# Addendum

Plummer

Elementary

2010-2011

CEDAR HILL

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

# Campus Improvement Plan
## Checklist

Each school year the principal of each school campus, with the assistance of the campus-level committee, must develop, review and revise the campus improvement plan for the purpose of improving student performance for all student populations, including students in special education programs under Education Code Chapter 29, subchapter A, with respect to the academic excellence indicators and any other appropriate performance measures for special needs populations. Education Code 11.252 (b). Each campus improvement plan must:

- ☐ Utilize a school wide planning team to complete the needs assessment (NCLB).
- ☐ Assess the academic achievement for each student in the school using the academic excellence indicator system (AEIS). Identify data sources and analyze data (NCLB).
- ☐ Set the campus performance objectives based on the academic excellence indicator system, including objectives for special needs populations, including students in special education programs under Education Code Chapter 29, subchapter A. Clarify the vision for reform (NCLB).
- ☐ Identify how the campus goals will be met for each student.
- ☐ Determine the resources needed to implement the plan.
- ☐ Identify staff needed to implement the plan.
- ☐ Set time lines for reaching the goals.
- ☐ Measure progress toward the performance objectives systematically to ensure that the plan is resulting in academic improvement.
- ☐ Provide for a system to document and analyze parental and community involvement at the campus.
- ☐ Create a school profile that includes (NCLB):
- ☐ Identify all funding sources in the Resources Needed column of the SMART Goals document.
- ☐ Have not met Adequate Yearly Progress see AYP Section after Professional Development Section.

_____

Principal Signature                                   Date

# Addendum

## Comprehensive Needs Assessment

### Comparison of 2009 and 2010 TAKS Results

**Table 1** shows third grade TAKS Reading decreased from 89% to 84%.  Previously, third grade reading was an SSI grade, so 2010 is the first year that third grade took the Reading TAKS only once instead of three times.

**Table 1:Third Grade Reading TAKS**

|                   | All | AA  | H   | W   | Ec. |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| **Passed 2010**   | 84  | 80  | 90  | 100 | 86  |
| Commended         | 37  | 33  | 40  | 80  | 31  |
| Avg. Scale Score  | 599 | 592 | 595 | 700 | 590 |
| Number tested     | 97  | 70  | 20  | 5   | 71  |
| **Passed 2009**   | 89  | 87  | 95  | 100 | 88  |
| Commended         | 37  | 33  | 52  | 31  | 31  |
| Avg. Scale Score  | 595 | 586 | 623 | 605 | 584 |
| Number tested     | 112 | 76  | 21  | 13  | 74  |

In **Table 2**, third grade TAKS math scores increased 1% to 70% from 69%.  African American and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups performed lower than Hispanic and White on both math and reading.  Average scale scores increased in every area of reading except Hispanic.  In math, scale scores increased for African Americans and Economically Disadvantaged with all others decreasing

**Table 2: Third Grade Mathematics TAKS**

|     | All | AA  | H   | W   | Ec. |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Passed 2010** | 70 | 66 | 80 | 100 | 69 |
| Commended | 20 | 20 | 10 | 40 | 20 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 546 | 541 | 546 | 608 | 545 |
| Number tested | 97 | 70 | 20 | 5 | 71 |
| **Passed 2009** | 69 | 61 | 81 | 92 | 60 |
| Commended | 30 | 19 | 48 | 54 | 28 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 548 | 525 | 592 | 609 | 535 |
| Number tested | 108 | 72 | 21 | 13 | 72 |

**Table 3** shows Fourth grade reading TAKS scores fell 3% from 80% to 77% with African Americans down 1% at 76%, Hispanics down 3% at 83%, Whites down 22% at 78%, and Economically Disadvantaged scoring down 5% at 77%. Commended increased  5% overall with all subgroups increasing with African Americans up 1%, Hispanics up 11%, White up 6%, and Economically Disadvantaged up 2%.  Average scale scores increased for all subpopulations except White which only had 9 tested students.

Table 3: Fourth Grade Reading TAKS

| | All | AA | H | W | Ec. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Passed 2010** | 77 | 76 | 83 | 78 | 77 |
| Commended | 22 | 16 | 30 | 44 | 17 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 633 | 620 | 665 | 664 | 620 |
| Number tested | 119 | 85 | 23 | 9 | 83 |
| **Passed 2009** | 80 | 77 | 86 | 100 | 82 |
| Commended | 17 | 15 | 19 | 38 | 15 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 612 | 599 | 631 | 715 | 611 |
| Number tested | 106 | 75 | 21 | 8 | 67 |

**Table 4** shows fourth grade Math TAKS staying the same at 77%. African Americans increased 3% from 73% to 76%,

Hispanics scores fell 7% from 90% to 83%, Whites fell from 100% to 78%, and Economically Disadvantaged gained 2% from 75% to 77%. Commended performance increased for All by 4% to 28%; African Americans increased 9% from 15% to 24%; Hispanics decreased 5% from 43% to 38%, and Economically Disadvantaged stayed at 22%. Whites decreased from 62% to 33%. Average scale scores increased for every category except White.

