Brackett Independent School District District Improvement Plan 2013-2014

Accountability Rating: Met Standard



Board Approval Date: March 17, 2014

Mission Statement

The mission of BISD, in partnership with parents and community, is to enable students to be safe and obtain the knowledge, desire and integrity to pursue meaningful and productive lives.

Vision

Brackett ISD ensures graduates have diverse learning experiences, creating confidence to reach their full potential and the honesty to own mistakes and the integrity to start again and achieve goals.

Value Statement

CORE BELIEFS

We believe Brackett ISD instills confidence, honesty and integrity in students to challenge, prepare and empower students to succeed in life.

We believe our students desire to be productive citizens.

We believe in Brackett ISD that instruction should be flexible to meet each student's needs.

We believe that Brackett ISD attracts and retains highly qualified staff.

We believe the Brackett ISD School Board is open-minded, engaged, supportive, student-focused and provides the tools and resources necessary for success.

We believe the Brackett ISD community is a support, giving and trusting community that deserves to be informed and involved.

Table of Contents

| Comprehensive Needs Assessment | 4 |
|---|----|
| District Culture and Climate | 4 |
| Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention | 6 |
| Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation | 7 |
| Goals | 9 |
| Goal 1: Improve student achievement annually. | 9 |
| Goal 2: Employ a diverse and qualified teaching, administrative and support staff. | 10 |
| Goal 3: Promote safe, healthy, and nurturing schools. | 11 |
| Goal 4: Efficient use of resources by all district components (campuses, departments, and board). | 12 |
| Goal 5: Improve communication between the district and all stakeholders. | 13 |
| Goal 6: All Campuses: Administrators and teachers continue preparation for the STAAR and End of Course exams as they come into place and be able to make necessary adjustments to curriculum to insure our students maintain the high levels of success we are accustomed to. All EOC passing | |
| percentage rates will exceed the state passing rate. | 14 |
| Goal 7: All Campuses will provide a safe and drug-free environment for students, staff and patrons. | |
| Goal 8: All Campuses: Improve student achievements annually: | |
| Goal 9: All Secondary Campuses: Increase Student Achievement in Social Studies 6-12 | 18 |
| Goal 10: All Secondary Campuses: Increase Student Achievement in Science 6-12 | |
| Goal 11: All Secondary Campues: Increase Student Opportunities and Achievement in the Area of Career and Technolocy Education (CTE) | 21 |
| Goal 12: All Campues: Increase Student Participation in GT Program Through Teacher Education and Awareness | 22 |
| Goal 13: Efficient use of resources by all district components (all campuses, departments and board.) | 22 |
| State Compensatory | 23 |
| Budget for District Improvement Plan: | 23 |
| 2013-2014 District Advisory Committee | 25 |
| District Funding Summary | 26 |
| Addendums | 27 |

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

District Culture and Climate

District Culture and Climate Summary

SEE Addendum: Texas Academic Performance Attendance & Dropout Rate

District Culture and Climate Strengths

SEE Addendum: Texas Academic Performance Attendance & Dropout Rate

District Culture and Climate Needs

SEE Addendum: Texas Academic Performance Attendance & Dropout Rate

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Summary

SEE Addendum: Texas Academic Performance Staff Information

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Strengths

SEE Addendum: Texas Academic Performance Staff Information

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Needs

SEE Addendum: Texas Academic Performance Staff Information

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

• District goals

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- AYP longitudinal data
- NCLB Report Card data
- PBMAS data

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), Exit Level, including all applicable versions
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) results
- Texas Success Initiative (TSI) data for postsecondary/college-ready graduates data
- Advanced Placement (AP) and/or International Baccalaureate (IB) assessment data
- SAT and/or ACT assessment data
- Student failure and/or retention rates

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Number of students assigned to each special program, including analysis of academic achievement, race, ethnicity, gender, etc
- Male / Female performance and participation data
- Special education population, including performance, discipline, attendance, and mobility
- Migrant population, including performance, discipline, attendance and mobility
- At-Risk population, including performance, discipline, attendance and mobility
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- Dyslexia Data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Completion rates and/or graduation rates data
- Annual dropout rate data
- Attendance data
- Discipline records

Brackett Independent School District Generated by Plan4Learning.com

- Violence and/or violence prevention recordsStudent surveys and/or other feedback

Goals

Goal 1: Improve student achievement annually.

Performance Objective 1: Provide a comprehensive curriculum and instructional program with high standards (PK-12) which enables all students to improve achievement.

Summative Evaluation: Focus has been and continues to be on gearing up for the more rigorous STAAR and End of Course testing. Tutorials were implemented at the secondary schools.

| Stratery Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Fo | rmati | ve Rev | iews |
|--|---|---|-----|-------|--------|------|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June |
| 1) Structured administrative meetings that focus on instruction, school policies and collaboration among campuses. | Alma Gutierrez, Elem. Principal / George Burks, JH Principal / Kevin Newsom, HS Principal | | | | | ~ |
| 2) Building Facility Assessment Committee 10-year Plan | | Implementation of 10-year plan for improvement abilities. | | | | > |
| | Funding Sources: Local | | | | | |
| 3) "BISD The Best That We Can Be" through interviews with students, staff, community members. | | | | | | > |
| 4) Staff Development focused on a common vision for the school system, grades PK-12. | Alma Gutierrez / George Burks / Kevin Newsom / Taylor Stephenson | | | | | |
| | Funding Sources: Local | | • | | | |
| 5) Annual Yearly Progress - Passing scores in all areas. | Taylor Stephenson / George Burks / Alma Gutierrez / Kevin Newsom | Test results from AYP | | | | ~ |
| 6) 2014 STAAR testing. Continue preparing students and staff for more rigorous tests. | Alma Gutierrez / George Burks / Kevin Newsom | Test results from STAAR | | | | ~ |
| | Funding Sources: Local | | • | | | |
| Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | |

Goal 2: Employ a diverse and qualified teaching, administrative and support staff.

Performance Objective 1: The district will recruit, employ, and retain a quality teaching, administrative, and support staff to attain excellence in student performance.

Summative Evaluation: All staff are highly qualified.

| Strategy Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Formative Reviews | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|-----|-----|--------------|--|--|
| Su access Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | | |
| 1) Hire the most qualified regardless of level of experience. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | All staff is Highly Qualified! | | | | \checkmark | | |
| 2) Continue focusing on a comprehensive view of all staff working at BISD. Adjust Staff - review state standards/local needs and adjust through attrition. | Taylor Stephenson / Alma Gutierrez / George Burks / Kevin Newsom | Implementation of staff changes as recommended by Principals and Superintendent. | | | | | | |
| | Funding Sources: Local | | | | | | | |
| Accomplished | | | | | | | | |

Goal 3: Promote safe, healthy, and nurturing schools.

Performance Objective 1: The district will provide and maintain safe, healthy and nurturing environments conducive to learning, which will enable students to think critically and act responsibly.

Summative Evaluation: Focus has been on common district planning with law enforcement, campus administrators and border patrol.

| Strategy Description | Staff Responsible | Fridance that Demonstrates Success | Formative Revi | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------|-----|-----|--------------|--|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | |
| 1) Periodic meetings with law enforcement, campus administrators and border patrol. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | A written District plan developed and understood by all. | | | | > | |
| | Funding Sources: Local | | • | | | | |
| 2) Develop a long range facilities plan. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | A written plan prepared with assistance from the Architect, Administrators, Board and Committee. | | | | \checkmark | |
| | Funding Sources: Local | • | • | | | | |
| 3) Implement Safety Audit for all campuses to focus on school safety. | Taylor Stephenson / Principals / Architect | Written building safety plan. Safety Committee meetings. | | | | \checkmark | |
| | Funding Sources: Local | | • | | | | |
| = Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | |

Goal 4: Efficient use of resources by all district components (campuses, departments, and board).

Performance Objective 1: The district will align its resources with its mission and establish operational processes that systematically improve individual components, which in turn, improve the district.

| Staff Responsible | Η ΜΠΑΝΛΑ ΤΝΑΤ ΠΑΜΑΝΕΤΡΑΤΑΕ ΝΠΛΛΑΕ | Formative Rev | | | iews | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| for Monitoring | | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | |
| ESC Region 20 | Written study adopted by School Board and implemented. | | | | > | |
| Funding Sources: Local | Spec Ed | | | | | |
| Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Principals | Written study. | | | | ~ | |
| Funding Sources: Local | | | | | | |
| Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Marla Madrid, Business Manager | Weekly meetings with focus on budget controls. Continued input from Principals. | | | | \checkmark | |
| Taylor Stephenson, Supt./ Marla Madrid, Business Manager/ Alma Gutierrez, Elem. Principal / George Burks, JH Principal / Kevin Newsom, HS Principal | Adopt 2014-2015 balanced budget. | | | | | |
| . Taylor Stephenson / Principals | Cost analysis. Focus on fewer, more effective programs. | | | | > | |
| - | for Monitoring ESC Region 20 Funding Sources: Local Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Principals Funding Sources: Local Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Marla Madrid, Business Manager Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Marla Madrid, Business Manager/ Alma Gutierrez, Elem. Principal / George Burks, JH Principal / Kevin Newsom, HS Principal . | for Monitoring Evidence that Demonstrates Success ESC Region 20 Written study adopted by School Board and implemented. Funding Sources: Local Spec Ed Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Principals Funding Sources: Local Written study. Funding Sources: Local Written study. Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Principals Written study. Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Marla Madrid, Business Manager Weekly meetings with focus on budget controls. Continued input from Principals. Taylor Stephenson, Supt./ Adopt 2014-2015 balanced budget. Marla Madrid, Business Manager/ Alma Gutierrez, Elem. Principal / George Burks, JH Principal / Kevin Newsom, HS Principal Adopt 2014-2015 balanced budget. . Taylor Stephenson / Cost analysis. | Start Responsible for Monitoring Evidence that Demonstrates Success Nov ESC Region 20 Written study adopted by School Board and implemented. Implemented. Funding Sources: Local Spec Ed Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Principals Written study. Funding Sources: Local Written study. Implemented. Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Principals Written study. Implemented. Taylor Stephenson, Supt. / Marla Madrid, Business Manager Weekly meetings with focus on budget controls. Continued input from Principals. Form Principals. Taylor Stephenson, Supt./ Adopt 2014-2015 balanced budget. Implemented. Implemented. Marla Madrid, Business Manager/ Alma Gutierrez, Elem. Principal / George Burks, JH Principal Adopt 2014-2015 balanced budget. Implemented. . Taylor Stephenson / Cost analysis. Implemented. Implemented. | Built Responsibility Evidence that Demonstrates Success Nov Jan ESC Region 20 Written study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board adopted by School Board adopted by School Board adopted by School | Start Monitoring Evidence that Demonstrates Success Nov Jan Mar ESC Region 20 Written study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint of the study adopted by School Board and implemented. Image: Constraint | |

Goal 5: Improve communication between the district and all stakeholders.

