u> | - | - | <u>20</u> | - | - | - | <u>3</u> |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 | - | - | <u>3</u> | - | - | <u>10</u> | - |
| Total Number of Tests | <u>8</u> | <u>55</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>23</u> | <u>19</u> | <u>39</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>3</u> |
| Total Points Score | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 9.5 | 39 | 0 | 1.5 |

Texas Education Agency

2019 Closing the Gaps

EDWARD K DOWNING EL (068901131) - ECTOR COUNTY ISD

Status and Data Table

| | All Students | African American | Hispanic | W |
|--|--------------|------------------|----------|----|
| Academic Achievement Status | | | | |
| ELA/Reading Target | 44% | 32% | 37% | 60 |
| Target Met | N | | N | |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 29% | 0% | 28% | 35 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 100 | 0 | 92 | 8 |
| Total Tests (Adjusted) | 350 | 1 | 325 | 23 |
| Math Target | 46% | 31% | 40% | 59 |
| Target Met | N | | N | |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 26% | 100% | 26% | 22 |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 91 | 1 | 85 | 5 |
| Total Tests (Adjusted) | 349 | 1 | 324 | 23 |
| Total Indicators | | | | |
| Growth Status | | | | |
| ELA/Reading Target | 66 | 62 | 65 | 69 |
| Target Met | Y | | Y | |
| Academic Growth Score | 70 | 0 | 71 | 70 |
| Growth Points | 125.5 | 0 | 110 | 15 |
| Total Tests | 179 | 1 | 156 | 22 |
| Math Target | 71 | 67 | 69 | 74 |
| Target Met | N | | N | |
| Academic Growth Score | 55 | 100 | 55 | 52 |
| Growth Points | 132 | 1 | 119.5 | 11 |
| Total Tests | 239 | 1 | 216 | 22 |
| Total Indicators | | | | |
| Graduation Rate Status *** | | | | |
| Target | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90 |
| Target Met | | | | |
| 2017 % Graduated | - | - | - | - |
| 2018 % Graduated | - | - | - | - |
| 2018 # Graduated | - | - | - | - |
| 2018 Total in Class | - | - | - | - |
| Total Indicators | | | | |
| English Language Proficiency Status | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|----|
| Target | | | | |
| Target Met | | | | |
| TELPAS Progress Rate | | | | |
| TELPAS Progress | | | | |
| TELPAS Total | | | | |
| Total Indicators | | | | |
| Student Success Status | | | | |
| Target | 47 | 36 | 41 | 58 |
| Target Met | N | | N | N |
| STAAR Component Score | 30 | 55 | 30 | 35 |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 56% | 100% | 55% | 69 |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 24% | 33% | 24% | 26 |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 10% | 33% | 10% | 10 |
| Total Tests | 939 | 3 | 866 | 68 |
| Total Indicators | | | | |
| School Quality Status | | | | |
| Target | 47% | 31% | 41% | 58 |
| Target Met | | | | |
| % Students meeting CCMR | - | - | - | - |
| # Students meeting CCMR | - | - | - | - |
| Total Students | - | - | - | - |
| Total Indicators | | | | |
| Participation | | | | |
| Target | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95 |
| ELA/Reading | | | | |
| % Participation | 100% | 100% | 100% | 10 |
| # Participants | 365 | 1 | 337 | 25 |
| Total Tests | 366 | 1 | 338 | 25 |
| Mathematics | | | | |
| % Participation | 99% | 100% | 99% | 10 |
| # Participants | 364 | 1 | 336 | 25 |
| Total Tests | 366 | 1 | 338 | 25 |

Student Achievement Strengths

Growth Measure Target was met in all subgroups in Reading.

TELPAS progress rate from 33% to 48 %.

Writing Scores increased from 31% to 40%.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Achievement Needs

Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. **Root Cause:** Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented.

Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. **Root Cause:** Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity.

Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled **Root Cause:** Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers.

Problem Statement 4: Percentage of students who met grade level standards in writing for all students 9%, Hispanic 7%, White 27%, Eco. Dis. 9%, EL 10%, Continuously Enrolled 8%, Non continuously enrolled 13% **Root Cause:** Tier 1 writing instruction was not taught across all grade levels and subject areas.

Problem Statement 5: Percentage of students who met grade level standard in Science in all students 22%, Hispanic 23%, White 18%, Eco. Dis. 16%, EL 13%, Continuously enrolled 23%, non continuously enrolled 20% **Root Cause:** Science is not taught consistently in grades K-5. Last year lab activities were limited.