Table 4: Fourth Grade Mathematics TAKS

|  | All | AA | H | W | Ec. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Passed 2010** | 77 | 76 | 83 | 78 | 77 |
| Commended | 28 | 24 | 38 | 33 | 22 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 632 | 619 | 663 | 666 | 621 |
| Number tested | 118 | 83 | 24 | 9 | 81 |
| **Passed 2009** | 77 | 73 | 90 | 100 | 75 |
| Commended | 24 | 15 | 43 | 62 | 22 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 615 | 597 | 655 | 704 | 613 |
| Number tested | 106 | 75 | 21 | 8 | 68 |

Plummer Writing TAKS scores decreased by 6% to 88% for All. (**See Table 5**)  African Americans decreased 9% to 86%; Hispanics increased stayed the same at 91%.  Whites scored 100% for both years, and Economically Disadvantaged decreased 8% from 93% to 85%.  Commended increased 4% for All from 19% to 23%, African Americans stayed at 17%, Hispanics increased by 5% to 32%,

Whites gained 38% from 12% to 50%, and Economically Disadvantaged from 21% to 22%.  Average scale scores went down overall with increases for Hispanic and Whites.

Table 5: Fourth Grade Writing TAKS

|  | All | AA | H | W | Ec. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Passed 2010** | 88 | 86 | 91 | 100 | 85 |
| Commended | 23 | 17 | 32 | 50 | 22 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 2314 | 2289 | 2362 | 2410 | 2298 |
| Number tested | 117 | 83 | 22 | 10 | 81 |
| **Passed 2009** | 94 | 95 | 91 | 100 | 93 |
| Commended | 19 | 17 | 27 | 12 | 21 |
| Avg. Scale Score | 2324 | 2319 | 2338 | 2341 | 2317 |

| Number tested | 107 | 75 | 22 | 8 | 68 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Plummer commended scores in reading were at the district goal of 30%. Commended scores for math and writing were at 24% and 23%. **(See table 6.)** CSCOPE and professional development will increase rigor of instruction in order to increase commended performance.

### Table 6: TAKS Commended Performance

| Student Group | Reading/ELA | | | Mathematics | | | Writing | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2009 Base-line | 2010 Target | 2010 Actual | 2009 Base-line | 2010 Target | 2010 Actual | 2009 Base-line | 2010 Target | 2010 Actual |
| All | 27 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 30 | 24 | 19 | 30 | 23 |
| African American | 24 | 30 | 25 | 17 | 30 | 22 | 17 | 30 | 17 |
| Hispanic | 36 | 37 | 35 | 45 | 46 | 24 | 27 | 30 | 32 |
| White | 33 | 34 | 62 | 57 | 58 | 37 | 12 | 30 | 50 |
| Eco. Dis. | 24 | 30 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 21 | 21 | 30 | 22 |

For 2010, TEA will use The Texas Projection Measure (TPM) to adjust student scores to estimate whether a student is likely to pass the TAKS the following year. Using TPM, the adjusted scores for Plummer indicate a TEA Recognized rating.

Using TPM adjustments, comparing **Table 7** and **Table 8**, 2010 TAKS Reading increased from 80% to 82%, and TAKS math scores increased from 74% to 85%. All subpopulations increased with African American from 77% to 79% in reading, and from 71% to 83% in math.

Hispanic scores in reading increased from 88% to 91%, math scores from 82% to 89%. White reading scores remained at 93% and math climbed from 86% to 93%. Economically Disadvantaged reading increased from 79% to 81%. All TAKS Writing scores were in the exemplary range for all subpopulations.

### Table 7: TAKS Without TPM

| 2010 | All | AA | H | W | Ec. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | 80 | 77 | 88 | 93 | 79 |
| Math | 74 | 71 | 82 | 86 | 73 |
| Writing | 94 | 92 | 95 | 100 | 91 |
| **2009** | | | | | |
| Reading | 85 | 82 | 90 | 100 | 85 |
| Math | 73 | 67 | 86 | 95 | 67 |
| Writing | 94 | 95 | 91 | 100 | 93 |

### Table 8: TAKS Using TPM

| 2010 | All | AA | H | W | Ec. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading | 82 | 79 | 91 | 93 | 81 |
| Math | 85 | 83 | 89 | 93 | 84 |
| Writing | 96 | 94 | 100 | 100 | 95 |
| **2009** | | | | | |
| Reading | 89 | 88 | 93 | 100 | 90 |
| Math | 85 | 82 | 93 | 100 | 81 |
| Writing | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