Performance Objective 1: The district will build and maintain positive relationships with its stakeholders, to create common interest in support of the district's mission. Stakeholders include employees, students, parents, trustees, media, volunteers, business partners, senior citizens, taxpayers, and voters.

| Strategy Description | Staff Responsible for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Formative Reviews | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-----|-----|--------------|--|
| Strategy Description | | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | |
| 1) Superintendent's report to the school board on weekly initiatives. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | Written reports. | | | | \checkmark | |
| 2) Superintendent's column published in two newspapers circulate in Kinney County. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | Newspaper published. | | | | | |
| 3) Weekly Administrative Meetings with principals and superintendent. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | Minutes of meetings. | | | | \checkmark | |
| 4) High visibility of superintendent in classrooms, campuses, and in the community. | Taylor Stephenson, Supt. | Superintendent calendar / visibility. | | | | \checkmark | |
| Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | |

Goal 6: All Campuses: Administrators and teachers continue preparation for the STAAR and End of Course exams as they come into place and be able to make necessary adjustments to curriculum to insure our students maintain the high levels of success we are accustomed to. All EOC passing percentage rates will exceed the state passing rate.

Performance Objective 1: Administrators and teachers will receive staff development targeted at changes in the state assessment program and attend the state assessment conference to prepare for the future.

Summative Evaluation: Attendance at state assessment conferences and workshops dealing with STAAR and EOC exams.

| Stuatory Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Formative Reviews | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------|-----|-----|--------------|--|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | |
| 1) Information will be gathered and disseminated to all regarding the changes in the assessment program. | Principals | Attendance at staff development and conferences targeting state assessments. | | | | \checkmark | |
| 2) Teacher/parent information meetings on EOC and STAAR | Staff/Administration | | | | | \checkmark | |
| 3) Inform parents of connection between End of Course standards and graduation plans. | Counselor | | | | | \checkmark | |
| 4) The administrators will request that the board require students to meet level two on End of Course exams. | Principal and Superintendent | | | | | \checkmark | |
| Accomplished | \bigcirc = Considerable \bigcirc = S | Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | |

Goal 6: All Campuses: Administrators and teachers continue preparation for the STAAR and End of Course exams as they come into place and be able to make necessary adjustments to curriculum to insure our students maintain the high levels of success we are accustomed to. All EOC passing percentage rates will exceed the state passing rate.

Performance Objective 2: Information regarding assessment changes will be provided to all faculty members and discussed at faculty meetings and campus leadership team meetings as it becomes available.

Goal 7: All Campuses will provide a safe and drug-free environment for students, staff and patrons.

Performance Objective 1: Incorporate presentations by motivational speakers, community members, and law enforcement agencies to all students on topics related to gangs/drugs, goals in life, education, and self-esteem. Seek presenters to provide character and anti-drug messages to our students.

Summative Evaluation: Scheduling of events.

Goal 7: All Campuses will provide a safe and drug-free environment for students, staff and patrons.

Performance Objective 2: Assure that all extra curricular activities are safe and drug free environments.

| Stratogy Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Fo | rmati | ve Rev | iews |
|---|---|--|-----|-------|--------|--------------|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June |
| 1) Remove disruptive students from extra curricular activities. | Principal and Law Enforcement | Successful campus activities. | | | | |
| 2) Drug dog walk through. | Interquest | No evidence of drugs. | | | | \checkmark |
| 3) Teacher duty rosters - before school, during lunch and after school. | Teachers | Fewer discipline problems. | | | | \checkmark |
| 4) Communication with Sheriff's department and City Police | Principal | Safer campus | | | | \checkmark |
| 5) Bullying | Principal and Law Enforcement | Cell Phone, Facebook, texting, safety, Snap Chat | | | | \checkmark |
| 6) Code Red and Mandatory Drug Testing | Principal and Law Enforcement/Uvalde Health | | | | | ~ |
| 7) Drivers Education | Principal, Administration and School Board | Safer Campus | | | | \checkmark |



Goal 8: All Campuses: Improve student achievements annually:

Performance Objective 1: Provide a comprehensive curriculum and instructional program with high standards (PK-12) which enables all students to improve achievement.

| Strategy Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Formative Reviews | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|-----|-----|--------------|--|
| | for Monitoring | | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | |
| 1) Utilize secondary Learning Center. | Staff and Administration | Improved grades and reduced failures. | | | | > | |
| 2) Tutorial periods for all students in need. | Staff | Improved grades and reduced failures. | | | | ~ | |
| 3) Utilize on-line programs and software. | Staff | Improved grades and reduced failures. | | | | \checkmark | |
| 4) Communicate with parents. | Staff | Student achievement. | | | | \checkmark | |
| Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | |

Goal 9: All Secondary Campuses: Increase Student Achievement in Social Studies 6-12

Performance Objective 1: More than 85 percent of all 9-12 students will meet or exceed the state passing level on Social Studies EOC with all subgroups at or above 80 percent. 85 percent of all 7-8 students will meet or exceed the state passing level on Social Studies STAAR exam with all subgroups at or above 80 percent.

Summative Evaluation: Number and frequency of meetings documented.

| Structure Description | Staff Responsible | E-idance that Demonstrates Success | Fo | rmativ | ve Revi | iews |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----|--------|---------|--------------|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June |
| 1) Department leader will train, disseminate information, and align courses and curriculum for social studies. Mentor teachers throughout the year. | Principal and Department Head | Sign-in sheets at department meetings. | | | | < |
| 2) Provide opportunities for regularly scheduled department meetings (6-12) that would enable better planning for Scope and Sequence; and departmental training and sharing of STAAR/EOC practice materials. | Principals and Department Head | Sign-in sheets at department meetings. | | | | < |
| 3) Use all available instructional programs to determine all at-risk students and provide appropriate interventions. | Principal, department head. | | | | | \checkmark |
| 4) Collaborate on increasing STAAR and EOC data bank of questions for both the standard and modified assessments and utilize these questions for reinforcement and practice. | PLC Committee | | | | | ~ |
| 5) Upgrade technology in all social studies classrooms. (1 to 1 ratio on available computers, document cameras in each classroom, and availability of online resources). | Technology | | | | | |
| Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | |

Goal 9: All Secondary Campuses: Increase Student Achievement in Social Studies 6-12

Performance Objective 2: All social studies teachers grade 3-12 will have the opportunity to meet at least once each semester to work on scope and sequence.

Summative Evaluation: Sign-in sheet with minutes of meeting.

Goal 9: All Secondary Campuses: Increase Student Achievement in Social Studies 6-12

Performance Objective 3: Increase available library books dealing with social studies at all levels that have Accelerated Reader tests.

Summative Evaluation: Circulation Reports

| Strategy Description | Staff Responsible | Staff Responsible for MonitoringEvidence that Demonstrates Success | Formative Reviews | | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------|-----|-----|------|--|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | |
| 1) Social Studies teachers will meet with librarian in January to make recommendations. | District Librarian and Department Heads | Sign-in sheets of meeting and purchase of new books. | | | | | |
| Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | |

Goal 10: All Secondary Campuses: Increase Student Achievement in Science 6-12

Performance Objective 1: 87 percent of all 9-12 students will meet or exceed the state passing level on Science STAAR with all subgroups at or above 80 percent. 80 percent of all 7-8 students will meet or exceed the state passing level on Science STAAR with all subgroups at or above 75 percent.

Summative Evaluation: Campus Accountability Data Tables

| Stratagy Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Fo | rmati | ve Rev | iews |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|-----|-------|--------|--------------|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June |
| 1) Department Leader will disseminate information via email and Department meetings; help align curriculum and courses, and mentor teachers in department throughout the year. | Department Head | continue | | | | ~ |
| 2) Hold both outside of school and in class EOC/STAAR preparation sessions for at least eight weeks prior to the Spring EOC/STAAR | Principal and Department Heads | Sign-in sheets. Continue | | | | ~ |
| 3) Utilize technology and online programs to provide both interventions and enrichment to all science students. (Study Island, Brain Pop, and library data banks.) | Principal, department head. | Continue | | | | ~ |
| 4) Keep science class sizes as small as possible to enable the teacher to give each student individual attention when needed. Loss of 1 Science teacher position each of the past 2 years has negatively impacted this goal. Analysis of BHS master schedule, class size, and teaching assignments clearly show a need to add 1 full teacher unit to the science department. This will allow us to meet this goal and to offer more courses, some of which have been dropped in the past 2 years | Principal, department head. | Master schedule with class sizes listed. No progress here! | | | | ~ |
| 5) Adjust the rigor of science instruction to meet the increased demands of the new state assessments. | Principal, department head | Lesson plans, exams. Continue | | | | \checkmark |
| 6) In cooperation with the Math department, ensure that all Chemistry and Physics students are provided with an up-to-date graphing calculator. | Department Head | Accomplished! | | | | \checkmark |
| Accomplished | = Considerable | = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | |

Goal 11: All Secondary Campues: Increase Student Opportunities and Achievement in the Area of Career and Technolocy Education (CTE)

Performance Objective 1: District will explore the need to update the Family Consumer Lab, Business Lab, and Agriculture Lab to meet the rigors of the changing job market.

Summative Evaluation: Advisory group meetings documented with discussion notes from each meeting.

| Strategy Description | Staff Responsible | Enderson that Demonstructor Success | Formative Reviews | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|------|--|--|--|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | | | |
| 1) Identify and create list of equipment requirements based on state curriculum. | CTE teachers, CTE director, Principal, and Superintendent | Updated labs and equipment. | | | | ~ | | | |
| 2) Identify Course sequences to support endorsements | CTE teachers, Counselor, Principal, Superintendent | Course catalog/offerings | | | | ~ | | | |
| 3) Create plan for shared building, meats lab/culinary arts, commerical | School Board, Superintendent | Approval and Plans | | | | | | | |
| = Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | | | | | |

Goal 12: All Campues: Increase Student Participation in GT Program Through Teacher Education and Awareness

Performance Objective 1: Core teachers will receive 30 hours of GT training and receive GT certification CORE teachers will receive yearly recertifications of 6 hours continuing education Certificates and hours on file in Central office.

Summative Evaluation: Certificates and hours on file in Central office.

Goal 13: Efficient use of resources by all district components (all campuses, departments and board.)

Performance Objective 1: Increase achievement levels of students in the special education program.

Goal 13: Efficient use of resources by all district components (all campuses, departments and board.)

Performance Objective 2: Address special ed staffing issues to address the needs of the special education population.