School Culture and Climate

School Culture and Climate Summary

Edward K. Downing Elementary is comprised of students from West Odessa. Many of our students are identified as low social economic status. Regardless of their economic status, our students are eager to learn and are excited about being a part of Edward K. Downing Elementary.

Edward K. Downing Elementary is described an innovative campus that is currently still trying to find its footing with using co-teaching and collaboration to help drive instruction for our students. It is very similar to an open concept campus with many opportunities for collaboration by student and staff.

Staff morale is high with the use of a social committee and an active PTA. The staff is well aware of the students needs and short comings, but have the passion and drive to make their future brighter.

Edward K. Downing Elementary offers several opportunities this school year for parents and community involvement such as:

Meet the teacher, Parent Orientation, Reading night, Math night, Science Night, Music programs, P.S I love you, Science night, Cafe' Con el Director (community meeting with principal)

We also had several programs in place such as:

VIPS programs, PTA, AVID, WATCH DOGS program, music programs, RTI time at the last hour of the day for our students.

EKD Elementary mission is to adopt best practice instructional methods that develop collaboration, creativity, communication, and critical thinking for world ready, life-long learners who discover their unique gifts, and achieve personal success. EKD Elementary is committed to ensuring all students learn regardless of obstacles faced. The campus will ensure open communication and alignment of efforts with staff, students, parents and community so that the culture and climate will continue to become more positive for EKD Elementary students.

School Culture and Climate Strengths

Strengths are the attendance to all student programs. Parents are well represented to all programs and activities. Instructional staff has continued with the study of the 4C model collaboration, creativity, communication, critical thinking. Overall the campus morale is high and motivating. Many of the staff have less than 5 years teaching experience and therefore willing to be creative and think out of the box. Staff is definitely dedicated to the community and therefore determined to move our campus to academic success.

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Summary

Total Staff 48.4

- Teachers 38
- Professional Support 4.8
- Campus Administration 2.0
- Educational Aides 3.0
- Beginning Teachers 15.0
- 1-5 Years Experience 12.0
- 6-10 Years Experience 4.0
- 11-20 Years Experience 3.0
- Over 20 Years Experience 5.0

Average class size is about 24 students.

Currently we have 11 long term subs in classroom teaching positions.

Our school district has just approved a teacher pay raise across all teaching positions and a 4% pay increase from midpoint for all ECISD positions.

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Strengths

Edward K. Downing Staff is a very energetic staff with a driven purpose for this new school to succeed. Many of the teachers are creative and are wanting to be innovative in the classroom. ECISD offers a 1000 dollar traveling stipend to work at Edward K. Downing and stipends for difficult to fill positions such as SPED, Math, Science, and Bilingual positions. Our school was recently built 5 years ago and therefore offers flexible learning space which does seem to entice many new teachers.

Problem Statements Identifying Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Needs

Problem Statement 1: 11 of our classroom teaching positions are held by long term substitutes **Root Cause:** cost of living in Odessa is at all time high and lack of teacher applicants.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summary

Edward K. Downing Elementary uses integral components of instruction, intervention and assessment to meet the educational needs of our student body. We provide an aligned instruction using the TEKS resource system in all core subjects. Students are monitored using DBA, unit assessments, Istation, Imagine Math. Instructional strategies and resources used are guided math, balanced literacy, Writers Workshop, Lonestar Math, Mentoring Minds, Learning A-Z. Tutoring is built within the school day to close the necessary gaps in struggling learners. Additionally, resource allocations in the form of textbooks, supplemental materials and classroom technology use contribute to student performance by providing tools to utilize when educating students. Teachers, Instructional specialists, dyslexia teacher, tutors, and special education personnel support the programs and intervention services which allow for the opportunity to close the achievement gap. COGAT, Nagliari, STAAR, DBAs, unit assessments, Istation, and TELPAS assessments allow for early identification of need and potential targets for intervention.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Strengths

Edward K Downing appropriately allocated resources in the form as student material, manipulatives, books, online programs, and staff development to meet the learning needs of our students and staff.

Problem Statements Identifying Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Needs

Problem Statement 1: Classroom teachers were not tracking students performance consistently across the subject areas **Root Cause:** Data gathering and tracking system was not properly put in place by campus administration.