### ITBS Results

**Table 9** shows a continual growth pattern in reading and math for Plummer students. In 2008, growth from kindergarten to fourth grade in reading indicates an increase of 12 points (42%), math increased 12 points (46%), and language showed a decrease from 33 to 30 (-9%),  and the survey total increased 7 points (25%) from 28 to 35.  In 2009, growth from kindergarten to fourth grade in reading increased 19 points (73%) from Kindergarten to fourth, math increased 14 points (52%), language increased 3 points (9%), and the survey total showed an 11 point (38%) gain. Comparing 2008 to 2009 ITBS scores showed an increase in the continual growth pattern from Kindergarten to fourth

of 58% in reading, 17% in math, 200% in language, and 57% in the survey total.

Table 9: Compare 2008 and 2009 ITBS

| | Read 08 | Read 09 | % Change | Math 08 | Math 09 | % Change | ELA 08 | ELA 09 | % Change | Survey Total 08 | Survey Total 09 | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| K | 28 | 26 | -7 | 26 | 27 | 4 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 4 |
| 1st | 22 | 31 | 41 | 24 | 34 | 42 | 39 | 44 | 13 | 30 | 37 | 23 |
| 2nd | 38 | 32 | -15 | 18 | 21 | 17 | 19 | 14 | -26 | 26 | 23 | -5 |
| 3rd | 38 | 41 | 8 | 31 | 29 | -6 | 28 | 32 | 14 | 33 | 34 | 3 |
| 4th | 40 | 45 | 13 | 38 | 41 | 8 | 30 | 36 | 20 | 35 | 40 | 14 |
| K-4 growth | 12 | 19 | 58 | 12 | 14 | 17 | -3 | 3 | 200 | 7 | 11 | 57 |

Table 9 shows beginning Kindergarten scores stayed relatively flat from 2008 to 2009 with a 2 point decrease (-7%) in reading, 1 point increase (4%) in math, and no change for language. The core total increased by 1 point (4%).

First grade students increased scores in reading by 9 points (41%), math by 10 points (42%) and language by 5 points (13%). The core total increased by 7 points (23%). These high increases show value added by Kindergarten teaching.

Second grade students dropped 6 points (-15%) in reading, increased 3 points (17%) in math, dropped 5 points (-26%) in language, and dropped 3 points (-5%) in the survey total. High district formative assessment scores in 2008-2009 indicated mastery of the scope and sequence. The question is whether first grade TEKS and CHISD Scope and Sequence are aligned with skills tested on ITBS. We need to analyze deficient ELA skills and incorporate them into

the curriculum.

Third grade students increased reading scores by 3 points (8%), math dropped 2 points (-6%), and language

| 09 | Read 08 | Read 09 | % Diff. | Math 08 | Math 09 | % Diff. | ELA 08 | ELA 09 | % Diff | Survey Total 08 | Survey Total 09 | % Diff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **K-1** | (K) 28 | (1)31 | 11 | (K) 26 | (1)34 | 31 | (K) 33 | (1)44 | 33 | (K) 28 | (1)37 | 32 |
| **1-2** | (1 )22 | (2)32 | 45 | (1) 24 | (2)21 | - 13 | (1st )39 | (2)14 | - 38 | (1st )30 | (2)23 | - 23 |
| **2-3** | (2 )38 | (3)41 | 8 | (2) 18 | (3)29 | 61 | (2nd) 19 | (3)32 | 68 | (2nd) 26 | 34 | 31 |
| **3-4** | (3 )38 | (4)45 | 18 | (3) 31 | (4)41 | 32 | (3rd) 28 | (4)36 | 29 | (3rd) 33 | 40 | 21 |

increased
4 points (14%), with a survey total increase of 1 point (3%).  Decreased math scores indicate a need to analyze how second grade teaches math and on which level of Bloom's.  Does the instructional level of Bloom's match the tested level?

Fourth grade students increased 5 points (13%) in reading, 3 points (8%) in math, and 6 points (20%) in language with an increase of 5 points (14%) for the survey total.  These are significant increases showing value added by third grade teachers.

If you compare beginning scores by Kindergarten students with 4th grade students, it is obvious the value added by instruction at Plummer.  2009 ITBS Reading showed Kindergarten to fourth grade increased 19 points (73%), math increased 14 points (51%), language increased 3 points (9%), and the survey total increased 11 points (38%).

**Table 10:Cohort Comparison of ITBS 2008 to 2009**

**Table 10** compares the same group of students in each subject area from one year to the next.   The only grade level that had decreases was second grade which indicates deficiencies with first grade curriculum.

First grade cohort increased 11% in reading, 31% in math, and 33% in language and 32% survey total.  This shows effective instruction in Kindergarten.