Summative Evaluation: STAAR and EOC passing levels will increase.

| Stratogy Description | Staff Responsible | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | | Formative Reviews | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----|-------------------|-----|------|--|--|
| Strategy Description | for Monitoring | Evidence that Demonstrates Success | Nov | Jan | Mar | June | | |
| 1) Teachers will receive all relevant information on each student in the special education program in a timely fashion. | Principal, Special education director. | | | | | | | |
| = Accomplished | = Considerable | Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue | | | | | | |

State Compensatory

Budget for District Improvement Plan:

| Account Code | Account Title | Budget |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|
| 6100 Payroll Costs | · | |
| 199.11.6112.xx.001.424000 | 6112 Salaries or Wages for Substitute Teachers or Other Professionals | \$1,000.00 |
| 199.11.6112.xx.101.424000 | 6112 Salaries or Wages for Substitute Teachers or Other Professionals | \$5,000.00 |
| 199.11.6118.xx.001.424000 | 6118 Extra Duty Stipend - Locally Defined | \$3,000.00 |
| 199.11.6118.xx.041.424000 | 6118 Extra Duty Stipend - Locally Defined | \$1,500.00 |
| 199.11.6117.xx.101.424000 | 6119 Salaries or Wages - Teachers and Other Professional Personnel | \$137,090.00 |
| 199.31.6117.xx.001.424000 | 6119 Salaries or Wages - Teachers and Other Professional Personnel | \$23,402.00 |
| 199.31.6117.xx.041.424000 | 6119 Salaries or Wages - Teachers and Other Professional Personnel | \$20,479.00 |
| 199.31.6117.xx.101.424000 | 6119 Salaries or Wages - Teachers and Other Professional Personnel | \$48,130.00 |
| 199.11.6125.xx.101.424000 | 6125 Salary Support - Locally Defined | \$65,667.00 |
| 199.12.6125.xx.001.424000 | 6125 Salary Support - Locally Defined | \$23,192.00 |
| 199.11.6125.xx.001.424000 | 6125 Salary Support - Locally Defined | \$32,445.00 |
| 199.11.6125.xx.041.424000 | 6125 Salary Support - Locally Defined | \$8,233.00 |
| 199.11.6126.xx.001.424000 | 6126 Part Time Support Personnel - Locally Defined | \$1,500.00 |
| 199.11.6141.xx.001.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$435.00 |
| 199.11.6141.xx.041.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$119.00 |
| 199.11.6141.xx.101.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$2,563.00 |
| 199.12.6141.xx.001.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$295.00 |
| 199.31.6141.xx.001.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$339.00 |
| 199.31.6141.xx.041.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$297.00 |
| 199.31.6141.xx.101.424000 | 6141 Social Security/Medicare | \$662.00 |
| 199.11.6142.xx.001.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$2,128.00 |

| | 6100 Subtotal: | \$421,315.00 |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|
| 199.31.6146.xx.101.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$621.00 |
| 199.31.6146.xx.041.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$505.00 |
| 199.31.6146.xx.001.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$577.00 |
| 199.12.6146.xx.001.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$128.00 |
| 199.11.6146.xx.101.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$6,164.00 |
| 199.11.6146.xx.041.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$45.00 |
| 199.11.6146.xx.001.424000 | 6146 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care | \$178.00 |
| 199.11.6144.xx.041.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$576.00 |
| 199.11.6144.xx.001.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$2,271.00 |
| 199.31.6144.xx.101.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$3,212.00 |
| 199.31.6144.xx.041.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$1,085.00 |
| 199.31.6144.xx.001.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$1,439.00 |
| 199.12.6144.xx.001.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$1,623.00 |
| 199.11.6144.xx.101.424000 | 6144 Teacher Retirement/TRS Care - On Behalf Payment | \$11,937.00 |
| 199.31.6143.xx.101.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$162.00 |
| 199.31.6143.xx.041.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$69.00 |
| 199.31.6143.xx.001.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$79.00 |
| 199.12.6143.xx.001.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$78.00 |
| 199.11.6143.xx.101.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$603.00 |
| 199.11.6143.xx.041.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$28.00 |
| 199.11.6143.xx.001.424000 | 6143 Workers' Compensation | \$109.00 |
| 199.31.6142.xx.101.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$2,411.00 |
| 199.31.6142.xx.041.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$3.00 |
| 199.31.6142.xx.001.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$4.00 |
| 199.12.6142.xx.001.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$2,711.00 |
| 199.11.6142.xx.101.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$7,215.00 |
| 199.11.6142.xx.041.424000 | 6142 Group Health and Life Insurance | \$6.00 |

2013-2014 District Advisory Committee

| Committee Role | Name | Position |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Business Representative | Lynn McCarson | |
| Business Representative | Darlene Shahan | |
| Classroom Teacher | Zoe Facilla | |
| Classroom Teacher | Marla Hibbitts | |
| Classroom Teacher | Christy Price | Chairperson |
| Classroom Teacher | Robin Schwandner | |
| Community Representative | Jean Hood | |
| Community Representative | Bob Nelson | |
| Counselor | Kimberly Ilse | |
| Counselor | Louisa Stone | |
| Parent | Stephanie Buitron | |
| Parent | Rosario Guzman | |
| Parent | Carla Newsom | |
| Student | Judy Adams | |
| Student | Leslie Allen | |
| Superintendent | Taylor Stephenson | |

District Funding Summary

| Local | | | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed Account Code | Amount |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 1 | 1 | 4 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 1 | 1 | 6 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| | | • | Sub-Total | \$0 |
| Local Sp | ec Ed | | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed Account Code | Amount |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | To Be Determined | \$0 |
| | | • | Sub-Total | \$0 |
| | | | Grand Total | \$0 |

Addendums

District Name: BRACKETT ISD

County Name: KINNEY District Number: 136901

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2012-13 District Performance

•

•

| | State | Region 20 | District | African American | Hispanic | White | American Indian | Asian | Pacific Islander M | Two or ore Races | Special Ed | Econ Disadv | ELL |
|--|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|--------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| Attendance Rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2011-12 | 95.9% | 95.5% | 95.5% | * | 95.2% | 96.2% | - | * | - | * | 94.8% | 95.3% | 96.6% |
| 2010-11 | 95.7% | 95.2% | 95.5% | * | .95.2% ⊽ | 96.2% | - | * | - | 94.1% | 94.3% | 95.4% | 95.8% |
| Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 7-8) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2011-12 | 0.3% | 0.5% | 0.0% | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | * | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| 2010-11 | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | * | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 9-12) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2011-12 | 2.4% | 3.0% | 5.5% | * | 5.4% | 4.0% | - | - | - | * | 4.3% | 6.2% | 0.0% |
| 2010-11 | 2.4% | 3.2% | 0.5% | * | 0.7% | 0.0% | - | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 4-Year Longitudinal Rate (Gr 9- Class of 2012 | ·12) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduated | 87.7% | 86.3% | 83.9% | - | 86.4% | 87.5% | - | - | - | * | 85.7% | 86.4% | * |
| Received GED | 1.0% | 1.2% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Continued HS | 5.0% | 4.7% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Dropped Out | 6.3% | 7.8% | 16.1% | - | 13.6% | 12.5% | - | - | - | * | 14.3% | 13.6% | * |
| Graduates and GED | 88.7% | 87.5% | 83.9% | - | 86.4% | 87.5% | - | - | - | * | 85.7% | 86.4% | * |
| Grads, GED, & Cont | 93.7% | 92.2% | 83.9% | - | 86.4% | 87.5% | - | - | - | * | 85.7% | 86.4% | * |
| Class of 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduated | 85.9% | 83.2% | 93.4% | - | 89.2% | 100.0% | - | - | - | * | 100.0% | 92.5% | * |
| Received GED | 1.1% | 1.4% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Continued HS | 6.2% | 6.4% | 4.9% | - | 8.1% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 7.5% | * |
| Dropped Out | 6.8% | 8.9% | 1.6% | - | 2.7% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| 5-Year Extended Longitudinal F Class of 2011 | Rate (Gr 9-12 | 2) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduated | 89.1% | 86.5% | 98.4% | - | 97.3% | 100.0% | - | - | - | * | 100.0% | 100.0% | * |
| Received GED | 1.4% | 1.9% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Continued HS | 1.6% | 1.4% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Dropped Out | 7.9% | 10.3% | 1 .6% | - | 2.7% | 0.0% | - | - | - | * | 0.0% | 0.0% | * |
| Graduates and GED | 90.5% | 88.3% | 98.4% | - | 97.3% | 100.0% | - | - | - | * | 100.0% | 100.0% | * |
| Grads, GED, & Cont | 92.1% | 89.7% | 98.4% | - | 97.3% | 100.0% | - | - | - | * | 100.0% | 100.0% | * |
| Class of 2010 (without exclus | sions) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduated | 88.0% | 84.0% | 94.0% | - | 94.3% | 93.3% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 91.7% | * |
| Received GED | 1.6% | 2.4% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 0.0% | * |
| Continued HS | 1.8% | 2.1% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 0.0% | * |
| Dropped Out | 8.6% | 11.4% | 6.0% | - | 5.7% | 6.7% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 8.3% | * |
| 6-Year Extended Longitudinal F Class of 2010 | Rate Withou | t Exclusions (G | ir 9-12) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Graduated | 88.7% | 84.9% | 94.0% | - | 94.3% | 93.3% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 91.7% | * |
| Received GED | 1.9% | 2.7% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 0.0% | * |
| Continued HS | 0.7% | 0.9% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 0.0% | * |
| Dropped Out | 8.7% | 11.6% | 6.0% | - | 5.7% | 6.7% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 8.3% | * |
| Graduates and GED | 90.6% | 87.6% | 94.0% | - | 94.3% | 93.3% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 91.7% | * |
| Grads, GED, & Cont | 91.3% | 88.4% | 94.0% | - | 94.3% | 93.3% | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | * | 91.7% | * |

District Name: BRACKETT ISD County Name: KINNEY District Number: 136901

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2012-13 District Profile

.