Parent and Community Engagement

Parent and Community Engagement Summary

Edward K. Downing provides opportunities through Reading, Math, Science Night for parents to attend and learn concepts with their children. Fall festivals, PTA program, Watch Dog programs have become an important part for parents to be involved at EKD.

Parent and Community Engagement Strengths

Increase of VIPS program and higher percentage of parents that participate in school activities. West Side Choir continues to grow and develop. This year the Boys and Girls of Odessa have built a club on EKD property. The Boys and Girls club will offer tutoring, art, stride computer access for some of our students who will be attending.

Problem Statements Identifying Parent and Community Engagement Needs

Problem Statement 1: Small number of parents in our VIPS program or showing willingness to help in classrooms and in school. **Root Cause:** School staff needs to reach out personally to see if parents would be willing to volunteer.

School Context and Organization

School Context and Organization Summary

Edward K. Downing Elementary will implement a in school intervention time in all classrooms K - 5. Data will be reviewed from istation, brainchild, benchmarks, unit tests,classroom observation during RTI meetings. Intervention will address the content areas of Reading, Math, and Science. PLCs are organized by grade levels and will meet to review student data, classroom instruction, and maintenance. PLC will meet weekly. CIT meets once a month to discuss campus goals and review of campus improvement plans. Leadership committee will meet once a month to review new campus initiatives and changes needed.

School Context and Organization Strengths

Edward K. Downing Elementary continues to maintain a working CIT committee as well as a strong leadership committee. PLCs focus on student data, sharing of best practices,rigorous activities, and help to strengthen individual teachers, grade levels and the school as a whole.

Technology

Technology Summary

Edward K. Downing Elementary has interactive projectors, document cameras, Smart TV, and WIFI system in every classroom. Each Grade level in grades K-2 have 30 IPADS and each K-2 class have 6 kindle fire HD tablets. Each grade level in grades 3-5 have 30 laptops plus 50 laptops for the entire 3-5 students. Each teacher is assigned a laptop with a docking station.

Technology Strengths

Edward K. Downing Elementary has interactive projectors, document cameras, Smart TV, and WIFI system in every classroom. Each Grade level in grades K-2 have 30 IPADS and each K-2 classroom has 6 kindle fire HD tablets. Each grade level in grades 3-5 have 50 laptops plus 30 IPADS for the entire 3-5 students. Each teacher is assigned a laptop with a docking station. All teachers have been trained to utilize the equipment.

Problem Statements Identifying Technology Needs

Problem Statement 1: Large amount of technology available from laptops to Ipads to kindles and projectors, but all devices are commonly used for lecture and instruction by the teacher instead of in the hands of the students. **Root Cause:** Proper training is needed to assist teachers and aides to utilize better use of technology for the benefit of student engagement and academic success.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Overall attendance rate 95%

Root Cause 1: Attendance meetings were not held consistently, incentives were only done at the end of the year.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 3: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math.

Root Cause 3: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 4: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled.

Root Cause 4: Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 5: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled

Root Cause 5: Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 6: 11 of our classroom teaching positions are held by long term substitutes

Root Cause 6: cost of living in Odessa is at all time high and lack of teacher applicants.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Problem Statement 7: Classroom teachers were not tracking students performance consistently across the subject areas

Root Cause 7: Data gathering and tracking system was not properly put in place by campus administration.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Problem Statement 8: Small number of parents in our VIPS program or showing willingness to help in classrooms and in school.

Root Cause 8: School staff needs to reach out personally to see if parents would be willing to volunteer.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Parent and Community Engagement

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- Campus and/or district planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

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

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR Released Test Questions
- STAAR EL Progress Measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) results
- Student Success Initiative (SSI) data for Grades 5 and 8
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Local diagnostic math assessment data
- Local benchmark or common assessments data
- Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) reading assessment data for Grades PK-2

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Homeless data
- Gifted and talented data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Discipline records

- Class size averages by grade and subject
- Class size averages by grade and subject
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data

Goals

Revised/Approved: August 28, 2019





Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 1: Students achieving the Meets Standard on state assessments will increase from 24% to 34% across all tested grade levels and content areas by May 2020.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: State Accountability 2019, 2020