Second grade cohort increased 45% in reading, went down -13% in math, and fell dramatically in language by 38% with a decrease in the survey total of -23%.  This indicates that we need to evaluate the first grade program to increase math and language achievement.   This does not correlate with the high formative assessments scores by first grade.

Third grade cohort increased in reading by 8%, in math by 61%, and in language by 68% with a survey total increase of 31%.  Again, this high increase shows excellent instruction that increased value added in second grade.

Fourth grade cohort scores increased by 18% in reading, 32% in math, 29% in language, with an increase of 21% in the survey total.  This indicates effective instruction in third grade.

**Table 11** shows campus results indicate that 35% of the Plummer students scored at or above 50% on ITBS Reading showing a 52% increase in ITBS reading scores in 2009 compared to 2008.  31% scored at or above 50% on ITBS Math with a 41% increase over 2008 ITBS scores significant increases in ITBS scores from 2008 to 2009 in every grade level except 3rd grade math which declined by one point. First grade increased 94% in reading and 580% in math.  2nd grade increased 146% in reading and 40% in math.  Although 3rd grade reading decreased by 3%, 3rd math increased by46%.  4th reading went up 55% and math increased by 24%.  All of these increases indicate the extent of the value added by Plummer teachers at each level.   Plummer has developed a Literacy Plan and a Math Improvement Plan that will improve ITBS scores.   Analysis of ITBS reading data indicates several areas for improvement including vocabulary, auditory clues, picture clues, word attack skills, phonemic awareness and decoding, identifying and analyzing word parts, reading comprehension, factual understanding, inference, interpretation, therefore, the   Plummer Literacy Plan will focus on activities and teaching to improve the areas of vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.   Analysis of ITBS math data indicated areas of number properties and operations, geometry, measurement, problem solving, concepts; interpretation of data, computation and estimation to be in need of improvement, therefore the focus of the Math Improvement Plan will be in the areas of critical thinking, problem-solving and vocabulary.

## Table 11: 2008-2009 ITBS-% of students at or above 50%

|  | Reading 08 | Math 08 | Reading 09 | Math 09 | Reading % Change | Math % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All | 23 | 22 | 35 | 31 | 52% | 41% |
| K | 24 (Voc) | 21 | 26 | 27 | 8% | 29% |
| 1st | 16 | 5 | 31 | 34 | 94% | 580% |
| 2nd | 13 | 15 | 32 | 21 | 146% | 40% |
| 3rd | 28 | 30 | 41 | 29 | 46% | -3% |
| 4th | 29 | 33 | 45 | 41 | 55% | 24% |

## 2009-2010 District Assessments Results

**Table 12** shows a comparison of Plummer formative and summative assessment scores by grade level to the district average scores. Plummer first grade students scored within 5 points above or below the district averages and are in the exemplary range for both reading and math. 2nd, 3rd, and 4th scored above district significantly on formative assessments with the exception of 3rd grade math which was 5% below the district. Summative assessment scores were either significantly above the district or within 4 points above or below except for third grade math and reading. Formative assessments show weakness in third grade math and reading.

## Table 12: District Assessments

| Grade | Subject | Formative Average % met expectations | District Formative Average % met expectations | Diff. | Summative % met expectations | District Summative % met expectations | Diff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First | ELA | 92 | 93.6 | -4 | 95 | 95.7 | -1 |
|  | Math | 92 | 97.2 | -5 | 100 | 97.7 | +2 |
|  | Science | 85 | 87.1 | -2 | 94 | 92.4 | +2 |
|  | Social Studies | 83 | 80.5 | +3 | 85 | 87.2 | -2 |
| Second | ELA | 78 | 68.7 | +9 | 77 | 78.6 | -2 |
|  | Math | 88 | 85.4 | +3 | 90 | 93.6 | -4 |
|  | Science | 86 | 75.7 | +10 | 94 | 90.3 | +4 |
|  | Social Studies | 76 | 73.5 | +3 | 71 | 52.1 | +19 |
| Third | ELA | 69 | 65.3 | +4 | 58 | 70.3 | -12 |
|  | Math | 78 | 82.6 | -5 | 77 | 87.5 | -10 |
|  | Science | 80 | 63.1 | +17 | 83 | 85.1 | -2 |
|  | Social Studies | 70 | 48 | +22 | 64 | 63.7 | +1 |
| Fourth | ELA | 82 | 68.9 | +13 | 89 | 80.3 | +9 |
|  | Math | 91 | 85.1 | +6 | 97 | 88.4 | +11 |
|  | Science | 88 | 58.5 | +30 | 98 | 83.1 | +15 |
|  | Social Studies | 75 | 43.2 | +32 | 71 | 35.1 | +36 |

Table 13 shows the campus average percentage passing of district assessments was 88% for math, 78% for science, 72% for language, and 65% for social studies.