.

| Staff Information Count Percent Count Total Staff 106.0 100.0% 642,184.2 Professional Staff: × 63.8 60.2% 410,626.9 Teachers 54.6 51.5% 327,419.5 Professional Support 5.8 5.4% 57,943.6 Campus Administration 2.0 1.9% 6,552.8 60,039.4 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60,039.4 Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289,867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 44.6 81,7% 205,51.4.5 African American 0.0 0.0% 4,235.1 White 44.6 81,7% 205,51.4.5 White 44.6 26.7% 75,928.1 Yor More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75,928.1 Teachers by HighestDegree Held: 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Males | | Dia | strict | State | | |
|---|---|-------|--------|-----------|---------|--|
| Professional Staff: 63.8 60.2% 410.626.9 Teachers 54.6 51.5% 327.419.5 Professional Support 54.8 54.4% 57.943.6 Campus Administration 1.4 1.3% 18.711.2 Campus Administration 2.0 1.9% 6.552.8 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60.039.4 Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171.517.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: - - - African American 0.0 0.0% 30.708.2 Hispanic 9.0 16.5% 81.501.1 White 44.6 81.7% 20.5514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1.256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 2.956.9 Bacheiros 45.8 83.8% 246.934.9 Males 7.8 0.38% 2.46.934.9 Males 7.8 0.38% 2.2756.2 <th>Staff Information</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Percent</th> | Staff Information | | | Count | Percent | |
| Professional Staff: 63.8 60.2% 410.626.9 327.419.5 Teachers 54.6 51.5% 327.419.5 Professional Support Campus Administration (School Leadership) 2.0 1.4 1.3% 18,711.2 Central Administration 2.0 19.0% 6552.8 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60.039.4 Auxillary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Total Minority Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 45.7 43.2% 289.867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 74.78 74.52 289.867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 74.79 74.53 74.53 African American 0.0 0.0% 29 | Total Staff | 106.0 | 100.0% | 642,184.2 | 100.0% | |
| Professional Support 5.8 5.4% 57.943.6 Campus Administration 1.4 1.3% 18.711.2 Central Administration 2.0 1.9% 6,552.8 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60,039.4 Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289,867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: | Professional Staff: | | 60.2% | 410,626.9 | 63.9% | |
| Campus Administration 1.4 1.3% 18,711.2 Central Administration 2.0 1.9% 6,552.8 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60,039.4 Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289,867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 0 0.0% 30,708.2 African American 9.0 16.5% 81,501.1 White 44.6 81.7% 205,514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 225,61 Asian 0.0 0.0% 225,61 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26,7% 75,928.1 Females 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,933.49 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,528.1 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 24,533.49< | Teachers | 54.6 | 51.5% | 327,419.5 | 51.0% | |
| Central Administration 2.0 1.9% 6,552.8 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60,039.4 Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289,867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 0.0 0.0% 30,708.2 African American 9.0 16.5% 81,501.1 White 44.6 81,7% 205,514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1,256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 2444.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 83.8% 246,934.9 Pachers by HighestDegree Held: 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 1.0 1.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 1.0 1.83% 246,934.9 Teachers by Years of Experience: 12.8 23 | Professional Support | 5.8 | 5.4% | 57,943.6 | 9.0% | |
| Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60.039.4 Educational Aides: 14.0 13.2% 60.039.4 Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171.517.9 Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289.867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: | Campus Administration (School Leadership) | 1.4 | 1.3% | 18,711.2 | 2.9% | |
| Auxiliary Staff: 28.2 26.6% 171,517.9 Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289,867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: - - - African American 0.0 0.0% 30,708.2 Hispanic 9.0 16.5% 81,501.1 White 44.6 81.7% 205.514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 4,241.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 4,256.1 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75.928.1 Females 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246.934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 1.0 18.3% 85,475.9 Teachers by Years of Experience: 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 <t< td=""><td>Central Administration</td><td>2.0</td><td>1.9%</td><td>6,552.8</td><td>1.0%</td></t<> | Central Administration | 2.0 | 1.9% | 6,552.8 | 1.0% | |
| Total Minority Staff: 45.7 43.2% 289,867.9 Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: | Educational Aides: | 14.0 | 13.2% | 60,039.4 | 9.3% | |
| Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: 0.0 0.0% 30,708.2 African American 9.0 16.5% 81,501.1 White 44.6 81.7% 205,514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1,256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 4,441.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75.928.1 Females 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75.715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 8 23.4% 22.758.2 1-5 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 1-20 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 1-20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | Auxiliary Staff: | 28.2 | 26.6% | 171,517.9 | 26.7% | |
| African American 0.0 0.0% 30,708.2 Hispanic 9.0 16.5% 81,501.1 White 44.6 81.7% 205,514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1,256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75.928.1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by HighestDegree Held: 10 1.8% 2,956.9 Maters 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 2 2 2.4% Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22.758.2 1-5 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74.433.1 1-5 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74.433.1 11-20 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74.433.1 <td< td=""><td>Total Minority Staff:</td><td>45.7</td><td>43.2%</td><td>289,867.9</td><td>45.1%</td></td<> | Total Minority Staff: | 45.7 | 43.2% | 289,867.9 | 45.1% | |
| Hispanic 9.0 16.5% 81,501.1 White 44.6 81.7% 205,514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1,256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 4,441.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75.928.1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251.491.4 Teachers by HighestDegree Held: 10 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 10.0 18.3% 82,757.9 Fears Sperience 10.0 18.3% 85,75.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 10.6 19,4% 56,570.2 | Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex: | | • | | | |
| White 44.6 81.7% 205,514.5 American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1,256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 4,441.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75.928.1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 10 1.8% 2,956.9 No Degree 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.4% 56,570.2 36,5 | | | | | 9.4% | |
| American Indian 0.0 0.0% 1,256.1 Asian 0.0 0.0% 4,441.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75,928.1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 2956.9 No Degree 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 6.570.2 | | | | | 24.9% | |
| Asian 0.0 0.0% 4,441.4 Pacific Islander 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75.928.1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by HighestDegree Held: No Degree 1.0 1.8% 2.956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 19.4% 56,570.2 36,570.2 | | | | | 62.8% | |
| Pacific Islander Two or More Races 0.0 0.0% 255.6 Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males Females 14.6 26.7% 75,928.1 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 No Degree 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 2 2 2 Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | 0.4% | |
| Two or More Races 1.0 1.8% 3,742.5 Males 14.6 26.7% 75,928,1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 10 1.8% 2,956.9 No Degree 1.0 1.8% 246,934.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 2 2 2,956.9 Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | 1.4% | |
| Males 14.6 26.7% 75,928.1 Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 73.3% 2,956.9 No Degree 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 7.8 14.4% 22,758.2 Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,70.2 | | | | | 0.1% | |
| Females 40.0 73.3% 251,491.4 Teachers by Highest Degree Held: | Two or More Races | 1.0 | 1.8% | 3,742.5 | 1.1% | |
| Teachers by Highest Degree Held: 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | 23.2% | |
| No Degree 1.0 1.8% 2,956.9 Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | Females | 40.0 | 73.3% | 251,491.4 | 76.8% | |
| Bachelors 45.8 83.8% 246,934.9 Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | | |
| Masters 7.8 14.4% 75,715.3 Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 23.4% 22,758.2 Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | 0.9% | |
| Doctorate 0.0 0.0% 1,812.5 Teachers by Years of Experience: 3 3 3 Beginning Teachers 12.8 23.4% 22,758.2 1-5 Years Experience 10.0 18.3% 85,475.9 6-10 Years Experience 9.0 16.5% 74,433.1 11-20 Years Experience 12.2 22.4% 88,182.0 Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | 75.4% | |
| Teachers by Years of Experience:12.823.4%22,758.21-5 Years Experience10.018.3%85,475.96-10 Years Experience9.016.5%74,433.111-20 Years Experience12.222.4%88,182.0Over 20 Years Experience10.619.4%56,570.2 | | | | | 23.1% | |
| Beginning Teachers12.823.4%22,758.21-5 Years Experience10.018.3%85,475.96-10 Years Experience9.016.5%74,433.111-20 Years Experience12.222.4%88,182.0Over 20 Years Experience10.619.4%56,570.2 | Doctorate | 0.0 | 0.0% | 1,812.5 | 0.6% | |
| 1-5 Years Experience10.018.3%85,475.96-10 Years Experience9.016.5%74,433.111-20 Years Experience12.222.4%88,182.0Over 20 Years Experience10.619.4%56,570.2 | | | | | | |
| 6-10 Years Experience9.016.5%74,433.111-20 Years Experience12.222.4%88,182.0Over 20 Years Experience10.619.4%56,570.2 | | | | | 7.0% | |
| 11-20 Years Experience12.222.4%88,182.0Over 20 Years Experience10.619.4%56,570.2 | | | | | 26.1% | |
| Over 20 Years Experience 10.6 19.4% 56,570.2 | | | | | 22.7% | |
| | | | | | 26.9% | |
| Number of Students per Teacher 11.4 p/a 15.5 | Over 20 Years Experience | 10.6 | 19.4% | 56,570.2 | 17.3% | |
| | Number of Students per Teacher | 11.4 | n/a | 15.5 | n/a | |

7

District Name: BRACKETT ISD County Name: KINNEY District Number: 136901

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2012-13 District Profile

.

| Staff Information (Continued) | District | State |
|--|----------|----------|
| Average Years Experience of Teachers: | 11.3 | 11.5 |
| Average Years Experience of Teachers with District: | 7.4 | 8.0 |
| Average Teacher Salary by Years of Experience (regular duties only): | | |
| Beginning Teachers | \$39,509 | \$41,878 |
| 1-5 Years Experience | \$34,957 | \$44,354 |
| 6-10 Years Experience | \$43,376 | \$46,784 |
| 11-20 Years Experience | \$45,846 | \$50,587 |
| Over 20 Years Experience | \$53,580 | \$58,291 |
| Average Actual Teacher Salaries (regular duties only): | | |
| Teachers | \$43,462 | \$48,821 |
| Professional Support | \$48,806 | \$57,253 |
| Campus Administration (School Leadership) | \$64,955 | \$71,259 |
| Central Administration | \$73,829 | \$91,993 |
| Instructional Staff Percent: | 64.8 | 64.2 |
| Turnover Rate for Teachers: | 29.0 | 15.3 |
| Staff Exclusions: | | |
| Shared Services Arrangement Staff: | | |
| Professional Staff | 0.0 | 1,153.9 |
| Educational Aides | 0.0 | 224.3 |
| Auxiliary Staff | 0.0 | 608.6 |
| Contracted Instructional Staff: | 0.0 | 1,556.8 |
| | | |

7

District Name: BRACKETT ISD County Name: KINNEY District Number: 136901

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY **Texas Academic Performance Report** 2012-13 District Profile

.

| | State | | |
|-----------|----------|--|--|
| Count | Percent | | |
| | | | |
| 840,072 | 16.6% | | |
| 1,110,812 | 22.0% | | |
| 387,578 | 7.7% | | |
| 431,041 | 8.5% | | |
| | | | |
| 17,422.4 | 5.3% | | |
| 13,453.0 | 4.1% | | |
| 9,490.0 | 2.9% | | |
| 6,417.3 | 2.0% | | |
| 239,612.0 | 73.2% | | |
| 30,185.4 | 9.2% | | |
| 10,839.3 | 3.3% | | |
| | 30,185.4 | | |

Link to: PEIMS Financial Standard Reports/ 2011-2012 Financial Actual Report

7

'?' Indicates that the data for this item were statistically improbable, or were reported outside a reasonable range.
'*' Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.
'-' Indicates zero observations reported for this group.
'n/a' Indicates data reporting is not applicable for this group.

