Ector County Independent School District

Burleson Elementary

Improvement Plan

2020-2021

Accountability Rating: Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster



Mission Statement

Burleson Elementary will provide quality instruction in a nurturing, fun learning environment in order that all students can reach their full potential and meet or exceed state standards.

Vision

Burleson Elementary will be a successful learning environment where students will enjoy learning while we work toward excellence in student achievement. Our students will learn to be lifelong learners, appreciate diversity, and respect themselves and others.

Table of Contents

| Comprehensive Needs Assessment | 4 |
|--|----|
| Demographics | 4 |
| Student Achievement | 6 |
| School Culture and Climate | 18 |
| Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention | 22 |
| Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment | 25 |
| Parent and Community Engagement | 33 |
| School Context and Organization | 36 |
| Technology | 39 |
| Priority Problem Statements | 40 |
| Goals | 42 |
| Goal 1: Goal 1: Foundational Excellence: Burleson will create an agile, forward-thinking organization that operates with excellence today, while continuously researching and innovating tomorrow's practices. | 42 |
| Goal 2: Goal 2: Invest in Talent: Burleson will recruit, develop and retain highly-effective individuals who are invested in looking at tomorrow to | |
| inform their practices today. | 51 |
| Goal 3: Burleson will establish rigorous standards while balancing pressure and support for individuals to work hard and achieve goals they have yet | |
| to dream. Burleson will equip students to be adaptable in an ever-changing society. | 53 |
| Targeted Support Strategies | 61 |
| Campus Funding Summary | 62 |
| Addendums | 64 |

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

4 of 64

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Enrollment

| Year | K-12 |
|-------------|------|
| 2020 | 544 |
| 2019 | 543 |
| 2018 | 428 |
| 2017 | 396 |

Burleson feeder pattern is Carver EE to Burleson to Bowie to Odessa HS

Ethnic Distribution

| Year | <u>H</u> | $\underline{\mathbf{W}}$ | <u>AA</u> | <u>2 or</u> <u>More</u> | EcoDis |
|-------------|----------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 83.5 | 9.8 | 3.9 | 1.3 | |
| 2019 | 81.4 | 10.1 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 67.8 |
| 2018 | 82.7 | 10.0 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 70.6 |
| 2017 | 81.1 | 13.4 | 3.0 | 1 | 75.0 |

Special Programs

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Special</u> <u>Ed</u> | <u>ELL</u> | At-Risk | <u>GT</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| 2019 | 14.5 | 22.8 | 45.5 | 3.9 |
| 2018 | 13.1 | 20.6 | 49.8 | 4.7 |
| 2017 | 10.1 | 21.5 | 59.3 | 4.8 |

2019 ELL population

99% Hispanic

1% White

2019 Special Ed population

4% African American

81% Hispanic

12% White

2% 2 or more

2019 GT population

6% African American

75% Hispanic

19% White

Demographics Strengths

Enrollment at Burleson has continues to go up, (2017 = 396 2020 = 544). Hispanic (81%), white (10) and economically disadvantaged (70) have remained constant, while African American is showing an increase (3.0 to 4.2%). Burleson Special education (10% to 15) & ELL (21% to 23%) continue to rise, while at risk (59% to 46%) are falling.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Special Education numbers are up 4.4% in 2 years, but GT numbers fell by 1% last year. **Root Cause:** Our biggest student population are our Hispanic students. They make up 81% of special education, and account for only 75% of GT students. This indicates a possible equity gap.

Student Achievement

Student Achievement Summary

2020 Projected Accountability Report Card - Spring DBA (February)

What MIGHT it look like for an Elementary School?

Enter Name of Campus Burleson

Campus Type Elementary School

Enter % EcoDis - Fall 2017 Snapshot 79.0

| | Raw Score | Enter Scale Score* | Word Rating | Grade [What If?] | Overall Grade Components | | Weight | Total |
|---|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|----|--------|-------|
| Domain I - Student Achievement | 18 | 45 | IR | F | | | | |
| Domain II - School Progress [Overall Scale Score is the BETTER of Part A or Part B] | | 50 | IR | F | Best Scale Score: Domain I, Domain II-Part A | 50 | 70% | 35 |
| Part A - Academic Growth | 43 | 50 | IR | F | or Domain II-Part B | | | |
| Part B - Relative Performance | 18 | 46 | IR | F | | | | |
| Domain III - Closing the Gaps | 0 | 30 | IR | F | Domain III Scale Score | 30 | 30% | 9 |
| Academic Achievement (%age of Indicators Met) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Academic Growth (%age of Indicators Met) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| EL Proficiency (%age of Indicators Met) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

2020 Projected Accountability Report Card - Spring DBA (February)

Student Success (%age of Indicators Met)

* To find the Scale Score applicable to each Raw Score, click on the link below

and select Accountability Ratings Scaled Score Conversion Tool

https://tea.texas.gov/2018scalingresources.aspx

Overall Score 44

IR

F

Overall Word Rating

Overall Letter Grade [What If?]

School Progress Academic Growth 2018 and beyond Percent Met or Exceeded Progress years 2017-2018

Reading

| Year | State | Bur | Н |
|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2018 2017 | 74 72 | 57 52 | 58 50 |
| Math | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2018 | 81 | 57 | 58 |
| 2017 | 79 | 52 | 50 |

State Assessment Results-Approaches Passing standard increased in 2016

3rd Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | Bur | Н |
|------|-------|-----|----|
| 2019 | | 58 | 52 |
| 2018 | 77 | 46 | 48 |

| SOM Fool Progress Academic Growth 2018 are 4th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Growth 2018 are 4th | • | 57 | 57 |
|--|-----------|-----|----|
| | | D | ** |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 | | 44 | 45 |
| 2018 | 73 | 61 | 59 |
| 2017 | 70 | 56 | 46 |
| 5th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Gr | ade Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 | | 55 | 59 |
| 2018 | 84 | 64 | 62 |
| 2017 | 82 | | |
| | | | |
| 4th Grade STAAR Writing Approaches Gra | ade Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 | | 45 | 48 |
| 2018 | 63 | 46 | 45 |
| 2017 | 65 | 620 | 58 |
| | | | |
| 5th Grade STAAR Science Approaches Gra | ade Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 | | 43 | 44 |
| 2018 | 76 | 40 | 40 |
| 2017 | 74 | 40 | 43 |
| 3rd Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade | e Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| | | | |

| 30h ol Progress Academic Growth 2018 an 2018 | d beyond 78 | 53 45 | 50 45 | | | |
|---|----------------|----------|----------|--|--|--|
| 2017 | 78 | 66 | 62 | | | |
| 4th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade Level | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | | | |
| 2019 2018 | 78 | 48 69 | 49 67 | | | |
| 2017 | 76 | 64 | 63 | | | |
| 5th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade | Level | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | | | |
| 2019 | | 60 | 60 | | | |
| 2018 | 91 | 57 | 61 | | | |
| 2017 | 87 | | | | | |