Table 13: Campus Formative Assessment Averages

| All Students | Formative Assessments | | | | Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Math | 83 | 87 | 92 | 91 | 88 |
| Science | 79 | 70 | 72 | 92 | 78 |
| ELA | 72 | 65 | 71 | 80 | 72 |
| Social Studies | 67 | 64 | 61 | 66 | 65 |
| Writing | 56 | 70 | 81 | N/A | 69 |

## Discipline Summary

The student discipline summary report revealed a 20% reduction in discipline incidences from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 with 158 incidents which involved 52 students. 21 incidents were committed by 13 students in Kindergarten, 47 incidents were committed by 20 students in first grade, 56 incidents by 18 students in second grade, 20 incidents by 13 students in third grade, and 30 incidents by 20 students in fourth grade. First grade focus on learning to read is often stressful and uncomfortable for some students which may lead to increased discipline incidents. **(See table 14.)**

Table 14: Discipline Referrals Compare
2008-2009 to 2009-2010

| | # Incidences 2008-2009 | # Incidences 2009 - 2010 | % Change | # Students 2008-2009 | # Students 2009 - 2010 | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 197 | 158 | -20% | 116 | 52 | -55% |
| Kindergarten | 12 | 21 | +75% | 10 | 13 | +30% |
| 1st Grade | 66 | 47 | -29% | 26 | 20 | -23% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2nd Grade | 21 | 56 | +67% | 10 | 18 | +80% |
| 3rd Grade | 50 | 20 | -60% | 36 | 13 | -36% |
| 4th Grade | 48 | 30 | -38% | 34 | 20 | -41% |

## Attendance

The Plummer student average daily attendance (**Table 15**) was 96% for 2009-2010, the same as the district ADA of 96%. Plummer attendance was 97% for the first second and fifth six weeks (1% above district). ADA for Plummer and the district were the same at 96% for the third and sixth six weeks, with 96% for the fourth six weeks (1% above the district).

**Table 15: ADA Report for 2009-2010**

| | 1st 6 Weeks | 2nd 6 Weeks | 3rd 6 Weeks | 4th 6 Weeks | 5th 6 Weeks | 6th 6 Weeks | Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Plummer | 97% | 97% | 96% | 96% | 97% | 96% | 96% |
| District | 96% | 96% | 96% | 95% | 96% | 96% | 96% |

Staff attendance rate was up 2% to 94%. One staff member was on maternity leave, one staff member was out for surgery, and one staff member on medical leave for a work related injury. These absences required long-term substitutes which is a factor in the staff attendance rate.

## School Climate

- New teacher district surveys indicate a need for increased technology, more parental involvement, and more time to get the job done.

- District staff surveys indicate a need for a more rigorous and articulated curriculum, insufficient resources, lack of time for collaboration and communication, and the need to use best practices.

- District student surveys show that textbooks are used as a resource, and that students need more time to discuss and express opinions in class. Students have access to computers but don't use them for homework. They feel that the schools are not kept clean, that students and staff do not respect each other, and that students do not behave in class. Diversity issues of making friends, getting along with each other, and having the same academic results for different ethnic groups are still a problem. Students want to learn more with technology and only 70% are satisfied with their school.

- The district community survey indicates that there is a belief that increased technology and smaller class sizes will improve the quality of education.  They do not feel that communication is effective nor are there enough opportunities for participation.  The trust climate is low and students do not feel safe.

- A survey for Plummer stakeholders will be developed to determine if district survey concerns are applicable to Plummer.  Based on results of surveys, the campus advisory team will develop a plan to address the concerns of all stakeholders.

**Inquiry Process**

Analysis of all possible data indicates an emphasis on increasing reading and math achievement as measured by district formative and summative assessments, ITBS, and TAKS.

## Math

In order to close the gap between the subgroups in math, Plummer will implement a plan to increase math scores for all groups.  CSCOPE will be used with fidelity staying within the time lines and administering benchmarks at the end of each unit.  Students will spiral through the math TEKS every two weeks using Lone Star Math.  Students will rotate through Math Centers Lab as part of the Specials schedule to practice skills taught in the classroom. Voyager Math will be implemented in the computer lab.  Students will increase math fluency by using Math Facts Matter at school and they may also access the web site at home.  A math aide will work with small flexible groups in third and fourth grades to remediate deficiencies as identified by CSCOPE benchmarks, ITBS, district assessments and TAKS..  Students that are identified as in need of intervention will be placed on the appropriate tier of the Response to Intervention Model (RTI) and will receive tutoring during and after school in flexible groups beginning in the fall of 2010 working towards mastery of objectives.  Student data will be closely monitored by teachers and administrators to ensure progress.