Education Service Center, Region 20

| | Migrant Education Program: Identification and Recruitment Action Plan | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Goal: | Identify and recruit migrant families residing in the SSA and Non Project districts to ensure that migrant students are provided with appropriate educational services, and to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state, content, and student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. | | | | | | | | |
| Objective: | Ensure all eligible migrant families residing in the districts are properly identified, recruited, and served in order to provide the supplemental services needed to ensure student success in school by zero errors on Certificate of Eligibility (COE). | | | | | | | | |
| Evidence of Need | Required Activity | Timeline | Staff Responsible | Resource | Evaluation of Program & Impact | | | | |
| Required Training | Attend Annual Identification & Recruitment (ID&R) Training and New Generation System (NGS) Training offered by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) | August or dates the online state training is released | Ed Specs | Online state trainings NGS website ID&R & NGS Manuals | Certificates | | | | |
| | New employees attend MSIX training offered by ESC 20 | Year round | Ed Specs | TEA materials MSIX website | Certificates | | | | |
| | Brainstorm and plan recruitment strategies for SSAs and Non Project districts and review roles & responsibilities of recruiters. | Year round | MEP staff | ID&R Manual new guidelines SSA Procedures Handbook | Increased identification of migrant students | | | | |
| Identification & Recruitment | Finalize all forms, documents and logs that will be utilized. Disseminate and train on all forms, documents, and logs, etc. | By September 30 | MEP staff | ID&R Manual SSA Procedures Handbook | Forms that meet Title I Part C Migrant Compliance Report | | | | |



Education Service Center, Region 20

| | Migrant Education Program: Identification and Recruitment Action Plan | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Goal: | Identify and recruit migrant families residing in the SSA and Non Project districts to ensure that migrant students are provided with appropriate educational services, and to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state, content, and student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. | | | | | | | | |
| Objective: | Ensure all eligible migrant families residing in the districts are properly identified, recruited, and served in order to provide the supplemental services needed to ensure student success in school by zero errors on COEs. | | | | | | | | |
| Evidence of Need | Required Activity | Timeline | Staff Responsible | Resource | Evaluation of Program & Impact | | | | |
| Identification | Contact potential/current eligible migrant families: using door to door recruitment based on leads or referrals, following-up on family surveys, during school registration, Conducting community outreach, visiting growers, locating out of school youth including pre-school aged children and contacting other state and federal agencies that serve migrant families. | Year round | Recruiters SEA Reviewers | Family Surveys Growers Community agencies District personnel COEs | Recruiter logs and certified letters sent to parents after three attempts to contact the family; completed COEs | | | | |
| & Recruitment (continued) | Contact current eligible migrant families to determine if new qualifying moves have occurred. Complete new COEs as needed. | July 1- October 1 | Recruiters | ID&R Manual | Completed COEs and documentation of contact attempts on First Contact Spreadsheet | | | | |
| | Recruiter will complete COEs and Supplemental Documentation Form (SDF) for all families with a new Qualifying Arrival Data (QAD) and submit to Eligibility Reviewer. | Year round submit to reviewer within 3 working days from parent signature | Recruiters SEA Reviewers | ID&R Manual COE, SDF SSA Procedures Handbook | Completed COE and SDF for all families having a new QAD | | | | |

Revised 7/15/2013



Education Service Center, Region 20

| Migrant Education Program: Identification and Recruitment Action Plan | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Goal: | Identify and recruit migrant families residing in the SSA and Non Project districts to ensure that migrant students are provided with appropriate educational services, and to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state, content, and student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. | | | | | | |
| Objective: | Ensure all eligible migrant families residing in the districts are properly identified, recruited, and served in order to provide the supplemental services needed to ensure student success in school by zero errors on COEs. | | | | | | |
| Evidence of Need | Required Activity | Timeline | Staff Responsible | Resource | Evaluation of Program & Impact | | |
| Identification & Recruitment (continued) | SEA Reviewers review COEs and SDF for all families with a new QAD. Return COE and SDF to recruiter if additional information is needed. Submit to NGS Terminal Site after eligibility review is completed for entry in NGS. | September-August Reviewer submit to terminal site within 5 days of parent signature Refer to current NGS Manual for entry procedures and timelines. | Recruiters SEA Reviewer System Specialist | COE, SDF ID&R Manual NGS Guidelines SSA Procedures Handbook COE Log | Monthly Unique Reports for each SSA district. | | |
| | Conduct Residency Verification to verify continued residency for all currently eligible children who have not made a new qualifying move during the current reporting period. | Sept 1 – Nov 1 or For 2 year olds turning 3: on or after 3 rd birthday | Recruiters System Specialist | NGS Guidelines ID & R Manual NGS Reports PEIMS | Monthly Residency Verification Report. | | |



Education Service Center, Region 20

| Migrant Education Program: Identification and Recruitment Action Plan | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Goal: | Identify and recruit migrant families residing in the SSA and Non Project districts to ensure that migrant students are provided with appropriate educational services, and to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state, content, and student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. | | | | | | | |
| Objective: | Ensure all eligible migrant families residing in the districts are properly identified, recruited, and served in order to provide the supplemental services needed to ensure student success in school by zero errors on COEs. | | | | | | | |
| Evidence of Need | Required Activity | Timeline | Staff Responsible | Resource | Evaluation of Program & Impact | | | |
| Interagency Coordination | Network with agencies that serve migrant families. Coordinate/network with local/regional organizations that provide services to migrant workers and their families by meeting with staff. | Year round | Recruiters Ed Spec Counselor | ID&R Manual SSA Procedures Handbook | Increase in services provided to migrant families by community organizations | | | |
| | Share and exchange information with parents, students, and district staff regarding High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) sites and Teaching and Mentoring Communities (TMC). | Year round | MEP staff | ID&R Manual District Staff | Increase in services provided to migrant families by community organizations | | | |
| Quality Control | Develop written procedures that outline ID&R quality control within the SSA. | September 30 | Ed Spec | ID&R Manual TEA SSA Procedures Handbook | Written procedures for quality control | | | |
| | Develop written procedures that outline ID&R quality control for Project Districts. | September 30 | Ed Spec | | Written procedures for quality control | | | |
| | Follow protocol for COEs that warrant further review by TEA as outlined in the ID & R Manual | Year round | Ed Spec | | Compliance with TEA requirements | | | |

Revised 7/15/2013



Education Service Center, Region 20

| Migrant Education Program: Identification and Recruitment Action Plan | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Goal: | Identify and recruit migrant families residing in the SSA and Non Project districts to ensure that migrant students are provided with appropriate educational services, and to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state, content, and student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. | | | | | | | |
| Objective: | Ensure all eligible migrant families residing in the districts are properly identified, recruited, and served in order to provide the supplemental services needed to ensure student success in school by zero errors on COEs. | | | | | | | |
| Evidence of Need | Required Activity | Timeline | Staff Responsible | Resource | Evaluation of Program & Impact | | | |
| Quality Control (continued) | Provide ID&R training and support to SSA MEP staff as specific needs are observed throughout the year. | Year round | Ed Spec | ID & R Manual SSA Procedures Handbook Second Reviewer Form | Annual Quality Control Documentation | | | |
| | Maintain updated active and inactive records. File COEs in alphabetical order by current mother's last name and retain records for seven years from the date eligibility ends. | Year round | NGS | ID&R Manual NGS Manual SSA Procedures Handbook | Compliance with Records Retention policies by April 30. | | | |
| | Validate eligibility through re-interview process according to instructions set forth by TEA. | As directed by the State MEP | Ed Specs Recruiters | ID&R Manual | 100 percent accuracy rate | | | |
| Evaluation | Gather and analyze data and input from various MEP stakeholders to incorporate appropriate changes in subsequent ID&R plan for continuous improvement. | November 30 | MEP Staff | ESC-20 Quality Services Survey Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Parent Survey Student Survey SSA Contacts Survey; | Identify strengths and weaknesses to redesign the services provided by ESC-20 MEP. | | | |


As part of the NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding, Part 4 of the Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program schedule, the Priority for Service (PFS) Action Plan is a required Program Activity for the Migrant Education Program. Priority for Service students are migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state's challenging state academic content standards and challenging state student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year. [P.L. 107-110, §1304 (d)]

The Priority for Service Report on NGS must be used to determine who to serve first and foremost with MEP funds. Students are identified as PFS if they meet both of the following criteria:

| | Criteria for [Insert School Year] |
|--------------------|---|
| Grades 3-12, | Students who failed one or more of the state assessments (TAKS/STAAR), or were granted a TAKS LEP Postponement, were Absent or were not enrolled in a |
| Ungraded (UG) or | Texas school during the state assessment testing period for their grade level; <u>and</u> have their education interrupted during the previous or current regular school year. |
| Out of School (OS) | |
| Grades K-2 | Students who are designated LEP in the Student Designation section of the New Generation System (NGS) Supplemental Program Component, or have been retained, or are overage for their current grade level <u>and</u> have their education interrupted during the previous or current regular school year. |

The following template is provided as a resource for districts to help document efforts that are being conducted on behalf of Priority for Service students. It contains all of the required components as described in Part 4 of the NCLB Consolidated Application for Federal Funding, but also allows room for districts to add additional activities. Each district's plan must clearly articulate criteria for defining student success, including timelines for achieving stated goals and objectives.