Percent of 3rd Graders Reading on Grade Level at End of

Year

Year

201953 201844 201756

Student Success Initiative – Percent Passing on First Administration 5th Reading

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|----|----|--------|------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 55 | 59 | 44 | 33 | 55 | 20 | 47 |
| 2018 | | 64 | 62 | 70 | 53 | 57 | 22 | 50 |
| 2017 | 72 | | | | | | | |

^{*}measured by Istation

| Student Success Initiative – Percent Passing on First Administration |
|--|
| 5th Math |

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|----|----|--------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 60 | 60 | 67 | 50 | 56 | 50 | 88 |
| 2018 | | 57 | 61 | 50 | 33 | 57 | 14 | 83 |
| 2017 | 81 | | | | | | | |

State Assessment Results-Meets

Grade 3 Reading Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-------|----|----|--------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 16 | 13 | 20 | | 14 | 11 | 27 |
| 2018 | 43 | 16 | 15 | 17 | 50 | 18 | 0 | 8 |
| 2017 | 45 | 25 | 26 | 23 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 17 |
| Grade 4 | Reading M | eets Grade | Level | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 33 |
| 2018 | 46 | 25 | 26 | 40 | 0 | 22 | 10 | 38 |
| 2017 | 44 | 22 | 21 | 28 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 5 | Reading M | eets Grade | Level | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 34 | 31 | 44 | 17 | 33 | 20 | 47 |
| 2018 2017 | 54 48 | 36 | 34 | 46 | 57 | 29 | 6 | 21 |

Grade 4 Writing Meets Grade Level

| Student Success | Initiative – | Percent | Passing | on First | Administration |
|------------------------|----------------|------------|-----------|-------------|--|
| Stadelle Saccess | IIII CICCI I C | I CI CCIIC | I WOULING | OII I II DU | 1 I MIIIIIIIII W W W W W W W W W W W W W |

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----|----|--------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 18 | 19 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 15 |
| 2018 | 39 | 17 | 15 | 30 | 17 | 14 | 20 | 0 |
| 2017 | 34 | 22 | 20 | 36 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 3 M | Math Meets | s Grade Le | vel | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 21 | 19 | 10 | | 18 | 33 | 33 |
| 2018 | 47 | 19 | 18 | 40 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 33 |
| 2017 Grade 4 M | 49 Math Meets | 28 Grade Le | 28 vel | 33 | 33 | 20 | 11 | 33 |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 23 | 23 | 38 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 42 |
| 2018 | 49 | 27 | 28 | 36 | 50 | 27 | 20 | 33 |
| 2017 Grade 5 M | 47 Math Meets | 32 s Grade Le | 29 vel | 45 | 25 | 29 | 0 | 57 |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 31 | 32 | 67 | 33 | 28 | 10 | 69 |
| 2018 | 58 | 21 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 42 |
| 2017 Grade 5.9 | 50 Science Me | ats Grada | I aval | | | | | |
| Year | State State | Bur | H | W | AA | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 20 | 20 | 33 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 40 |
| 2018 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 18 |

| Student Success Initiative – Percent Passing on First Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------------|---|---|----|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2017 | 42 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| State A | ssessmen | t Results-N | f asters | | | | | | | | | | |

STAAR Percent at Masters (previously advanced level III)

All Subjects

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|---|---|--------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 22 | 6 | 6 | | 7 | | 7 |
| 2017 | 20 | 8 | 9 | | 7 | | 8 |

4 Writing Masters Level

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | EcoDis | Special Ed | d ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|----|--------|------------|-------|
| 2019 | | 4 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

5-EOC Science Masters Level

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|---|----|--------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 7 | 7 | 22 | 7 | 0 | 20 |
| 2018 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

2019 Domain 2 Results:

ELA/Reading and Mathematics

| | Did Not Meet | | | 11 | | | Meets Grade Level | | | Masters Grade Level | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Prior-Year Performance on STAAR | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (0 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (1 point) | Growth Points Earned | Total Possible Points |
| Did Not Meet | - | 51 | 54 | - | 0 | 28 | - | - | 3 | 0 | | |
| Approaches Grade Level | - | 26 | 0 | - | 29 | 17 | - | - | 17 | 3 | | |
| Meets Grade Level | 0 | - | - | 16 | - | - | - | 7 | 15 | 18 | | |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 6 | - | - | 22 | | |
| Total Number of Tests | of_0 | 77 | 54 | 16 | 29 | 45 | 6 | 7 | 35 | 43 | | |
| Total Points Score | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 14.5 | 45 | 0 | 3.5 | 35 | 43 | 195 | 312 63 |
| ELA/Reading | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S | Did Not Me | eet | | Approaches | Grade Lev | /el | Meets Grad | e Level | | Masters Grade Leve | 1 | |
| Prior-Year Performance on STAAR | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (0 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress | Growth Points Earned | Total Possible Points |
| Did Not Meet | - | 27 | 27 | - | 0 | 16 | - | - | 1 | 0 | | |
| Approaches Grade Level | - | 9 | 0 | - | 10 | 12 | - | - | 12 | 1 | | |

ELA/Reading and Mathematics

| Meets Grade | 0 | _ | _ | 8 | _ | _ | _ | 3 | 5 | 6 | | |
|---------------------|-------|----|----|---|----|----|---|-----|----|----|------|-----|
| Level | O | _ | _ | G | _ | _ | _ | 3 | 3 | O | | |
| Masters Grade | 0 | _ | _ | 0 | | _ | 5 | | | 11 | | |
| Level | O | - | _ | U | - | _ | 3 | - | - | 11 | | |
| Total Number of | f_0 | 36 | 27 | 8 | 10 | 28 | 5 | 3 | 18 | 18 | | |
| Tests | O | 30 | 21 | G | 10 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 10 | | |
| Total Points | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 1.5 | 18 | 18 | 97.5 | 153 |
| Score | | | | | | | | | | | | 64 |

Mathematics

| | Did Not Meet | | | Approaches Grade Level | | | Meets Grade Level | | | Masters Grade Level | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Prior-Year Performance on STAAR | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (0 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (0 points) | Did Not Meet Progress (1/2 points) | Met or Exceeded Progress (1 point) | Progress Not Applicable (1 point) | Growth Points Earned | Total Possible Points |
| Did Not Meet | - | 24 | 27 | - | 0 | 12 | - | - | 2 | 0 | | |
| Approaches Grade Level | - | 17 | 0 | - | 19 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 2 | | |
| Meets Grade Level | 0 | - | - | 8 | - | - | - | 4 | 10 | 12 | | |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 11 | | |
| Total Number of Tests | 00 | 41 | 27 | 8 | 19 | 17 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 25 | | |
| Total Points Score | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 9.5 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 25 | 97.5 | 159 61 |