## Reading

To achieve the goal of students reading at grade level, classroom teachers will use a Guided Reading approach teaching all students at their level either individually or in small groups using leveled books and phonics, as well as using Literacy Stations for a minimum of 90 minutes per day.   Additionally, Headsprout, an Internet-based supplemental reading program, will be used for all Kindergarten and first grade students, and any second grade students below level to improve phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension three times per week.  All students will have an opportunity to check out books from the library weekly.  A Read Naturally lab will be used to provide interventions to small groups of students to increase fluency, phonics, and comprehension.  All students will be required to practice reading at home, thereby increasing parental involvement.  Teachers will identify student reading levels using DRA and Read Naturally Fluency Benchmark Assessor (RNBA) to track growth.  .

For students reading below level, the Plummer Literacy Plan includes identifying students in need of intervention following the RTI model and providing support for classroom teachers in the form of a literacy coach and staff development, as well as closely monitoring data of each student by the classroom teacher, literacy coach, and administrators. The district dyslexia specialist will teach a daily class for dyslexia students.  Special education students will receive general education reading as well as support from the special education teacher.  ESL and LEP students will receive instruction from ESL certified classroom teachers as well as any other interventions offered for which they qualify.

## Staff Development

Professional Staff Development will provide strategies for teachers to use in the successful implementation of the three tiered Response to Intervention Model (RTI), guided reading, Literacy Stations, Improving Vocabulary, Running Records, Comprehension, and effective research based reading and math strategies, as well as a book study. On going monitoring of student data will identify areas of needed staff development to be conducted throughout the year, especially in the area of math instruction.

## Discipline

To achieve a reduced number of disruptive discipline incidents, all staff will be trained in methods to reduce off task behavior and to increase on task behavior including Fred Jones training for new staff, and Boys Town training. Additionally, staff development on effective teaching strategies will train teachers to increase student engagement, thus decreasing discipline problems.

## Attendance

To address the issue of increasing student attendance, thus increasing student achievement, teachers will encourage students to attend and will make contact with the parents when a child is absent. The attendance clerk will attempt to contact students that are absent, also, to let them know they are missed. Classrooms will participate in a program designed to increase attendance. Awards Assemblies are held each six weeks to honor students with perfect attendance.

## 10 Components of a Title I Program

1. **Comprehensive needs assessment** – All data were reviewed for all students and student groups. The components of the campus needs assessment include the: establishment of a school wide planning team, clarification of the campus vision with a focus on reform, creation of the school profile, identification of data sources and analysis of the data.

2. **School-wide reform strategies** – The continued use of the student information system to identify and monitor student growth, the continued use of FOCUS and the staff development which accompanies it, the use of best practice lesson plans and the meeting by content and grade level to monitor and develop instructional plans are

part of our school-wide reform strategies.

3. **Instruction by highly qualified teachers** –100% of our teachers are certified for the position they hold.  They have varying levels of experience, and support is given to less experienced teachers by their colleagues. Parents are notified if a teacher is not certified and the teacher must either be working toward certification or efforts continue to hire someone who is certified.

4. **High-quality and on-going professional development** – Lead Teachers who receive training during the summer and during the school year will provide on-site training and monitoring to assist in professional development. The Site Base Decision-Making Committee identifies areas in which staff development is needed. Staff members participate in staff development. Staff development may also be done on site by in-house instructional leaders or by administrative district instructional support staff.

5. **Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers** – Recruitment and retention of teachers who are certified for positions for which they are appropriately certified is ongoing.  We closely work with our district's Personnel officer and network with other principals to help in this effort; our own teachers also serve as recruiters. The result has been that 100% of our classroom teachers are appropriately certified for the position they hold.

6. **Strategies to increase parental involvement** – Family Math, Science and Literacy Nights are held to increase parents in the school's programs. Open Houses, frequent telephone contact and weekly folder updates/newsletters are methods of recognizing parents as partners. In addition, parents are offered classes to meet their needs, for example ESL classes or TAKS information programs.

7. **Transition from early childhood programs** – Early Childhood Centers collaborate with receiving elementary schools to coordinate parent and student visits to kindergarten programs. Elementary schools conduct community awareness campaigns, on-site meetings at the ECCs and Head Start programs, and round up and registration days to distribute information about programs and registration. Newsletters are distributed from receiving elementary schools. Not applicable to secondary schools.

8. **Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the uses of academic assessments** – Ongoing staff development is available on site to analyze assessment data, whether national, state or teacher produced, to use in making instructional decisions. Grade level or departmental meetings and the SBDMC provide forums to discuss assessment issues.

9. **Effective, timely additional assistance** – The use of formative and summative assessments and AWARE allow for individual student progress to be monitored at the teacher level, building and administrative district levels so that

interventions and assistance will be timely.

10. **Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs** – At the building level, federal, state and local services and programs are coordinated to best address student needs; this coordination of services and programs is reflected in the activities listed in the campus goals and activities.