Summative Evaluation 1:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------------|--|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| Comprehensive Support Strategy Targeted Support Strategy TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 1) EKD instructional staff will improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. Teacher will be trained in depth and complexity and teaching to the level of the TEKS | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | PLCs held weekly to review instructional strategies | Improve our meet grade level standard by 10% compared to 2019 STAAR results. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 Funding Sources: Local - 0.00, Title One School-wide - 0.00 | | | | | | | |
| Comprehensive Support Strategy Targeted Support Strategy TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 2) Implement a data system used to measure the amount of growth for all students K-5 | 2.4, 2.6 | After each unit assessment and DBA. and final results of STAAR | Become 100% knowledgeable for students's performance and growth. Teachers will then develop more targeted instruction | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 Funding Sources: Title One School-wide - 0.00 | | | | | | | |

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
|  = Accomplished  = Continue/Modify  = No Progress  = Discontinue | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:


| Student Achievement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. Root Cause 1: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented. |
| Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. Root Cause 2: Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity. |
| Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled Root Cause 3: Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers. |
| Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment |
| Problem Statement 1: Classroom teachers were not tracking students performance consistently across the subject areas Root Cause 1: Data gathering and tracking system was not properly put in place by campus administration. |

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 2: Students achieving the Masters Standard on state assessments will increase from 10% to 20% across all tested grade levels and content areas by May 2020.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: State Accountability 2019, 2020

Summative Evaluation 2:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 1) EKD instructional staff will improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. Teacher will be trained in depth and complexity and teaching to the level of the TEKS | 2.4, 2.6 | PLCs held weekly to review instructional strategies | Improve our meet grade level standard by 10% based on 2019 STAAR results. | | | | |
| | Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 | | | | | | |
| 2) Implement a data system used to measure the amount of growth for all students K-5 | 2.4, 2.6 | After each unit assessment and DBA. and final results of STAAR | Become 100% knowledgeable for students's performance and growth. Teachers will then develop more targeted instruction | | | | |
| | Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

| Student Achievement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. Root Cause 1: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented. |
| Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. Root Cause 2: Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity. |

Student Achievement

Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled **Root Cause 3:** Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Problem Statement 1: Classroom teachers were not tracking students performance consistently across the subject areas **Root Cause 1:** Data gathering and tracking system was not properly put in place by campus administration.

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 3: Students achieving the Meets Standard on the state assessments in Reading and Writing will increase by 10% by May 2020.

3rd Grade Reading from 35% to 45%

4th Grade Reading from 23% to 33%


5th Grade Reading from 26% to 36%

4th Grade Writing from 8% to 18%.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 3: State Accountability 2019, 2020

Summative Evaluation 3:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|--|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 1) Balanced Literacy framework will be implemented in all ELAR classrooms | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Running Records Unit assessments Istation data reports STAAR Reading STAAR Writing TELPAS | Increase STAAR Writing and STAAR reading by 10% | | | | |
| | | | | Problem Statements: Student Achievement 2 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 Funding Sources: Title One School-wide - 0.00 | | | |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 2) Implement a data system used to measure the amount of growth for all students K-5 | 2.4, 3.1 | Istation reports Unit/SBA tests STAAR tests | Become 100% knowledgeable for students' performance and growth. Teachers will then develop more targeted instruction | | | | |
| | | | | Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 | | | |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 3) EKD instructional staff will improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. Teacher will be trained in depth and complexity and teaching to the level of the TEKS | | PLCs held weekly to review instructional strategies | Improve our meet grade level standard by 10% based on 2019 STAAR results. | | | | |
| | | | | Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 | | | |

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
|  | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

| Student Achievement |
|---|
| <p>Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. Root Cause 2: Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity.</p> |
| <p>Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. Root Cause 1: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented.</p> |
| <p>Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled Root Cause 3: Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers.</p> |
| Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment |
| <p>Problem Statement 1: Classroom teachers were not tracking students performance consistently across the subject areas Root Cause 1: Data gathering and tracking system was not properly put in place by campus administration.</p> |

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 4: Students achieving the Meets Standard on state assessments in Math will increase by 10% in each tested grade level by May 2020.


3rd Grade Math from 25% to 35%

4th Grade Math from 20% to 30%

5th Grade Math from 28% to 38%

Evaluation Data Source(s) 4: 2020 State Accountability

Summative Evaluation 4:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Implement a data system used to measure the amount of growth for all students K-5 | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | PLCs held weekly to review instructional strategies | Become 100% knowledgeable for students's performance and growth. Teachers will then develop more targeted instruction | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 | | | | | | | |
| 2) EKD instructional staff will improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. Teacher will be trained in depth and complexity and teaching to the level of the TEKS | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | PLCs held weekly to review instructional strategies | Improve our meet grade level standard by 10% based on 2019 STAAR results. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

| Student Achievement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. Root Cause 1: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented. |

Student Achievement

Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. **Root Cause 2:** Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity.





Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled **Root Cause 3:** Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers.

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 5: Students achieving the Meets Standard on state assessments in Science will increase by 5% by May 2020. 5th Science from 22% to 32%.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 5: 2020 State Accountability

Summative Evaluation 5:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------------|---|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) EKD instructional staff will improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. Teacher will be trained in depth and complexity and teaching to the level of the TEKS | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | PLCs held weekly to review instructional strategies | Improve our meet grade level standard by 10% based on 2019 STAAR results. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 | | | | | | | |
|  = Accomplished  = Continue/Modify  = No Progress  = Discontinue | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

| Student Achievement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. Root Cause 1: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented. |
| Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. Root Cause 2: Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity. |
| Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled Root Cause 3: Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers. |

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 6: Edward K. Downing Elementary student attendance rate will increase from 95% to 96% by May 2020 (State average was 95.7% in 2017).

Evaluation Data Source(s) 6: District attendance reports

Summative Evaluation 6:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|---|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 1) Hold attendance meeting with parents more than 5 absences | 2.4, 2.6 | Absentee report and parent contact report | Move attendance form 95 % to over 96% | | | | |
| | Problem Statements: Demographics 2 Funding Sources: Local - 0.00 | | | | | | |
| 2) Create an attendance incentive for class with with best attendance. | 2.6 | Attendance report | Increase attendance rate from 95%-over 96% | | | | |
| | Problem Statements: Demographics 2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|--|
| Problem Statement 2: Overall attendance rate 95% Root Cause 2: Attendance meetings were not held consistently, incentives were only done at the end of the year. |

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 7: The percentage of At Risk students that will Meet Grade Level Standards will increase from 54% to 64% by May 2020. Accelerated instructional materials & remedial programs will be offered to all At Risk students to help close the achievement gap.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 7: 2020 State Accountability Report

Summative Evaluation 7:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 1) RTI hour will be built within the school day. Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students will be divided and instructed at their level. LLI kits in English and Spanish will be used for Tier 3 instruction to help close the achievement gap. | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Classroom teachers and campus administrators | 50% reduction of all Tier 3 students. 85% of students in each class will be identified as Tier 1 students. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 7 Problem Statements:

| Student Achievement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 27% of our economically disadvantage students are meeting grade level standard reading and 24% meet grade level standard in Math. Root Cause 1: Quality and effective response to intervention has not been consistently implemented. |
| Problem Statement 2: 29% of all students did not meet grade level standards in reading, 28% Hispanic, 35% White, 26% EL students, 15% Spec. Ed., 28% Continuously Enrolled, 34% Non-Continuously Enrolled. Root Cause 2: Tier 1 reading instruction is not taught to the TEKS specificity. |
| Problem Statement 3: Percentage of students not meeting grade level standard for Math was 26% All students, 26% Hispanic, 22% White, 24% Economically Disadvantaged, 26% EL, 12% Special Ed, 29% Special Ed. former, 25% continuously enrolled, 30% Non continuously enrolled Root Cause 3: Tier 1 math instruction was not taught to the TEKS specificity due to the lack of experience in 4th and 5th grade math teachers. |

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 8: Coordinated School Health requirements in fitness assessment and physical activity levels will be met by 2020-21 in all Edward K. Downing Elementary physical education classes.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 8: FitnessGram Annual Report

Summative Evaluation 8:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|---------------|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) All students participating in PE will track their fitness gram data to measure progress. | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Fitness gram benchmark results at the BOY, MOY, EOY | 85% of all student who participate in EKD PE classes will have met the fitness gram targets. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Goal 1: Edward K Downing Elementary will align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional learning to promote college and career readiness to positively impact student outcomes to ensure all grade levels and all subject areas meet or exceed state averages by 2024.

Performance Objective 9: English Learners achieving Advanced and Advanced High Composite Level scores will increase by 5 percentage points for the academic year 2019-2020.