NOTE: This tool can be obtained electronically in MS Word format from the regional ESC MEP Coordinator.

| Goal(s): | Objective(s): |
|--|---|
| Ensure that identified Priority for Service migrant students have the same | 100% of PFS migrant students will receive priority access to supplemental |
| opportunity to meet the challenging state, content, and student | instructional opportunities. |
| performance standards expected of all children. | |

| Required Activities | Timeline | Person(s) Responsible | Documentation |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| On a monthly basis, run NGS Priority for Service (PFS) reports to ide | entify migrant children | and youth who require prior | rity access to MEP services. |
| \mathbf{A} | Monthly | System Specialists | NGS Monthly Reports |
| Before the first day of school, develop a PFS Action Plan for serving success, including timelines for achieving stated goals and objective | | an must clearly articulate cri | teria for defining student |
| | May-August | MEP Coordinator Ed Spec Supervisors Counselors Recruiters System Specialists District Contact | Completed 2013-2014 ID&R Action Plan |
| The PFS Action Plan must include the following: When, in your school year calendar, the district's Title 1 Migrant and parents the Priority for Service criteria and updated NGS Pri | | | appropriate campus staff |
| Provide SSA migrant contacts a copy of the PFS criteria, monthly updated NGS PFS reports, and expectation of procedures to follo with PFS students. | Monthly | Ed Spec Supervisors Counselor District Contact, Campus Administrator or Campus Designee | PFS Report |
| Provide parents of PFS students a copy of the PFS criteria, discuss what it means, and discuss implications for the student. | Monthly | Ed Spec Supervisors Counselor District Contact, Campus Administrator or Campus Designee | PFS Criteria Sign-In Sheet |
| 2. When, in your school year calendar, the district's Title I Migrant community visits to update parents on the academic progress of | - | f and migrant school staff wi | ll make home and /or |

| Provide parents with the knowledge of local and state | Year Round | Ed Spec Supervisors | Parent evaluations/ |
|--|------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| requirements for promotion, graduation, academic progress of their | | Counselor | feedback |
| child, PFS criteria and community or social services. | | Recruiters | Counselor follow-up |
| | | Tutors | Tutor Feedback |
| | | District Contact, | Student Feedback |
| | | Campus Administrator | |
| | | or Campus Designee | |

| 2 | | ior Service reports to | | to these students in Migrant |
|----------|--|------------------------|--|--|
| 3. | How the district's Title I Migrant Coordinator will use NGS Priority f Education Program activities. | or Service reports to | give priority placements i | to these students in Migrant |
| A | SSA districts will provide migrant students who enroll late priority placement in core content classes. (Required Activity "m") | | | 100% of students who enroll late will be placed in the necessary core content classes |
| 4. | How the district's Title I Migrant Coordinator will ensure that Priorit | y for Service studer | Its receive priority access | to instructional services, as |
| | well as social workers and community social services/agencies. | | | |
| | Provide appropriate placement/ programs for students not meeting the state content standards or mastering TEKS objectives. Examples: tutoring, state assessment (TAKS, STAAR and EOC) remediation, UT Austin migrant coursework, credit recovery (Nova Net, Plato, FLEX, night school, etc.), summer school, or community resources/services | Year Round | Ed Spec Ed Spec Supervisor Counselor | Increased number of students completing partial credit and/or passing state assessments |
| | Identify dropout students/ out-of-school youth (OSY) to provide information regarding options for obtaining diploma/ GED. | Year Round | OSY Recruiter Ed Spec Supervisor Counselor | Identify and provide information regarding options to 100% of OSY students |
| 5. | What federal, state and local programs service Priority for Service | students? | | |
| | Identify state, federal, and local programs that serve PFS students during the current school year in order to ensure migrant services are supplemental. | Year Round | Ed Spec Supervisor | Completed spreadsheet from each SSA district on file |
| ide | e Title I Migrant Coordinator will include the PFS Action Plan in the I ntified (e.g., "Migrant PFS Action Plan" section), rather than integrat Ident population groups (e.g., Bilingual, ESL, economically disadva | ting the action plan o | | |
| | Provide district contacts with Priority for Services criteria and a copy of the PFS action plan to be included in their District Improvement Plan (DIP). | July-September | Ed Spec Supervisor Counselors | Visually verify that PFS Action Plan was included in all district DIPs |

| Additional Activities | Timeline | Person(s) Responsible | Documentation |
|---|------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Collect and analyze sources of student data to determine progress toward graduation. | Year Round | Counselor Ed Spec Supervisor | Increased number of students completing partial credit and/or passing state assessments |
| Provide an opportunity for campus counselors to participate in the Migrant Counselor Overview session to analyze migrant student educational needs. | Year Round | Counselor | Increase the number of participants to this session by 100%. |
| Provide on-line and face to face opportunities for district/campus staff to attend staff development for enhancing their knowledge of the migrant student population including migrant student needs. | Year Round | Ed Spec Supervisor Counselor | Increase the number of participants at the ESC sessions/ contact meetings by 100%. Participant evaluations Participant feedback |

BRACKETT ISD

STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION:

AN ADDENDUM TO THE DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

SCHOOL YEAR 2013-2014

CONTENTS

| State Compensatory Education:1 |
|---|
| An Addendum to the DISTRICT Improvement Plan1 |
| School Year 2013-20141 |
| Overview of State Compensatory Education |
| Students in At-Risk Situations4 |
| Policies and Procedures5 |
| Use of Funds6 |
| District Profile and Needs Assessment0 |
| Description of SCE Programs and Services 2013-20141 |
| Use of Other Resources for Compensatory Activities2 |
| Appendices |
| Appendix A: Needs Assessment4 |
| Appendix B: Student PERFORMANCE ON the STAAR7 |
| Appendix C: Evaluation of 2012-2013 Programs15 |
| Appendix D: Assurances and Good Practices19 |
| Appendix E: State Compensatory Education Budget21 |

OVERVIEW OF STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

State Compensatory Education (SCE) is the state's means for addressing the unmet needs of students in "at-risk" situations, i.e., are not functioning at grade level. These funds are to be used to improve and enhance the programs funded under the regular educational program by addressing the needs of students who are at risk of dropping out of school.

STUDENTS IN AT-RISK SITUATIONS

The Texas Education Code (TEC §29.081) provides criteria for identifying students who are "at risk," that is, those who are eligible to receive the SCE services. As amended by S. B. 702, "students at risk of dropping out of school" includes each student under 21 years of age who:

(1) was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years (excluding students who did not advance from prekindergarten or kindergarten to the next grade level only as the result of the request of the students' parents);

(2) if the student is in grade 7,8,9,10,11, or 12, did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;

(3) did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;

(4) if the student is in prekindergarten, kindergarten, or grade 1,2, or 3, did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;

(5) is pregnant or is a parent;

(6) has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with Section 37.006 during the preceding or current school year;

(7) has been expelled in accordance with Section 37.007 during the preceding or current school year;

(8) is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;

(9) was previously reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to have dropped out of school;

(10) is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by Section 29.052;

(11) is in the custody of care of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services or has, during the current school year been referred to the department by a school official, officer or the juvenile court, or law enforcement officer;

(12) is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302, and its subsequent amendments; or

(13) resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house or foster group home.

In addition to the above list, the local education agency may establish local criteria for identifying students who are at risk. However, the number of students served using local criteria during a school year may not exceed ten percent of the number of students served using state-defined criteria during the preceding school year. Students identified solely under local criteria are not included in the PEIMS count.

Module 9 of the Financial Accountability System Resource Guide (FASRG) clearly states that the SCE funds "are intended for the primary benefit of students in at-risk situation, as defined in Texas Education Code Section 29.081" [FASRG, §9.2.3.1].

Authority for funding for the State Compensatory Education program is found in the Texas Education Code (TEC) Section 42.152. For each student who is educationally disadvantaged or who is a student who does not have a disability and resides in a residential placement facility in a district in which the student's parent or legal guardian does not reside, a district is entitled to an annual allotment equal to the adjusted basic allotment multiplied by 0.2. The adjusted basic allotment is multiplied by 2.41 for each full-time equivalent student who is in a remedial and support program under §29.081 because the student is pregnant.

For purposes of funding, the number of educationally disadvantaged students is determined by averaging the best six months' enrollment in the national school lunch program of free or reduced-price lunches for the preceding school year. Determination of the number of such students is based on the number of students actually receiving free or reduced-price lunches as submitted to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) on monthly reimbursement claims. Passed in 2009, Section 52 of HB 3646 amends Texas Education Code Section 42.152(c) to increase the indirect cost rate or administrative allowable to forty-eight percent (48%); however, each district must use at least fifty-two percent (52%) of it allotment for instructional purposes.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Brackett ISD has adopted the following administrative policies and procedures for identifying students:

1) Students shall be identified as meeting one or more of the at-risk criteria as defined in TEC Section 29.081 annually when that information is accumulated for the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS).

2) The district does not use local criteria to identify students in at-risk situations.

3) Students meeting one or more of at-risk criteria as defined in TEC Section 29.081 will be considered for placement in one or more of the programs and/or services currently being implemented with funds under the State Compensatory Education (SCE) program. Students most in need based on their performance on the various assessment instruments administered by the district, number of years retained, etc., and upon their teacher's recommendation will be entered into a program or service that best addresses their individual needs.

4) Students who demonstrate sustained success in mastering the success criteria defined in the summative evaluation for the SCE program and/or service to which they have been assigned may be exited from the program and/or service upon the recommendation of the their teacher(s).

5) Students who perform at a level of 110 percent of the satisfactory performance on the assessment instrument administered to the student under Subchapter B, Chapter 39 of the TEC shall no longer be considered at risk inasmuch as satisfactory performance of the instrument is concerned. This determination shall be made annually upon the receipt of the student's performance on said instrument.

6) The district has established staffing ratios and financial allocation standards for basic education programs to ensure that all SCE-funded activities are supplemental. Brackett ISD uses all SCE funds to supplement services beyond those offered through the regular education program, less 48 percent indirect costs and the 18 percent allowable to provide base services at the DAEP.

7) According to the Financial Accountability System Resource Guide (§9.2.14.2): SCE funds may only be used on a Title I, Part A schoolwide campus to upgrade the entire educational program where the actual poverty percentage of the campus is 40% or greater. SCE funds may be used to upgrade the entire educational program on a schoolwide campus as long as the SCE funds allocated to the campus are supplemental to the costs of the regular education program. Although, activities conducted with SCE funds do not have to be supplemental, the campus must continue to receive its fair share of state and local funds for conducting the regular education program, and the intent and purpose of the SCE program must met. A SCE Program implemented under the flexibility of a Title I, Part A schoolwide program will follow the same rules and regulations that govern the Title I, Part A program. To determine a campus' poverty percentage under SCE, school district will use the same auditable poverty data it uses for Title I, Part A for identifying campuses in the NCLB Consolidated Federal Grant Application.

USE OF FUNDS

According to TEC §42.152, school districts must spend SCE funds:

...to improve and enhance programs and services funded under the regular school program. A district's compensatory education allotment may be used for costs supplementary to the regular program, such as costs for program and student evaluation, instructional materials and equipment, and other supplies required for quality instruction, supplemental staff expenses, salary for teachers of at-risk students, small class size and individualized instruction.

The rules governing SCE require school districts to identify student needs through a comprehensive needs assessment, to design effective programs to address the identified needs, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs in meeting those needs. While innovative programs are encouraged only successful programs, as determined by the local evaluation, may be continued under SCE funding.

To provide the maximum amount of local control and local responsibility consistent with the statutory provisions, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) recommends that the following five questions be

considered by the school in determine the appropriate use of SCE funds. The school is responsible for maintaining information to support affirmative responses to these questions.

1) Is the proposed program or service identified in the campus and/or district improvement plan, as required by TEC §11.252 and §11.253? [These sections of law require the there be a comprehensive needs assessment, measurable performance objectives identified strategies for improvement of student performance, identified resources for each strategy, identification of staff responsible for ensuring the accomplishment of each strategy, timelines for monitoring implementation of each strategy, and evaluation criteria.]

2) Will the effectiveness of the proposed program or service be evaluated locally, as required by TEC §29.081(c)?

3) Is the program or service designed to reduce the dropout rate for students identified in TEC §29.081 as being at risk of dropping out of school?