## Organizational Structure

Our campus Shared Decision-Making Model (SDM) is designed to establish, monitor, and evaluate goals for budgeting, staffing, curriculum, planning, school organization, staffing patterns, and staff development. This model is aligned to state legislation and CHISD board policy. The intention of the SDMC is to pull together our community in a constructive, organized, and unified body to enhance the education of all students.

The SBDMC is the shared decision-making body. SBDMC representatives are elected by the faulty and parents are elected by the PTO membership. It meets monthly and as needed to discuss issues brought forth by the administration, staff, parents, or community. The Council is supported by standing committees that address budgeting, staffing, curriculum, planning, school organization, staffing patterns, and staff development. Standing committees meet as needed. Parents are encouraged to serve on standing committees.

The SBDMC functions under the direction of the Principal. Members of the SBDMC attend SBDMC meetings for the term of his/her office, monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan, address issues presented by the principal, present issues for discussion and recommend resolutions to the SBDMC, create ad hoc committees by consensus of the SBDMC, chair standing committees and ad hoc committees, submit minutes to the principal for committee meetings, and report the recommendations to the SBDMC. The SBDMC is responsible for approving all professional development plans for the school.

The Principal coordinates the process of shared decision making, facilitates communication for all stakeholders, considers issues and recommendations from the community, SBDMC, and standing committees, and makes decisions based on those recommendations.

## Shared Decision-making Process

Consensus is the ultimate goal of the SBDMC. Agreement by all participants is not always possible or necessary for consensus. Consensus is a collective process that provides a forum for full dialogue on appropriate/applicable

responses to issues.

Members of the committees discuss and make recommendations to the SBDMC. The SBDMC reviews recommendations and reaches consensus. Sufficient consensus is defined as a willingness to settle an issue in favor of the majority. All points of view will be considered and general agreement must be reached before decisions will be implemented. If general agreement is not reached, further study of the issue will occur and alternatives will be presented until agreement is reached. After all alternatives have been explored, a deadlock can be broken by a majority vote. As issues come up for discussion, the chairperson is responsible for ensuring that all present have a legitimate opportunity to state their case. The principal retains the authority to exercise a veto over decisions made by the SBDMC.

## Method of Communication

Members of the school community may submit non-personnel issues for consideration through the shared decision-making process. Written issues or concerns are submitted to any SDMC member or placed in the SDMC box located in the main office. A school community member may attend a meeting of any committee to discuss or present an issue. All meetings are on the monthly calendar. The SBDMC delivers issues to appropriate standing committees for action. Communications from all committees is transmitted to faculty, staff, and parents.

| Membership Composition of the Shared Decision-Making Committee | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Classroom Teachers (2/3) | 4 | Number of Parents | 2 |
| Number of School-based Staff (1/3) | 2 | Number of Community Members | 2 |
| Number of Non-Instructional Staff | 1 | Number of Business Members | 1 |
| Name of SDMC Member | | Position (Term expires) | |
| TBA | | Business Member | |
| Inass Barnes | | Classroom Teacher | |
| Diane Rose | | Classroom Teacher | |
| Barbara Brown | | Classroom Teacher | |
| Shelly Hernandez | | Classroom Teacher | |
| Sue Agee | | Community Member | |
| TBA | | Community Member | |
| Phyllis Phillips | | Non-Instructional Staff | |
| Darlene Davis | | Parent | |
| Barbretta Baker | | Parent | |
| Linda L. Cronenberg | | Principal | |

| Denalda Jones | School-Based Staff |
| Alison Gravley | School-Based Staff |

| State Compensatory Education | |
|---|---|
| Total amount of State Compensatory Education Funds. | $57868.00 |
| Personnel funded with State Compensatory Education Funds (number of FTEs.) | |
| List title of funded staff i.e. | X.5 |
| List title of funded staff i.e. | 1.0 |
| Total FTEs funded with State Compensatory Education Funds. | 1.5 |

## Gifted/Talented Program Goal

For 2010-2011, provisions to modify services for students identified as Gifted/Talented (G/T) are provided through the implementation of the Vanguard Standards (Standards 5, 6, 7 and 8), Standard Practice Memorandum (SPM) 5610.A and the G/T Curriculum Framework Scholars & Knowledge.

**Formative**     Differentiated strategies for instruction and assessment are documented weekly in lesson plans.

**Summative**     Students identified as G/T shall be expected to score above grade level on the district required ITBS and score at the commended level on TAKS

**Strategy**     Monitor and provide differentiated instruction for students to perform above grade level.

## Parent and Community Involvement Goal

For 2010-2011, the percent of parents and community members' attendance at campus events will increase by 20%.

**Formative**     At the end of the first semester, the percent of parents and community members attending PTA meetings and campus events will be reviewed to determine progress.