TELPAS Advanced Level from 37.86% to 42.86%

TELPAS Advanced High Level from 9.9% to 14.9%

Evaluation Data Source(s) 9: TELPAS ratings 2020

Summative Evaluation 9:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------------|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| TEA Priorities Improve low-performing schools 1) Classroom teachers will be trained in SIOP strategies to assist students comprehension of the English language. | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | campus administration | TELPAS Advanced Level from 37.86% to 42.86% TELPAS Advanced High Level from 9.9% to 14.9% | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 Funding Sources: State Bilingual ESL - 0.00 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 9 Problem Statements:

| Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Classroom teachers were not tracking students performance consistently across the subject areas Root Cause 1: Data gathering and tracking system was not properly put in place by campus administration. |

Goal 2: Edward K. Downing Elementary will work to retain and recruit highly qualified employees who demonstrate the ability to work together to meet District goals and improve student learning.


Performance Objective 1: By May 2021, the Edward K Downing teacher turnover rate will decrease from 27% to 10% (state turnover rate is 16.6%).

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: TAPR

System Data

Exit Survey Data

Summative Evaluation 1:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Utilize our Instruction specialist to help coach beginning teachers and build their skills to become effective and successful in the classroom | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Instructional specialist and campus administration, walkthroughs, and coach feedback | By May 2021, the Edward K Downing teacher turnover rate will decrease from 27% to 10% (state turnover rate is 16.6%) | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1 | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 11 of our classroom teaching positions are held by long term substitutes Root Cause 1: cost of living in Odessa is at all time high and lack of teacher applicants. |

Goal 2: Edward K. Downing Elementary will work to retain and recruit highly qualified employees who demonstrate the ability to work together to meet District goals and improve student learning.


Performance Objective 2: Edward K. Downing Elementary will reduce teacher vacancies from 11 in 2019-2020 to 0 by the start of the 2020-21 school year.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: Entry Survey Data

Exit Survey Data

TAPR Report - Retention

Summative Evaluation 2:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------|---------------|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| <p>TEA Priorities Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals 1) Provide new teacher academy every 2 weeks afterschool on campus to help coach new subs and teachers to proper procedures and teaching skills</p> | 2.5, 2.6 | Sign In sheet | New subs and teachers become more confident in teaching content areas and running a classroom. Retain 100% staff for the 2020-2021 school year. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1 | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

| Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 11 of our classroom teaching positions are held by long term substitutes Root Cause 1: cost of living in Odessa is at all time high and lack of teacher applicants. |

Goal 3: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize technology to enhance instruction, create efficient processes, and increase communication and collaboration within the district and with all stakeholders.

Performance Objective 1: Reduce the number of student transfer code errors from 30% to 15% in ITCCS by May 2020.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: ITCCS reports

Summative Evaluation 1:

Goal 3: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize technology to enhance instruction, create efficient processes, and increase communication and collaboration within the district and with all stakeholders.

Performance Objective 2: 100% of campus improvement plans will be aligned to the district improvement plan by August 2019.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: 2019-2020 Campus improvement Plans

Summative Evaluation 2:

Goal 3: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize technology to enhance instruction, create efficient processes, and increase communication and collaboration within the district and with all stakeholders.

Performance Objective 3: Increase student computer (wireless device) ratio to a minimum of one computer per four students. Moving towards a long term goal of one computer per student at each campus by 2024 pending approval.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 3: Campus inventory and student enrollment.

Summative Evaluation 3:

Goal 3: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize technology to enhance instruction, create efficient processes, and increase communication and collaboration within the district and with all stakeholders.

Performance Objective 4: Increase the use of digital tools and strategies using cloud-based applications by 2020.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 4: Usage reports

Summative Evaluation 4:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------------|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Train classroom teachers through our technology specialist in the various other applications for our technology supplies. | 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Sign in sheets from technology trainings and walkthroughs with documentation of technology use. | Weekly teachers will be able to use technology applications with their students to gain engagements and student achievement. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Goal 3: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize technology to enhance instruction, create efficient processes, and increase communication and collaboration within the district and with all stakeholders.

Performance Objective 5: Increase the use of parent portal activity from 37% to 60% by 2020.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 5: txConnect administrator reports.

Summative Evaluation 5:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Campus will use parent portal for registration process. Campus administration will send reminders to parents about the uses of parent portal. | 3.1, 3.2 | Parent portal usage report | increase of usage from 37% to 60% | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Goal 4: Edward K. Downing Elementary will utilize financial resources in a responsible and data-driven manner to support student learning.