Burleson 2019 Domain 3 Results:

| | All Students | Hispanic | Econ Disadv | EL (Current & Monitored)+ | Special Ed (Current) | Continu- ously Enrolled | Non- Continu- ously Enrolled | Total Met | Total Evaluated |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Academic Achievement Status | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA/Reading Target | 44% | 37% | 33% | 29% | 19% | 46% | 42% | | |
| Target Met | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | N | | |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 26% | 25% | 26% | 39% | 23% | 25% | 29% | | |
| # at Meets GL Standard or Above | 62 | 49 | 42 | 20 | 7 | 42 | 20 | | |
| Total Tests (Adjusted) | 237 | 194 | 161 | 51 | 31 | 167 | 70 | | |
| Math Target | 46% | 40% | 36% | 40% | 23% | 47% | 45% | | |
| Target Met | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | N | | |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 26% | 26% | 26% | 47% | 26% | 25% | 30% | | |
| # at Meets GL Standard or | (2) | <i>7</i> .1 | 40 | 2.4 | 0 | 4.1 | 21 | | |
| Above | 62 | 51 | 42 | 24 | 8 | 41 | 21 | | |
| Total Tests (Adjusted) | 237 | 194 | 161 | 51 | 31 | 167 | 70 | | |
| Total Indicators | | | | | | | | 4 | 14 |
| Growth Status | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA/Reading Target | 66 | 65 | 64 | 64 | 59 | 66 | 67 | | |
| Target Met | N | Y | Y | Y | | N | Y | | |
| Academic Growth Score | 64 | 66 | 64 | 69 | 64 | 62 | 69 | | |
| Growth Points | 97.5 | 83 | 69 | 20 | 13.5 | 68 | 29.5 | | |
| Total Tests | 153 | 126 | 107 | 29 | 21 | 110 | 43 | | |
| Math Target | 71 | 69 | 68 | 68 | 61 | 71 | 70 | | |
| Target Met | N | N | N | Y | | N | N | | |
| Academic Growth Score | 61 | 64 | 62 | 80 | 62 | 60 | 64 | | |
| Growth Points | 97.5 | 84 | 69.5 | 28 | 13 | 69.5 | 28 | | |
| Total Tests | 159 | 131 | 113 | 35 | 21 | 115 | 44 | | |
| Total Indicators | | | | | | | | 5 | 12 |
| Graduation Rate Status *** | | | | | | | | | |
| Target | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | n/a | n/a | | |
| Target Met | | | | | | | | | |
| 2017 % Graduated | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| 2018 % Graduated | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |

Burleson Elementary Generated by Plan4Learning.com Campus #068901103 August 25, 2020 12:09 AM

| | All Students | Hispanic | Econ Disadv | EL (Current & Monitored)+ | Special Ed (Current) | Continuously Enrolled | Non- Continu- ously Enrolled | Total Met | Total Evaluated |
|---|-----------------|----------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| 2018 # Graduated | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| 2018 Total in Class | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| Total Indicators | | | | | | | | | |
| English Language Proficiency S | Status | | | | | | | | |
| Target | | | | 36% | | | | | |
| Target Met | | | | Y | | | | | |
| TELPAS Progress Rate | | | | 48% | | | | | |
| TELPAS Progress | | | | 44 | | | | | |
| TELPAS Total | | | | 91 | | | | | |
| Total Indicators | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Student Success Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Target | 47 | 41 | 38 | 37 | 23 | 48 | 45 | | |
| Target Met | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | | |
| STAAR Component Score | 30 | 30 | 29 | 45 | 22 | 29 | 34 | | |
| % at Approaches GL Standard or Above | 55% | 55% | 53% | 78% | 32% | 54% | 58% | | |
| % at Meets GL Standard or Above | 25% | 25% | 25% | 41% | 23% | 24% | 29% | | |
| % at Masters GL Standard | 11% | 10% | 10% | 15% | 10% | 9% | 15% | | |
| Total Tests | 633 | 519 | 435 | 137 | 82 | 449 | 184 | | |
| Total Indicators | | | | | | | | 1 | 10 |

Student Achievement Strengths

Burleson failed to meet state standards on STAAR test in the 2018/2019 year. Burleson has seen a three-year upward trend with ELL students, and most subject areas showing a double-digit growth each year on STAAR. ELL students consistently scored higher in all areas of math with scores in the 70s & 80s, while campus averages ranged from 40s to 60s. In writing, white and ELL students showed strengths with white students scoring 63 and ELL scoring 62. In reading scores, the past three years have been inconsistent with different subpopulations scoring high and lower year to year. Burleson has failed to meet standards in index I for three years. For Index II A, Burleson has scored 60 (2016), 60 (2017) and this year a 59. Index three scores have risen the last three years with Burleson scoring a 67 this year. 3-year Istation scores show 3rd graders reading at grade level were 56% in 2017, 44% in 2018, and 53% in

2019. Measuring the 3rd and 4th-grade cohorts meets and masters level in STAAR rose a total of 34 points last year and 14 of 17 tested areas showed growth at the approaches, meets, and masters level. TELPAS scores as measured by Index III were at a 50% with a 2019 target of 42%. On TELPAS, 46 students progressed at least one proficiency level and 98 students matched last year's TELPAS levels. The February DBA indicated that Burleson would have a letter grade of F. Domain I showed a scale score of 45, Domain II showed a scale score of 50, and Domain III showed a scale score of 30. The 2020 DBA compared to the 2019 DBA was an improvement and given earlier in the year.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Achievement Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Burleson failed to reach academic standards on the state assessment. **Root Cause:** Lack of teacher experience leads to a lack of quality instruction in classroom.

Problem Statement 2: Burleson's overall TEA report card grade was a 59 F. In domain I we had a 56 F, Domain II we had a 59 F and Closing the gaps we had a 67 D. Burleson will need to improve in all domains to reach our goal this year of a C rating. **Root Cause:** Lack of teacher experience leads to a lack of quality instruction in classroom. Edit Associated Areas

School Culture and Climate

School Culture and Climate Summary

Staff Survey

Feedback and Coaching

Perceptions of the amount and quality of feedback faculty and staff receive.

68%

Professional Learning

Perceptions of the amount and quality of professional growth and learning opportunities available to faculty and staff.

65%

School Climate

Perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school.