4) Is the program or service designed to increase the achievement of students identified in TEC §29.081 as being at risk of dropping out of school?

5) Is the program or service designed to supplement the regular education program, a required by TEC §42.152(q)?

DISTRICT PROFILE AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Brackett ISD serves approximately six hundred seventeen students in grades Early Elementary (EE) through twelfth grade. Over fifty-six percent of students meet the low-income criteria for eligibility for free or reduced-price lunches at this campus.

Using the state's criteria to identify students in at-risk situations, Brackett ISD has found over forty-six percent of the six hundred seventeen students enrolled meet one or more of the criteria for being in an at-risk situation. The greatest number and percent were those students who did not pass the STAAR/TAKS exam. One hundred four students or sixteen percent met this criterion for being at-risk. In the category, "Performed unsatisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument during school year 2012-2013", one hundred nine students or seventeen percent met this criterion (see Appendix A: Needs Assessment).

Brackett ISD conducts an annual needs assessment to identify students who have not made, or are not making satisfactory academic progress and students with non-academic problems which may inhibit academic success (see Appendix A: Needs Assessment). This information is used to set priorities and goals, to allocate available financial and support resources, and to determine whether the redirection of the SCE programs and services is needed.

The greatest need facing the campus principal and the staff for school year 2013-2014 is the need for information concerning the state assessment, the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR). The more information available, the better the staff will be able to address needs of students. Differentiated instruction in the areas of targeted tutoring, supplemental instructional support, and summer school are needs of the campus and district.

To supplement the instruction of students and their academic needs, the campus will utilize SCE funds to provide additional support with an at risk counselor, educational aides, a supplemental counselor and supplemental teachers, summer school instructors, summer school supplies and materials, tutors and tutoring instructional supplies and materials.

DESCRIPTION OF SCE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES 2013-2014

Objective: To reduce the dropout rate and decrease any disparity in performance on state assessments between students at risk of dropping out of school and all other district students.

| Strategy/Activities | Resources | Staff Responsible | Timelines | Formative Evaluation | Summative Evaluation |
|--|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Educational Aide - Provide supplemental instructional support in the resource setting for differentiated instruction based on the needs of at-risk students | 1.78 FTEs | Principal | Every Six Weeks | Report Cards | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At-Risk Students Passing on First Administration) |
| Library Aide - Provide academic support in instructional material to increase literacy among at-risk students | 1.0 FTE | Principal | Every Six Weeks | Report Cards | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At-Risk Students Passing on First Administration) |
| At-Risk Counselors - Provide counseling services to those students identified as at- risk to ensure academic success | 1.54 FTE | Principal | Every Six Weeks | Report Cards | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At-Risk Students Passing on First Administration) |
| Class Size Reduction Teachers - Supplemental teachers provided to allow for more direct instruction in a reduced class size setting | 2.98 FTE | Principal | Every Six Weeks | Report Cards | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At-Risk Students Passing on First Administration) |
| Computer Assisted Instruction (1.75 FTE) - An instructional aide is to provide support utilizing learning software in a lab. | 1.75 FTE | Principal | Every Six Weeks | Report Cards | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At-Risk Students Passing on First Administration) |

USE OF OTHER RESOURCES FOR COMPENSATORY ACTIVITIES

Federal Programs

- 1) ESEA, Title I, Part A
- 3) ESEA, Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
- 5) Title I, Part C, Carl D. Perkins Career and Technology Education Improvement Act
- 6) IDEA B: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

State Programs

- 1) English as a Second Language (ESL)
- 2) Bilingual Education

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPENDIX B: STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR APPENDIX C: EVALUATION OF THE 2012-2013 PROGRAM APPENDIX D: ASSURANCES AND GOOD PRACTICES APPENDIX E: STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION BUDGET

APPENDIX A: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The requirement for Texas districts and campuses to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) as part of the planning and decision-making process is contained in the Texas Education Code (TEC) Sections 11.252(a)(1-2) and 11.253. A Comprehensive Needs Assessment should identify and prioritize district and campus needs by analyzing and interpreting multiple sources of data.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN AT-RISK SITUATIONS IDENTIFIED BY CRITERION

This table presents the percentage of students at each grade level who have been identified under each of the state and local criteria as being at risk of dropping out of school. At-risk status is obtained from the PEIMS 110 records. The percent of at-risk students is calculated as the sum of the students coded as at risk of dropping out of school, divided by the total number of students in membership.

A column showing at-risk student performance is shown on the district, region, and state AEIS reports. While this column is not available on the campus-level reports, counts of at-risk students are shown in the Profile section of the campus reports (as well as the district, region, and state reports).

NUMBER & PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN AT-RISK SITUATIONS IDENTIFIED BY CRITERION

| | # of | | ot noted | | elow) Avg | | iled AAR | Rea | ailed adiness PK-3) | | egnant/ renting | | AEP | E | xpelled | F | Parole | | LEP |
|-------|----------|-----|-------------|----|---------------|-----|-------------|-----|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---|-----|---|---------|---|--------|---|-----|
| Grade | Students | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| РК | 27 | 0 | 0% | | | | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5 | 19% |
| К | 45 | 0 | 0% | | | | | 6 | 13% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| 1 | 49 | 7 | 14% | | | | | 8 | 16% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | 46 | 17 | 37% | | | | | 22 | 48% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | 32 | 9 | 28% | | | 0 | 0% | 16 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 3% |
| 4 | 44 | 5 | 11% | | | 5 | 11% | | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | 43 | 11 | 26% | | | 19 | 44% | | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 6 | 44 | 8 | 18% | | | 6 | 14% | | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 7 | 42 | 7 | 17% | 2 | 5% | 17 | 40% | | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 8 | 56 | 11 | 20% | 10 | 18% | 2 | 4% | | | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 9 | 62 | 9 | 15% | 10 | 16% | 11 | 18% | | | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| 10 | 49 | 7 | 14% | 10 | 20% | 11 | 22% | | | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| 11 | 45 | 7 | 16% | 5 | 11% | 11 | 24% | | | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% | 1 | 2% | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% |
| 12 | 55 | 11 | 20% | 9 | 16% | 22 | 40% | | | 3 | 5% | 1 | 2% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 639 | 109 | 17% | 46 | 7% | 104 | 16% | 52 | 8% | 3 | 0% | 4 | 1% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 8 | 1% |

The following tables and graphs present the percentage of students making satisfactory performance on Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Social Studies and Language Arts sections of the STAAR. Additionally, the STAAR results for At-Risk students are compared with the results for All students. The goal of State Compensatory Education is to increase the academic performance of students identified as being in atrisk situations, to reduce any disparity in performance on assessment instruments administered under Subchapter B, Chapter 39 between students at risk of dropping out of school and all other district students, as well as to reduce the dropout rate of identified students in at-risk situations. The tables are arranged by grade levels to facilitate the analysis of the results for each campus and grade level.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR

2012-2013 STAAR RESULTS

| | State Compensatory Education Program | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------|----------------|----------------------------------|------|--|--|
| | At | | | Comparison | i - Grades 3-1 kett ISD | - | | sults | | | | |
| STAAR | Ma % Met S | ath tandard | Readir % Met S | ng/ELA Standard | | Writing % Met Standard | | nce tandard | Social Studies % Met Standard | | | |
| Third Grade | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | | |
| Students At-Risk | 63 | 67 | 70 | 80 | | | | | | | | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 72 | 86 | 94 | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| Fourth Grade | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | | |
| Students At-Risk | 33 | 31 | 40 | 50 | 30 | 44 | | | | | | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 60 | 64 | 77 | 90 | 63 | 87 | | | | | | |
| Fifth Grade | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | | |
| Students At-Risk | 73 | 38 | 69 | 56 | | | 46 | 38 | | | | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 100 | 71 | 100 | 81 | | | 82 | 68 | | | | |
| Sixth Grade | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | | |
| Students At-Risk | 91 | 73 | 73 | 25 | | | | | | | | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 100 | 90 | 88 | 87 | | | | | | | | |
| Seventh Grade | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | | |
| Students At-Risk | 47 | 75 | 50 | 76 | 47 | 53 | | | | | | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 86 | 71 | 97 | 93 | 91 | 83 | | | | | | |
| Eighth Grade | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | | |
| Students At-Risk | 42 | 80 | 69 | 65 | | | 58 | 33 | 25 | 13 | | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 97 | 74 | 96 | 100 | | | 93 | 69 | 75 | 50 | | |

| End of Course ELA (9-12) | English I % Met S | | | Reading | English II % Met S | l Reading Itandard | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | 70 10100 3 | | | | 70 1010 2 3 | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | English I | English I | English II | English II | English III | English III | |
| | Reading | Reading | Reading | Reading | Reading | Reading | |
| | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | |
| Students At-Risk | 65 | 92 | * | 94 | 71 | * | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 100 | 94 | * | 96 | 100 | * | |
| | | | | | | | |
| End of Course | English I | Writing | English I | I Writing | English II | I Writing | |
| Writing (9-12) | % Met S | tandard | % Met S | Standard | % Met S | standard | |
| | English I | English I | English II | English II | English III | English III | |
| | Writing | Writing | Writing | Writing | Writing | Writing | |
| | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | |
| Students At-Risk | 55 | 43 | * | 50 | 40 | * | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 88 | 69 | * | 89 | 88 | * | |
| | | | | | | | |
| End of Course | Alge | bra I | Geor | netry | Algebra II | | |
| Math (9-12) | % Met S | | % Met S | | % Met Standard | | |
| | Algebra I | Algebra I | Geometry | Geometry | Algebra II | Algebra II | |
| | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | |
| Students At-Risk | 87 | 50 | * | 100 | * | * | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 100 | 89 | 100 | 96 | * | 100 | |
| Students Not At Misk | 100 | 05 | 100 | 50 | | 100 | |
| End of Course | Biol | ഹസ | Chen | nistry | Phy | sics | |
| Science (9-12) | % Met S | | % Met S | | % Met S | | |
| | Biology | Biology | Chemistry | Chemistry | Physics | Physics | |
| | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | 2012 | 2013 | |
| Students At-Risk | 92 | 91 | * | 71 | * | * | |
| Students Not At-Risk | 92 | 91 | 100 | 71 | * | 100 | |
| | J1 | J4 | 100 | /1 | | 100 | |
| End of Course | | ography | \A/orld | Liston | | story | |
| | World Ge % Met S | | | History | | story | |
| Social Studies (9-12) | | | | tandard | % Met S | lanuaru | |
| | World | World | World | World | | | |
| | Geography | Geography | History | History | US History | US History | |
| | 2012 | 2012 | 2012 | 2012 | 2012 | 2012 | |



STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR IN BRACKETT ISD, READING





STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR IN BRACKETT ISD, MATH



STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR THE STAAR IN BRACKETT ISD, WRITING







STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR THE STAAR IN BRACKETT ISD, SCIENCE



STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON THE STAAR IN BRACKETT ISD, SOCIAL STUDIES





APPENDIX C: EVALUATION OF 2012-2013 PROGRAMS

This table presents the number of students served in each of the programs/services provided under State Compensatory Education funding and the percentage of these students who met the criteria established by Brackett ISD to determine their success in the program.