**Summative**     At the end of the school year, the percent of parents and community members attending PTA meetings and events will be reviewed to determine if the objective was met.

**Strategy**     Provide sign-in sheets at each event.

## Dyslexia Program Goals

For 2010-2011, provisions for identification, assessment and instructional services to students having or suspected of having dyslexia or a related disorder, dyslexia teachers and parents are provided through compliance with laws governing dyslexia programming: TEC §11.252, TEC §38.003; TEC §28.006; TAC 19 §74.28; §504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Dyslexia Program Guidelines/standards.

**Formative**    STAT meeting minutes will reflect students discussed or referred as students suspected of having dyslexia.

**Summative**    All student data will be reviewed and monitored for progress such as ITBS, TPRI, DRA, RNBA, TAKS, formative assessments, CSCOPE benchmarks, and Read Naturally or Headsprout Reports.

**Strategy**    Students identified as having dyslexia will receive daily instruction from the district dyslexia specialist.

## Special Education Goal

For 2010-2011, 70% of all special education students will meet the state standard for improvement/ growth.

**Formative**   Each grading period, students' progress will be monitored and reviewed through IEP goals and objectives.

**Summative**   Results of the TAKS and/or TAKS ACC and/or TAKS-M tests and Formative/Summative Assessment data will be reviewed.

**Strategy**   Special education students will receive general education as well as special education instruction and interventions as a response to data analysis for academic weaknesses.  Tutoring during and after school will be provided in both the general education and/or special education setting.  Teachers will receive professional development in instructional strategies that will improve student performance.


## Violence Prevention Goal

For 2010-2011, the discipline referrals will be reduced by **10**% from the previous school year.

**Formative**   Each grading period the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine the percent of referrals.

**Summative**   At the end of the school year, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine the percent of referrals.

**Strategy**   The Discipline Advisory Team (DAT) will review the discipline report each grading period and make recommendations to reduce discipline referrals.


## Attendance Goal

For 2010-2011, the ADA student attendance will be at or above **97**%.

**Formative**   Monthly attendance rates by grade level and total school will be reviewed in addition to a list of students with more than three absences per month.

**Summative**   The yearend ADA will be reviewed to determine if the annual attendance objective was met.

**Strategy**   Send letters to parents of students with three or more unexcused absences. Initiate attendance referrals for students with more than five unexcused absences.

## Highly Qualified Teacher Goal

For 2010-2011, the percent of highly qualified teachers in the core academic areas will be at or above **100**%.

**Formative**    At the end of the first semester, the percent of teachers in the core academic areas who are highly qualified will be reviewed to determine progress.

**Summative**    At the end of the school year, the percent of teachers in the core academic areas who are highly qualified will be reviewed to see if the objective was met.

**Strategy**    Hire highly qualified teachers.

## Staff Development Plans
## 2010 – 2011

| Date | Who should attend | Purpose |
|---|---|---|
| **Full Day Staff Development** | | |
| August 4, 2010 | Teachers | Reading Textbook Training |
| August 5 - 6, 9 – 11, 2010 | New teachers | TIPS |
| August 9, 2010 | Librarians | Alexandria Training |
| August 9 – 11, 2010 | Instructional Aides | Paraprofessional Training – Government Center. Training Room |
| August 12, 2010 | All staff | Convocation 8:00 – 11:30 Data Analysis Training 1:00 – 4:00 |
| August 13, 2010 | All staff | Procedural Guidelines for School Operations, PDAS, CIP, Literacy Action Plan, Math Action Plan, Sexual Harassment |
| August 16, 2010 | Teachers | Guided Reading K - 4 |
| August 17 – 18 | All staff | Boy's Town Training |
| August 19 | All staff | CSCOPE Update, ARD Decision Making, Blood Pathogen, Emergency Operation Plan, Counseling & Child Protective Services Procedures |
| August 20, 2009 | Campus Incident | Emergency Operation Plan – Plummer CIRT |

| | Response Team | |
|---|---|---|
| August 12 – August 20 | Teachers | Science Lab Safety course on line<br>https://olc.region10.org/pd/login/index.php |
| October 8, 2010 | All staff | Parent Conferences |
| November 8, 2010 | All staff | Using the 5E Model of Instruction to Engage Students in Mathematics |
| January 3, 2011 | All staff | Reading Centers Facilitate Guided Reading |
| February 21, 2011 | All staff | 21st Century Technology – Have You Caught It? |

| Half Day Staff Development | | |
|---|---|---|
| September 24, 2010 | All Staff | Testing Procedures – District & Campus, Data Analysis |
| January 14, 2011 | All Staff | Reading Prescriptions – Where Are We Now? |
| February 18, 2011 | All Staff | HOT (Higher Order Thinking) Math |