73%

School Leadership

Perceptions of school leadership's effectiveness.

89%

Student Survey

School Belonging

How many students feel that they are valued members of the school community.

63%

School Climate

Perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school.

53%

School Engagement

How attentive and invested students are in school.

60%

School Rigorous Expectations

How many students feel that their teachers hold them to high expectations around effort, understanding, persistence, and performance in class. 62%

School Safety

Perceptions of student physical and psychological safety at school.

43%

School Teacher-Student Relationships

How strong the social connection is between teachers and students within and beyond the school.

69%

Family Survey

Family Engagement

The degree to which families become involved and interact with their child's school.

31%

School Climate

Perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school.

61%

School Safety

Perceptions of student physical and psychological safety at school.

66%

Attendance Rates

Year Bur H W AA EcoDis Special ELL

2020 94.7

Burleson Elementary Generated by Plan4Learning.com

| 2019 | 93.9 | | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2018 | 95.1 | 95.2 | 94.1 | 95 | 949 | 94.3 | 96 |
| 2017 | 95.8 | 95.6 | 95.0 | 94.9 | 95.3 | 95.3 | 96.3 |

Discipline referral break down by sub pop

Asian = 1% African American = 18%

Hispanic = 52%

White = 26%

2 or more races = 2%

Discipline referral break down by grade level

1st = 1

2nd = 23

3rd = 9

4th = 43

5th = 14

Total = 90

School Culture and Climate Strengths

Results from the staff survey show that School leadership scored high with an 89% favorable response. Attendance went up from 93.9 to 94.7. Discipline referrals also fell from the previous year.

Problem Statements Identifying School Culture and Climate Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Surveys show that 38% of students don't feel like they are being engaged and challenged at school. **Root Cause:** Limited teacher experience and training. 58.8 % of Burleson teachers are novice teachers.

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Summary

of Teachers

Year PreK-12 2019 32.8 2018 26.4 2017 29.1

of Employees (FTEs) /

Enrollment

| Year | Employees |
|------|-----------|
| 2019 | 49.7 |
| 2018 | 37.40 |
| 2017 | 36.70 |

Teachers by Years of Experience

| Year | Beginning | 11 – 20 Years | Over 20 Years |
|------|-----------|---------------|---------------|
| 2019 | 58.8 | 30 | 11.2 |
| 2018 | 53.5 | 26.5 | 5.7 |
| 2017 | 38.3 | 21.0 | 1.1 |

Average Years of Experience of

Teachers

Year Burleson 2019 10.4 2018 8.5 Average Years of Experience of Teachers

2017 5.5

Average Years of Experience of Teachers with the District

| Year | Burleson |
|------|----------|
| 2019 | 9.2 |
| 2018 | 8.1 |
| 2017 | 5.2 |

Turnover Rate for Teachers

| Year | Burleson |
|------|----------|
| 2019 | 10 |
| 2018 | 10 |

Burleson has had to hire long term subs because we did not have enough teachers. This year Burleson is fully staffed except for 1 special education teacher.

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Strengths

Burleson has 11% of teachers with 20+ years of experience, 30% with 11-20 years, and beginning teachers were at 59%. The average years of experience in the district are 9.2 years, and the average experience of Burleson teachers was 10.4 years. Bulreson has a low teacher turnover rate-losing only 3 teachers last year. The trend has been that Burleson is keeping its teachers and teaching experience is growing. This year Burleson only has 1 teacher opening for a special education teacher, all other positions have been filled with a certified teacher.

Problem Statements Identifying Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Needs Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 58.8% of Burleson's teaching staff is made up of novice educators. Root Cause: Lack of availability of certified teachers in area.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summary

2020 Projected Accountability Report Card - Spring DBA (February)

What MIGHT it look like for an Elementary School?

Enter Name of Campus Burleson

Campus Type **Elementary School**

Enter % EcoDis - Fall 2017 Snapshot 79.0

Generated by Plan4Learning.com

| | Raw Score | Enter Scale Score* | Word Rating | Letter g Grade [What If?] | Overall Grade Components | | Weight | Total |
|---|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--|----|--------|-------------------|
| Domain I - Student Achievement | 18 | 45 | IR | F | | | | |
| Domain II - School Progress [Overall Scale Score is the BETTER of Part A or Part B] | | 50 | IR | F | Best Scale Score: Domain I, Domain II-Part A | 50 | 70% | 35 |
| Part A - Academic Growth | 43 | 50 | IR | F | or Domain II-Part B | | | |
| Part B - Relative Performance | 18 | 46 | IR | F | | | | |
| Domain III - Closing the Gaps | 0 | 30 | IR | F | Domain III Scale Score | 30 | 30% | 9 |
| Academic Achievement (%age of Indicators Met) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Academic Growth (%age of Indicators Met) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| EL Proficiency (%age of Indicators Met) | | | | | | | | |
| Student Success (%age of Indicators Met) | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Burleson Elementary | | | 25 of 64 | <u> </u> | | | | Campus #068901103 |

25 of 64

August 25, 2020 12:09 AM

2020 Projected Accountability Report Card - Spring DBA (February)

* To find the Scale Score applicable to each Raw Score, click on the link below and select Accountability Ratings Scaled Score Conversion Tool

https://tea.texas.gov/2018scalingresources.aspx

School Progress Academic Growth 2018 and beyond Percent Met or Exceeded Progress years 2013-2017

Reading

| Year | State | Bur | Н |
|------|-------|-----|----|
| 2019 | | | |
| 2018 | 74 | 57 | 58 |
| 2017 | 72 | 52 | 50 |
| Math | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 | | | |
| 2018 | 81 | 57 | 58 |
| 2017 | 79 | 52 | 50 |

State Assessment Results-Approaches Passing standard increased in 2016

3rd Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | Bur | Н |
|------|-------|-----|----|
| 2019 | | 58 | 52 |
| 2018 | 77 | 46 | 48 |
| 2017 | 73 | 57 | 57 |

Overall Score 44
Overall Word Rating IR

Overall Letter Grade [What If?]