Performance Objective 1: All 2019-2020 requests for professional development will include an implementation plan that reflects the financial impact from the initial training to follow up training for years 2 and 3 and include planning for new employees.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: Professional Development Plans

Summative Evaluation 1:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| TEA Priorities Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals 1) Campus leadership team develop a professional development plan for campus as a whole and for individual teachers | 2.5 | teachers and administration. individual professional development plans and campus development plans. | Decrease in teacher turnover to less than 10%. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1 Funding Sources: Title One School-wide - 0.00 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: 11 of our classroom teaching positions are held by long term substitutes Root Cause 1: cost of living in Odessa is at all time high and lack of teacher applicants. |

Goal 5: Edward K. Downing Elementary will provide and promote a safe climate that is conducive to learning.

Performance Objective 1: Special programs will be offered to support the unique needs of students at various social/ emotional levels of functioning in order to promote a safe climate that is conducive to learning.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: Program rosters, attendance data, completion and graduation rates

Summative Evaluation 1:


| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Anti-Bullying presentation to help lower the percentage of bullying on campus. | 2.6, 3.1 | student attendance and discipline referrals on bullying | reduce the amount of bullying referrals to less than 10% of total amount of referrals. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Goal 5: Edward K. Downing Elementary will provide and promote a safe climate that is conducive to learning.

Performance Objective 2: Edward K. Downing Elementary will ensure training for 100% of the staff will occur annually to promote the safety of all students.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: Staff sign-in, archived training documents

Summative Evaluation 2:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Monthly fire drills will be conducted. 4 times a year the lock down safety drills will be conducted. 4 times a year the severe weather drills will be conducted | 2.6, 3.2 | End of year safety drill reports | meet the district and state compliance. | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |


Goal 6: Edward K. Downing Elementary will establish and maintain strong partnerships with parents, the community, businesses, and local partnerships.

Performance Objective 1: Improve customer service and community perceptions of Edward K. Downing Elementary to an 80% as measured by a campus created Customer Service Survey by 2024.


Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: Pre and Post Surveys
District/Campus Customer Satisfaction Feedback

Summative Evaluation 1:


| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Pre and Post survey to measure customer service and community perceptions | 3.1, 3.2 | Survey results | above 90% satisfaction by survey data | | | | |




= Accomplished



= Continue/Modify



= No Progress



= Discontinue

Goal 6: Edward K. Downing Elementary will establish and maintain strong partnerships with parents, the community, businesses, and local partnerships.

Performance Objective 2: Streamline the flow of communication so that teachers and parents are efficiently directed to the proper department in order to have their questions answered in a timely manner.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2:

Summative Evaluation 2:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Social Media apps and blackboard will be used to communicate to community and of upcoming events | 3.1 | usage report of social media apps and blackboard messages | 100% parent communication | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Parent and Community Engagement 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:


| Parent and Community Engagement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: Small number of parents in our VIPS program or showing willingness to help in classrooms and in school. Root Cause 1: School staff needs to reach out personally to see if parents would be willing to volunteer. |

Goal 6: Edward K. Downing Elementary will establish and maintain strong partnerships with parents, the community, businesses, and local partnerships.

Performance Objective 3: Encourage partnerships with community health-based agencies and individuals as educational resources to improve the wellness of Edward K. Downing students, faculty, staff, and their families.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 3:

Summative Evaluation 3:

| Strategy Description | ELEMENTS | Monitor | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | | | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | | | Oct | Dec | Mar | May |
| 1) Restart the Watch D.O.G.S program | 3.1, 3.2 | Number of dads joining and participating in Watch D.O.G.S. program and sign up sheet | To have a male role model (dad) on campus every day of the school year. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Parent and Community Engagement 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2) Create parent meetings titled "Cafe con el Director". These meetings are parents meetings with the principal to discuss campus needs and progress. | 3.2 | sign in sheets. | Increase of parent communication of the status and progress of our school. | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Parent and Community Engagement 1 | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

| Parent and Community Engagement |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: Small number of parents in our VIPS program or showing willingness to help in classrooms and in school. Root Cause 1: School staff needs to reach out personally to see if parents would be willing to volunteer. |

Comprehensive Support Strategies

| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Description |
|------|-----------|----------|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | EKD instructional staff will improve the quality of Tier 1 instruction. Teacher will be trained in depth and complexity and teaching to the level of the TEKS |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | Implement a data system used to measure the amount of growth for all students K-5 |