EVALUATION OF 2012-2013 PROGRAM

| District Name: Brackett ISD | Co. Dist. No.: 136901 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--------------------------------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Campus Name: Brackett High School | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCE FUNDED PROGRAM/STRATEGY | CRITERIA TO MEASURE SUCCESS | NUMBER SERVED | PERCENT MEETING CRITERIA | | | | | | | |
| Educational Aide (1.25 FTE) - Provide supplemental instructional support in the resource setting for differentiated instruction based on the needs of at-risk students | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 28 | 26 | 93% | | | | | | |
| Library Aide (1.0 FTE) - Provide academic support in instructional material to increase literacy among at-risk students | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 28 | 26 | 93% | | | | | | |
| At-Risk Counselor (.65 FTE) - Provide counseling services to those students identified as at-risk to ensure academic success | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 28 | 26 | 93% | | | | | | |

District Name: Brackett ISD

Co. Dist. No.: 136901

Campus Name: Brackett Junior High

| SCE FUNDED PROGRAM/STRATEGY | CRITERIA TO MEASURE SUCCESS | NUMBER SERVED | MEETING CRITERIA | PERCENT MEETING CRITERIA | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Educational Aide (1.25 FTE) - Provide supplemental instructional support in the resource setting for differentiated instruction based on the needs of at-risk students | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 46 | 27 | 59% | | | | | |
| Library Aide (1.0 FTE) - Provide academic support in instructional material to increase literacy among at-risk students | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 46 | 27 | 59% | | | | | |
| At-Risk Counselor (.65 FTE) - Provide counseling services to those students identified as at-risk to ensure academic success | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 46 | 27 | 59% | | | | | |

District Name: Brackett ISD

Co. Dist. No.: 136901

| Campus Name: Brackett Elementary and Intermediate | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCE FUNDED PROGRAM/STRATEGY | CRITERIA TO MEASURE SUCCESS | NUMBER SERVED | MEETING CRITERIA | PERCENT MEETING CRITERIA | | | | | | | |
| Educational Aide (.5 FTE) - Provide supplemental instructional support in the resource setting for differentiated instruction based on the needs of at-risk students | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 40 | 25 | 63% | | | | | | | |
| Library Aide (1.0FTE) - Provide academic support in instructional material to increase literacy among at-risk students | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 40 | 25 | 63% | | | | | | | |
| At-Risk Counselor (.89 FTE) - Provide counseling services to those students identified as at-risk to ensure academic success | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 40 | 25 | 63% | | | | | | | |
| Class Size Reduction (2.98 FTE) - Supplemental teachers provided to allow for more direct instruction in a reduced class size setting | - | 40 | 25 | 63% | | | | | | | |
| Computer Assisted Instruction (1.75 FTE) - An instructional aide is to provide support utilizing learning software in a lab setting | STAAR/TAKS/EOC Reading Scores (Total Number of At- Risk Students Passing on First Administration) | 40 | 25 | 63% | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX D: ASSURANCES AND GOOD PRACTICES

STATE AND LOCAL EFFORT

State and local funds are used to provide the regular program of instruction for all students to include general operating costs of instruction, which includes expenses related to building, maintenance, and utilities, as well as salaries and related expenses for instructional and support staff and instructional materials.

IMPROVEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

State Compensatory Education funds are used to improve and enhance the regular program of instruction for students who are at risk of academic failure or of dropping out of school as defined in the state rules and Brackett ISD's at-risk criteria.

COORDINATION OF FUNDING

All federal, state and local funds received by Brackett ISD will be coordinated to ensure that all of the programs are operated in an effective and efficient manner. All students are guaranteed equal access to all foundation programs and services. The integrity of supplemental programs is maintained.

COORDINATION OF INSTRUCTION

Instruction will be coordinated between and among regular classroom teachers and special program staff who are serving students in the same content area. Instructional coordination will be skill and concept specific for activities that include assessment, instructional activities and on-going monitoring of student progress. Special emphasis is given to collaborative planning between regular classroom teachers and the staff of the special programs.

APPENDIX E: STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION BUDGET

Authority for funding for the State Compensatory Education program is found in the Texas Education Code (TEC) Section 42.152. For each student who is educationally disadvantaged or who is a student who does not have a disability and resides in a residential placement facility in a district is entitled to an annual allotment equal to the adjusted basic allotment multiplied by 0.2. The adjusted basic allotment is multiplied by 2.41 for each full-time equivalent student who is in a remedial and support program under §29.081 because the student is pregnant.

For purposes of funding, the number of educationally disadvantaged students is determined by averaging the best six months' enrollment in the national school lunch program of free or reduced-price lunches for the preceding school year. Determination of the number of such students is based on the number of students actually receiving free or reduced-price lunches as submitted to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) on monthly reimbursement claims. Section 52 of HB 3646 amends the Texas Education Code Section 42.152 (c) to increase the indirect cost rate or administrative allowable to forty-eight percent (48%); however, each district must use at least fifty-two percent (52%) of its allotment for instructional purposes.

TECS Personnel Summary Detail

FY2014 State Compensatory Education **BRACKETT H S**

| Name | Position | Grade Span | Subject Area | Days Cont/ Paid | FTE | Annual Salary | Func Code | , | Salary Funded | Deduc. Code | SS/ Med (6141) | Health/ Life (6142) | Work Comp (6143) | Unemp Comp (6145) | TRS (6146) | Salary/ Benefits Funded |
|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|------|------------------|--------------|------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Abbey, Debbie | Educationa Aide | al 09 - 12 | Resource Aide | 187 / 187 | 0.5 | 16,965.00 | 11 | 6129 | 8,482.50 | DED | 123.00 | 0.00 | 28.47 | 8.05 | 0.00 | 8,642.02 |
| Garcia, Mary Jane | Educationa Aide | al 09 - 12 | Resource Aide | 187 / 187 | 0.78 | 23,712.00 | 11 | 6129 | 18,495.36 | DED | 268.18 | 0.00 | 62.07 | 17.55 | 0.00 | 18,843.16 |
| Stone, Louisa | Counselor | 09 - 12 | Counselor | 207 / 207 | 0.65 | 43,881.00 | 31 | 6129 | 28,522.65 | DED | 413.58 | 0.00 | 95.72 | 27.07 | 0.00 | 29,059.02 |
| 001 BRACKETT H | S Total | | | | | | | | \$55,500.51 | | 804.76 | 0.00 | 186.26 | 52.67 | 0.00 | \$56,544.20 |

136-901

Brackett ISD

TECS Personnel Summary Detail

FY2014 State Compensatory Education JONES ELEMENTARY/INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

| Name | Position | Grade Span | Subject Area | Days Cont/ Paid | FTE | Annual Salary | | Obj Code | Salary Funded | | SS/ Med (6141) | Health/ Life (6142) | Work Comp (6143) | Unemp Comp (6145) | TRS (6146) | Salary/ Benefits Funded |
|--|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------|------------------|----|-------------|------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Avila, Adela | Educationa Aide | I PK - 05 | Computer Aide | 187 / 187 | 1 | 23,192.00 | 11 | 6129 | 23,192.00 | DED | 336.28 | 0.00 | 77.83 | 22.01 | 0.00 | 23,628.12 |
| Bonner, Maxine | Teacher | PK - 05 | 2nd Grade Supp Math | 187 / 187 | 0.98 | 53,670.00 | 11 | 6119 | 52,596.60 | DED | 762.65 | 0.00 | 176.51 | 49.91 | 0.00 | 53,585.67 |
| Gutierrez, Elia | Educationa Aide | l PK - 05 | Computer Aide | 187 / 187 | 0.75 | 24,749.00 | 11 | 6129 | 18,561.75 | DED | 269.15 | 0.00 | 62.29 | 17.62 | 0.00 | 18,910.81 |
| Ilse, Kimberly | Counselor | PK - 05 | Counselor | 187 / 187 | 0.89 | 48,130.00 | 31 | 6129 | 42,835.70 | DED | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 42,835.70 |
| Massingill, Tara | Teacher | PK - 05 | 3rd Supp Science | 187 / 187 | 1 | 32,490.00 | 11 | 6119 | 32,490.00 | DED | 471.10 | 0.00 | 109.04 | 30.83 | 0.00 | 33,100.97 |
| Smith, Jackie | Educationa Aide | I PK - 05 | Aide | 187 / 187 | 0.5 | 8,993.00 | 11 | 6129 | 4,496.50 | DED | 65.20 | 0.00 | 15.09 | 4.27 | 0.00 | 4,581.06 |
| Young, Twilley | Teacher | PK - 05 | 5th Supp. Reading | 187 / 187 | 1 | 50,930.00 | 11 | 6119 | 50,930.00 | DED | 738.48 | 0.00 | 170.92 | 48.33 | 0.00 | 51,887.73 |
| 101 JONES ELEMENTARY/INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL Total | | | | | | | | | \$225,102.55 | | 2,642.86 | 0.00 | 611.68 | 172.97 | 0.00 | \$228,530.06 |

Brackett ISD

TECS Personnel Summary Detail

FY2014 State Compensatory Education DISTRICT

Brackett ISD

| Name | Position | Grade Span | Subject Area | Days Cont/ Paid | FTE | Annual Salary | | Obj Code | Salary Funded | | SS/ Med (6141) | Health/ Life (6142) | Work Comp (6143) | Unemp Comp (6145) | TRS (6146) | Salary/ Benefits Funded |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----|------------------|----|-------------|------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Ramon, Celia | Library Aic | le | Library Aide | 187 / 187 | 1 | 23,192.00 | 11 | 6129 | 23,192.00 | DED | 336.28 | 0.00 | 77.83 | 22.01 | 0.00 | 23,628.12 |
| 999 DISTRICT To | otal | | | | | | | | \$23,192.00 | | 336.28 | 0.00 | 77.83 | 22.01 | 0.00 | \$23,628.12 |

| TECS Personnel Summary Detail | | | | | | | 136-901 |
|--|------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| FY2014 State Compensatory Education | | | | | | Br | ackett ISD |
| | Salary Funded | SS/ Med (6141) | Health/ Life (6142) | Work Comp (6143) | Unemp Comp (6145) | TRS (6146) | Salary/ Benefits Funded |
| State Compensatory Education Grand Total | \$303,795.06 | 3,783.90 | 0.00 | 875.77 | 247.65 | 0.00 | \$308,702.38 |