F

4th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | Bur | Н |
|--|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 2019 2018 2017 | 73 70 | 44 61 56 | 45 59 46 |
| 5th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Gr | rade Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 2018 2017 | 84 82 | 55 64 | 59 62 |
| 4th Grade STAAR Writing Approaches Gra | ade Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 2018 2017 | 63 65 | 45 46 620 | 48 45 58 |
| 5th Grade STAAR Science Approaches Gra | ade Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 2018 | 76 | 43 40 | 44 40 |
| 2017 | 74 | 40 | 43 |
| 3rd Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade | e Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 | | 53 | 50 |
| | | | |

| 30h8 ol Progress Academic Growth 2018 and | d78eyond | 45 | 45 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| 2017 | 78 | 66 | 62 |
| 4th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade | Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 2018 | 78 | 48 69 | 49 67 |
| 2017 | 76 | 64 | 63 |
| 5th Grade STAAR Math Approaches Grade | Level | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н |
| 2019 2018 | 91 | 60 57 | 60 61 |

87

Percent of 3rd Graders Reading on Grade Level at End of

Year
Year
2019 53
2018 44
2017 56

2017

Student Success Initiative – Percent Passing on First Administration 5th Reading

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or Moi | reEcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|------|-------|-----|----|----|----|-------|----------|----------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 55 | 59 | 44 | 33 | 100 | 67 | 55 | 20 | 47 |
| 2018 | | 64 | 62 | 70 | 53 | 94 | 77 | 57 | 22 | 50 |

28 of 64

2017 72

5th Math

Burleson Elementary Generated by Plan4Learning.com

^{*}measured by Istation

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELI |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|----|----|-------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----|
| 2019 | | 60 | 60 | 67 | 50 | 100 | 67 | 56 | 50 | 88 |
| 2018 | | 57 | 61 | 50 | 33 | 0 | | 57 | 14 | 83 |
| 2017 | 81 | | | | | | | | | |
| State A | Assessmer | nt Results | -Meets | | | | | | | |
| Grade | 3 Reading | g Meets C | Grade Lev | el | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELI |
| 2019 | | 16 | 13 | 20 | | 67 | 33 | 14 | 11 | 27 |
| 2018 | 43 | 16 | 15 | 17 | 50 | | 0 | 18 | 0 | 8 |
| 2017 | 45 | 25 | 26 | 23 | 0 | | 0 | 29 | 17 | 17 |
| Grade | 4 Reading | g Meets C | Grade Lev | el | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or M | oreEcoDis | Special Ed | ELI |
| 2019 | | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 25 | 0 | 33 |
| 2018 | 46 | 25 | 26 | 40 | 0 | | 0 | 22 | 10 | 38 |
| 2017 | 44 | 22 | 21 | 28 | 25 | | | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade | 5 Reading | g Meets C | Grade Lev | el | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or M | oreEcoDis | Special Ed | ELI |
| 2019 | | 34 | 31 | 44 | 17 | 100 | 67 | 33 | 20 | 47 |
| 2018 2017 | 54 48 | 36 | 34 | 46 | 57 | 56 | 55 | 29 | 6 | 21 |
| Grade | 4 Writing | Meets G | rade Leve | el | | | | | ~ | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or M | oreEcoDis | Special | EL |

2 or MoreEcoDis

Ed

| Student Success Initiative – Percent Passing on First Administration | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-------------|-----|----|-------|--------------------|---------|---------------|------|
| 2019 | | 18 | 19 | 25 | 0 | | 0 | 20 | 0 | 15 |
| 2018 | 39 | 17 | 15 | 30 | 17 | | | 14 | 20 | 0 |
| 2017 | 34 | 22 | 20 | 36 | 0 | | | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade 3 Math Meets Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or Mor | eEcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 21 | 19 | 10 | | 67 | 33 | 18 | 33 | 33 |
| 2018 | 47 | 19 | 18 | 40 | 0 | | 0 | 20 | 0 | 33 |
| 2017 Grade 4 | 49 4 Math Me | 28 eets Grade | 28 Level | 33 | 33 | | 0 | 20 | 11 | 33 |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or MoreEcoDis | | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 23 | 23 | 38 | 0 | | 0 | 23 | 0 | 42 |
| 2018 | 49 | 27 | 28 | 36 | 50 | | 0 | 27 | 20 | 33 |
| 2017 Grada 4 | 47 5 Math Me | 32 | 29 Level | 45 | 25 | | | 29 | 0 | 57 |
| | | | | *** | | | 2 16 | E D' | Special | DI I |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or MoreEcoDis Ed | | _ | ELL |
| 2019 | | 31 | 32 | 67 | 33 | 100 | 33 | 28 | 10 | 69 |
| 2018 | 58 | 21 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | | 18 | 0 | 42 |
| 2017 | 50 | | | | | | | | | |
| Grade 5 Science Meets Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 20 | 20 | 33 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 40 |
| 2018 | 41 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 8 | 0 | 18 |
| 2017 | 42 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 0 | | | 12 | 0 | 0 |

STAAR Percent at Masters (previously advanced level III)

All Subjects

| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----|----|----|----|-------|--------------|--------|---------------|-------|
| 2019 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 22 | 6 | 6 | | | | | 7 | | 7 |
| 2017 | 20 | 8 | 9 | | | | | 7 | | 8 |
| 4 Writing Masters Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special E | EdELL |
| 2019 | | 4 | 3 | 13 | 0 | | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 0 | | | | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 5-EOC Science Masters Level | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | State | Bur | Н | W | AA | Asian | 2 or More | EcoDis | Special Ed | ELL |
| 2019 | | 7 | 7 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 20 |
| 2018 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2017 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | | 4 | 0 | 0 |

Burleson followed the ECISD curriculum and hired 1 1/2 in school tutors. Last year when school was done virtually due to COVID-19 tutoring was stopped. After the Relay curriculum audit, it was found that the teacher supplemental curriculum did not meet the level of rigor for the STAAR test.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Strengths

To improve instruction Burleson, ILT has attended RELAY training. Burleson has implemented DDI in PLCs that include: teacher taking the exemplar,

making a know show chart on priority SEs, breaking down data, looking at student-facing work revisiting the know show chart and scripting lessons. Burleson also started the observation feedback process where each member of ILT coached 5 teachers a week. This year we are working with Big Rocks to continue these processes and refine our system to make it better. The year started with Big Rocks strong start playbook and the teacher management hierarchy.

Problem Statements Identifying Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): RELAY curriculum audit found that the supplemental materials being used in the classroom was not aligned with the rigor of STAAR **Root Cause:** Teachers are not trained to pick out supplement materials at the appropriate level of STAAR.

Parent and Community Engagement

Parent and Community Engagement Summary

Family Survey

Family Engagement

The degree to which families become involved and interact with their child's school.

31%

School Climate

Perceptions of the overall social and learning climate of the school.

61%

School Safety

Perceptions of student physical and psychological safety at school.

66%

Burleson has 1 in school-approved VIP for the year and 1 virtual VIP so far for 2020.

Burleson has 159 Facebook followers, 759 parents on class dojo & 143 followers on Twitter.

All Burleson parents have access to the Parent Portal in 2020.

The most effective form of communication to parents has been Class Dojo as we reach 759 each time, we will also use parent portal phone calls.