Plan Notes

3rd Grade Reading and Math

3rd Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 77 | 65 | 63 | | | | | 61 | | 60 |
| 2017 | 73 | 61 | 60 | | | | | 60 | | 60 |
| 2016 | 73 | 56 | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | 77 | 59 | | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | 76 | 61 | | | | | | | | |

Grade 3 Reading Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 43 | 31 | 30 | | | | | 27 | | 31 |
| 2017 | 45 | 28 | 29 | | | | | 27 | | 32 |

3rd Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 78 | 67 | 67 | | | | | 64 | | 61 |
| 2017 | 78 | 61 | 60 | | | | | 60 | | 60 |
| 2016 | 75 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | 71 | | | | | | | | | |

Grade 3 Math Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 47 | 36 | 36 | | | | | 34 | | 31 |
| 2017 | 49 | 31 | 30 | | | | | 29 | | 32 |

4th Grade Reading and Math

4th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 73 | 42 | 41 | | | | | 38 | | |
| 2017 | 70 | 32 | | | | | | | | |
| 2016 | 75 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | 74 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | 74 | | | | | | | | | |

Grade 4 Reading Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 46 | 17 | 17 | | | | | 11 | | |
| 2017 | 44 | 14 | | | | | | | | |

4th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 78 | 54 | 53 | | | | | 51 | | 52 |
| 2017 | 76 | 42 | 44 | | | | | | | |
| 2016 | 73 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | | | | | | | | | | |

4th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade Level

2014 71

Grade 4 Math Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 49 | 29 | 28 | | | | | 22 | | 31 |
| 2017 | 47 | 18 | 19 | | | | | | | |

5th Grade Reading, Math, and Science

5th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 84 | 57 | 56 | | | | | | | |
| 2017 | 82 | 53 | 54 | | | | | 56 | | |
| 2016 | 81 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | 87 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | 86 | | | | | | | | | |

Grade 5 Reading Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 54 | 27 | 27 | | | | | | | |
| 2017 | | 16 | 15 | | | | | 16 | | |

5th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|---|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
|------|-------|-----|---|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|

5th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade Level

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|----|----|----|--|--|--|----|--|----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 91 | 79 | 79 | | | | 74 | | 90 |
| 2017 | 87 | 70 | 71 | | | | 72 | | |
| 2016 | 86 | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | 88 | | | | | | | | |

Grade 5 Math Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 58 | 38 | 38 | | | | | 30 | | 40 |
| 2017 | 50 | 23 | 23 | | | | | 23 | | |

5th Grade STAAR Science Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 76 | 56 | 56 | | | | | | | |
| 2017 | 74 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2016 | 74 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015 | 72 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014 | 74 | | | | | | | | | |

Grade 5 Science Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | EKD | H | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|---|----|-------|-----------|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 41 | 16 | 15 | | | | | | | |
| 2017 | 42 | | | | | | | | | |

Campus Based Leadership Team

| Committee Role | Name | Position |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Administrator | Marcos Lopez | Principal |
| Administrator | Shenna Wallace | assistant principal |
| Instructional Coach | Elvia Orras | IS Math |
| Instructional Coach | Mayra Leyva | IS Reading |
| Counselor | Cynthia Ramos | Counselor |
| Classroom Teacher | Dunia Herrera | 2nd bilingual |
| Classroom Teacher | Lizbeth Castillo | 3rd Bilingual |
| Classroom Teacher | Beth Pittmon | 4th Teacher |
| Classroom Teacher | Valeria Contreras | 1st grade |
| Classroom Teacher | Darian Scorgie | 5th grade |

Campus Funding Summary

| Local | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|---|--------------|---------------|
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | RTI resources and classroom Tier 1 resources | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | Attendance incentives | | \$0.00 |
| Sub-Total | | | | | \$0.00 |
| State Bilingual ESL | | | | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 1 | 9 | 1 | SIOP training and materials | | \$0.00 |
| Sub-Total | | | | | \$0.00 |
| Title One School-wide | | | | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Mentoring Minds | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Formative Loop | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | resources for data wall such as cards, printer ink, pocket charts | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | Bilingual LLI kits | | \$0.00 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | conference fees, professional development trainers and materials | | \$0.00 |
| Sub-Total | | | | | \$0.00 |
| Grand Total | | | | | \$0.00 |