Parent and Family Engagement Policy

The school provides opportunities for the participation of all Title I, Part A parents, including parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory students. Information and school reports are provided in a format and language that parents understood (ESSA Section 1116 (b)(1)).

Family involvement is communicating and engaging with your child, their teacher, and/or the school to support learning and ensure success. Parents, family members, and other caregivers can be involved in a student's education in many ways.

What can you do at home?

- Talk with your child about classroom activities, assignments, projects, and assessments, be involved in your child's learning.
- Talk with your child about the importance of learning and accomplishing school-related tasks.
- Talk with your child about college and careers.
- Help your child organize homework, plan their calendar, and motivate them to learn.
- Read notes, announcements, and newsletters from the school including recorded phone calls home.
- Send notes, emails or call the school to communicate with teachers and other school staff.
- Complete surveys to share your ideas about supporting your child's learning and growth.
- Complete surveys to share your ideas about parent involvement,
- Ask for and read a copy of your district's parent involvement policy.
- Obtain and utilize Parent Portal on any mobile device.
- Use school Facebook for additional school information.
- Read messages posted on See Saw.

What you can do in the classroom?

- Talk with your child's teacher.
- Help with learning activities.
- Volunteer for special assignments (field trips, projects, campus events and meetings)

What you can do at the school?

- Attend Back to School Night, Parent Orientation
- Sign up for Parent Portal and Class Dojo
- Talk with the principal/assistant principal/counselor about your student.
- Talk with the principal about parent involvement opportunities at the school.
- Attend parent education and informational events.
- Attend advisory committee meetings.
- Be active in volunteer opportunities at the campus.
- Help write and review the parent involvement plans.

What you can do at the District Level?

- Attend training on the curriculum and school budget.
- Attend advisory committee meetings.
- Serve on an advisory committee to provide input on important decisions and spending.

- Help write and review the parent involvement policy and plans.
- Help plan, design, and provide training for principals and teachers.
- Link the district with other community organizations you know.
- Vote on board elections.
- Attend board meetings.

Parent and Community Engagement Strengths

Burleson parents gave a positive response of 61% and 66% to school climate and school safety respectively. Burleson does have a VIP program with a few VIPS that are very committed to helping the school and VIP almost every day. Burleson offers several parental engagement events each year, this includes pastries with parents, 2 family math and reading nights, various award ceremonies, meet the teacher, Mr. Gatties family night, talent show, field day, PTA programs, grade-level student performances and family show off nights.

Problem Statements Identifying Parent and Community Engagement Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 69% of parents gave a negative response to family engagement. **Root Cause:** Parents have a hard time getting to school for family engagement activities.

School Context and Organization

School Context and Organization Summary

of Teachers

Year PreK-12 2019 32.8 2018 26.4 2017 29.1

of Employees (FTEs) / Enrollment

Year Employees 2019 49.7 2018 37.40 2017 36.70

Teachers by Years of Experience

| Year | Beginning | 11 - 20 Ye | ears Over 20 Years |
|------|-----------|-------------|--------------------|
| 2019 | 58.8 | 30 | 11.2 |
| 2018 | 53.5 | 26.5 | 5.7 |
| 2017 | 38.3 | 21.0 | 1.1 |

Average Years of Experience of Teachers

| Year | Burleson |
|------|----------|
| 2019 | 10.4 |
| 2018 | 8.5 |
| 2017 | 5.5 |

Average Years of Experience of Teachers with the District

| Year | Burleson |
|------|----------|
| 2019 | 9.2 |
| 2018 | 8.1 |
| 2017 | 5.2 |

Turnover Rate for Teachers

| Year | Burleson |
|------|----------|
| 2019 | 10 |
| 2018 | 10 |

Enrollment

| Year | K-12 |
|------|------|
| 2020 | 544 |
| 2019 | 543 |
| 2018 | 428 |
| 2017 | 396 |

Ethnic Distribution

| Year | Н | \mathbf{W} | AA | 2 or More | EcoDis |
|------|------|--------------|-----|--------------|---------------|
| 2019 | 81.4 | 10.1 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 67.8 |

Ethnic Distribution

| 2018 | 82.7 | 10.0 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 70.6 |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|
| 2017 | 81.1 | 13.4 | 3.0 | 1 | 75.0 |

Special Programs

| Year | Special Ed | ELL | At-Risk | GT |
|------|---------------|------|---------|-----|
| 2019 | 14.5 | 22.8 | 45.5 | 3.9 |
| 2018 | 13.1 | 20.6 | 49.8 | 4.7 |
| 2017 | 10.1 | 21.5 | 59.3 | 4.8 |

CIT is the decision-making committee for Burleson.

ILT includes the principal, AP and two Instructional coaches.

After school programs include a monthly sports program and sign language class.

This year Burleson started the year with 97 in-class students, while 338 are working virtually.

_

School Context and Organization Strengths

Burleson allots the following monthly minute to each subject: 100 art, 220 music, 880 PE, 400 health, 3100 ELA, 1300 math, 900 social studies. Burleson is fully staffed except for 1 special education teacher. Due to COVID-19 Burleson is starting the year with 97 students on campus but we do expect more students to come in person as the year goes on. In 4 years the enrollment of Burleson has grown from 396 to 544.

Problem Statements Identifying School Context and Organization Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Burleson spends more minutes a month on ELA, but ELA student outcomes are below math. **Root Cause:** More training in the science of reading is needed

Technology

Technology Summary

This year all students K - 2 will receive an iPad and 3 - 5 will receive a Chromebook. Teachers have the opportunity to get a laptop. Each classroom has a smartboard, infocus, and Elmo. This year at Burleson every teacher will use Class Dojo to communicate with parents, use Google classroom for face to face live instruction, and K - 2 will use seesaw for turning in student work. Technology will be a focus for PD this year as we have to be ready to move virtual at any moment. Burleson will utilize technology resources that will enable students, teachers, and leaders to implement and monitor personalized learning for all. Burleson has 761 iPads and Chromebooks, so far this year 437 have been checked out for students' use (52.17%.)

Technology Strengths

Burleson has a Google Classroom for teachers that are populated with technology training that teachers may engage in at their own pace. 100% of Burleson teachers are working on the Teacher lap top proficiency program so that they can acquire a desk laptop. Burleson has enough devices that 100% of students can have their own device (IPad or Chromebook) to use for in-school learning or as a virtual learner.

Problem Statements Identifying Technology Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 31% of the total teachers at Burleson have technology in their room with an open work order that needs to be updated or fixed. **Root Cause:** Budget constraints at campus level does not allow us to update technology. IT department does not have enough workers to fix all of the technology needs in teachers' classrooms.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Burleson failed to reach academic standards on the state assessment.

Root Cause 1: Lack of teacher experience leads to a lack of quality instruction in classroom.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 2: Special Education numbers are up 4.4% in 2 years, but GT numbers fell by 1% last year.

Root Cause 2: Our biggest student population are our Hispanic students. They make up 81% of special education, and account for only 75% of GT students. This indicates a possible equity gap.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Surveys show that 38% of students don't feel like they are being engaged and challenged at school.

Root Cause 3: Limited teacher experience and training. 58.8 % of Burleson teachers are novice teachers.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: School Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 4: 58.8% of Burleson's teaching staff is made up of novice educators.

Root Cause 4: Lack of availability of certified teachers in area.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Problem Statement 5: RELAY curriculum audit found that the supplemental materials being used in the classroom was not aligned with the rigor of STAAR

Root Cause 5: Teachers are not trained to pick out supplement materials at the appropriate level of STAAR.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Problem Statement 6: 69% of parents gave a negative response to family engagement.

Root Cause 6: Parents have a hard time getting to school for family engagement activities.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Parent and Community Engagement

Problem Statement 7: Burleson spends more minutes a month on ELA, but ELA student outcomes are below math.

Root Cause 7: More training in the science of reading is needed

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Context and Organization

Problem Statement 8: 31% of the total teachers at Burleson have technology in their room with an open work order that needs to be updated or fixed.

Root Cause 8: Budget constraints at campus level does not allow us to update technology. IT department does not have enough workers to fix all of the technology needs in teachers' classrooms.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Technology

Goals

Goal 1: Goal 1: Foundational Excellence: Burleson will create an agile, forward-thinking organization that operates with excellence today, while continuously researching and innovating tomorrow's practices.

Performance Objective 1: Performance Objective 1: Annual student attendance will increase from 94.7 in 2020 to 95.2 in 2021.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student attendance for 2020/2021 school year

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Burleson will follow the matrix of roles and responsibilities for elementary staff. Burleson will have a weekly award for the class with the highest attendance. Burleson will have 9 week and EOY attendance parties.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson attendance will improve to 95.2% | | Formative |
|--|--|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, teachers | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | Student prizes, trophies to pass out to classes with highest attendance, attendance party. Title One School-wide \$150 | Summativ |
| | acconductes, acconducted party. The one sensor wide \$150 | May |

Performance Objective 2: Performance Objective 2: Provide differentiated processes for priority classrooms/students.

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Plan and implement effective transitions for K, 2nd, and 5th grade to maintain academic learning and support the social-

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The expected result | is effective transitions for student to improve student performance | Formative |
|--|---|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals | | Oct |
| Γitle I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| ΓΕΑ Priorities: Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | SEL training & kinder roundup. Local \$60 | Summative |
| | | May |

Performance Objective 3: Performance Objective 3: Burleson will embed technology for anytime, anywhere teaching and learning.

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs, Blended Learning

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Use technology resources that will enable students, teachers and leaders to implement and monitor personalized learning for all, including the following: Learning Management System (LMS) and Adaptive Technology

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased confidence | e in Burleson data resources. | Formative |
|---|--|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators & Teachers | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.5 | Problem Statements: | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools | Technology 1 | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | Funding Sources: Google classroom, seesaw and class dojo Local \$0 | Summative |
| | Big Rocks & relay training Title One School-wide \$0 | May |
| No Progress Accor | mplished Continue/Modify Discontinue | |

Technology

Problem Statement 1: 31% of the total teachers at Burleson have technology in their room with an open work order that needs to be updated or fixed. **Root Cause:** Budget constraints at campus level does not allow us to update technology. IT department does not have enough workers to fix all of the technology needs in teachers' classrooms.

Performance Objective 4: Performance Objective 4: Develop the adult collective understanding and shared vision of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) that creates systemic change where SEL can thrive.

Evaluation Data Sources: Discipline Referral Numbers in itccs

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson staff will understand the impact of SEL and will be critical partners understanding the | | Formative |
|---|---|-----------|
| importance of implementing social- emotional-cultural learning so that discipline referral numbers will drop. | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor & Principals | | Jan |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 Problem Statements: None | | Mar |
| TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: | |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | SEL training and darkness to light training Local | Summative |
| 222 20,0100 20,010 0,110 0000,000 0000000 | | May |

Performance Objective 5: Performance Objective 5: Burleson will provide a safe and supportive learning environment.

Evaluation Data Sources: Staff, Student & Family surveys

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Awareness training for staff, students and parents will be provided in the area of sexual abuse and other maltreatment of children. All new staff will be trained during required new employee training on Darkness to Light, /Stewards of Child prevention program. Counselors will train all staff during on-campus professional development on prevention and reporting requirements. Required child abuse awareness posters for students will be displayed on all campuses.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased ability of | of staff and students to recognize and report signs of abuse. | Formative |
|--|---|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Teachers & Principals | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: None | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | Darkness to light training & SEL training by counselor. Local | Summative |
| | | May |
| | | |

Strategy 2: All campus staff will be trained yearly during campus professional development concerning ECISD suicide prevention response procedures.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of Burleson staff will be trained in suicide prevention response procedures. | | Formative |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor and Principal | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: None | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | None | Summative |
| | | May |

Strategy 3: The ECISD comprehensive Guidance and Counseling curriculum will continue to be implemented in PK-12 to implement lessons that will include dating violence, child abuse, bullying, conflict resolution, substance abuse, self efficacy, decision making, behavior and other social-emotional topics.

| <u>-</u> | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Monthly Burleson counselor reports will indicate growth in the guidance curriculum | | Formative |
| implementation. | | Oct |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor & Principa | .1 | Jan |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Mar |
| TEA Priorities: None | Funding Sources: | |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture None | | Summative |
| | | May |
| Strategy 4: Teacher discipline management programs v | will be evaluated for alignment to CHAMPS, PBIS, and Conscious | Discipline |

Strategy 4: Teacher discipline management programs will be evaluated for alignment to CHAMPS, PBIS, and Conscious Discipline practices (SEL body of work).

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Office referrals will decrease from 90 to 60 which will increase the amount of instructional time for students. | | Formative |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| for students. | | Oct |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers & Principals | | Jan |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.5, 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Mar |
| TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: None | Summative |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | May |

Strategy 5: Burleson will attach the district's freedom from bullying policy and procedures which includes how to prevent, identify, respond to and report bullying. Administrators will follow all legal requirements pertaining to incidents of bullying. School counselors will provide guidance lessons or implement programs to include bullying prevention. **Formative** Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson staff is trained in awareness, recognition and response regarding Bullying and will properly identify and report to principal. Oct Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Burleson Staff & Principals Jan Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.5, 2.6 **Problem Statements:** None Mar **TEA Priorities:** None **Funding Sources: Summative** None **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture May **Strategy 6:** Burleson's systems and structures will be developed to monitor/improve disaggregated discipline data regularly to identify inequities. **Formative** Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Data driven trend will show actions the needed to lead to a decrease in office referrals to which will increase the amount of instructional time for students Oct **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** CHAMPS/PBIS committee & Principals Jan Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 **Problem Statements:** None Mar **TEA Priorities:** None **Funding Sources: Summative** None **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture May Strategy 7: Burleson will have coordinated health strategies that include data on student fitness, academics, attendance, & eco dis pops. **Formative Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Stundents will perform better if they are healthy. Oct Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PE coach, Principals, Counselor Jan **Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4 Problem Statements:** None

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture

Mar

Summative

May

None

Funding Sources:

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Partnering with pare | nts will increase student outcomes. | Formati |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals, PTA, librarian, teachers, ICs | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 3.1 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | Title One School-wide \$500 | Summat |
| | | |
| diness. | serving Migrant, GT and ELL students and supporting college and | 1 |
| diness. | serving Migrant, GT and ELL students and supporting college and int, GT and ELL students we are getting them prepared for adulthood and | career |
| diness. | | career |
| diness. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By supporting migra | ant, GT and ELL students we are getting them prepared for adulthood and | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By supporting migratheir academics will improve. | ant, GT and ELL students we are getting them prepared for adulthood and | career Format Oct Jan |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By supporting migratheir academics will improve. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, teachers, co | ant, GT and ELL students we are getting them prepared for adulthood and unselor Problem Statements: None | career Format Oct Jan Mar |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By supporting migratheir academics will improve. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, teachers, co Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 | ant, GT and ELL students we are getting them prepared for adulthood and unselor Problem Statements: None | career Format Oct Jan |

Performance Objective 6: Burleson will ensure efficient systems are in place to increase productivity to meet the needs of all that we serve.

Evaluation Data Sources: NA

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Proper preve | rentive maintenance measures will increase equipment life and save on energy costs | |
|--|--|-----------|
| associated with running equipment. | | Oct |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal & He | ead Custodian | Jan |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | Problem Statements: None | Mar |
| TEA Priorities: None | Funding Sources: | |
| ESF Levers: None | cleaning supplies, maintenance items Local | Summative |
| | | May |

Performance Objective 7: Burleson will implement a strategic staff development plan that focuses on Big rocks, Relay and Technology training for administrators and staff.

Targeted or ESF High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Student achievement data

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Burleson administrators will be trained on Big Rocks and Relay and to provide job-embedded coaching for teachers. Burleson will also offer individual teacher technology training on google classroom and via ECISD techy tribe. **Formative** Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Administrators, teachers will improve with focused training, this will improve student achievement and teacher retention Oct

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT Jan **Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4 Problem Statements:** None Mar **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **Funding Sources: Summative** Big Rocks and Relay training, Google Classroom, techy tribe Local **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, May Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers



% No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 2: Goal 2: Invest in Talent: Burleson will recruit, develop and retain highly-effective individuals who are invested in looking at tomorrow to inform their practices today.

Performance Objective 1: Performance Objective 1: Burleson teacher retention rate will increase from 90% in 2020 to 91% in 2021.

Evaluation Data Sources: Teacher retention rate at end of school year.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase staff retention; im- | prove employee effectiveness; develop career pathways. | Formativ |
|--|---|----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers | Big Rocks & Relay Training, Burleson Google classroom Donated Funds | |
| | 1 unus | May |

Performance Objective 2: In 2020-21, Burleson will offer a job-embedded, personalized professional learning system for teachers.

Evaluation Data Sources: Coaching logs, student achievement growth

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Through walkthoughs and | observation feedback meetings Burleson Teachers will show | Formati |
|---|---|----------------------|
| accelerated growth in learning. | _ | Oct |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals & ICs | | Jan |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Mar |
| TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math | Funding Sources: Big Rocks training & Relay Training, Burleson google classsroom. | Summati |
| ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers | Donated Funds | May |
| trategy 2: Strategy: Utilize Opportunity Culture to extend the | te reach of excellent teachers and their teams during 2020-2021. | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Flexibility in staffing will l | ead to improved student outcomes. | Format |
| | | Oct |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| <u> </u> | Problem Statements: None Funding Sources: | - |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.6 | | Jan Mar Summat |

Goal 3: Burleson will establish rigorous standards while balancing pressure and support for individuals to work hard and achieve goals they have yet to dream. Burleson will equip students to be adaptable in an ever-changing society.

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of students reading on grade level in grades K-2 will increase 4% from the BOY MAP to EOY MAP assessment.

Evaluation Data Sources: EOY MAP assessment

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 4% increase in BOY to EOY MAP increase of students on grade level | | Formative |
|--|--------------------------|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ICs, Teachers & Principals | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum District curriculum Title One School-wide | | Summative |
| | | May |

Performance Objective 2: 3rd grade reading "Meets" percentages will increase from 16% (2019 STAAR) to 26% as measured by the 2021 STAAR assessment.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson 3rd Meets scores will rise to 26% | | Formative |
|---|--|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ICs, Teachers & Principals | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5 | de Elements: 2.4, 2.5 Problem Statements: None | |
| ΓΕΑ Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math | Funding Sources: | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum | district curriculum Title One School-wide | Summative |
| | | May |

Performance Objective 3: 3rd grade math "Meets" percentages will increase from 21% (2019 STAAR) to 31% as measured by the 2021 STAAR assessment.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson 3rd Meets scores will rise to 31% | | Formative |
|---|--|------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ICs, Teachers & Principals | S | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: district curriculum & number talks training Title One School-wide | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | Summative May |

Performance Objective 4: The percentage of students that Met Standard on all subjects/grades tested will increase from 25% (2019 STAAR) to 30% as measured by the 2021 STAAR assessment.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson All subjects/grades Meets scores will rise to 30% | | Formative |
|---|--|------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ICs, Teachers & Principals | S | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: district curriculum, literacy block and Number Talks training Title | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction | One School-wide | Summative May |

Performance Objective 5: The percentage of students meeting or exceeding the growth target will increase from 63% (2019 STAAR) to 75% as measured by the 2021 STAAR assessment.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR results

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Burleson will follow district curriculum, monitor virtual learning with MAP testing and daily teacher contact, literacy block and Number Talks to ensure student success.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Burleson growth scores will rise to 75% | | Formative |
|---|--|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ICs, Teachers & Principals | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: district curriculum, literacy block and Number Talks training Title | Mar |
| ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: | One School-wide | Summative |
| Effective Instruction | | May |
| No Progress (100%) Accomplis | shed Continue/Modify X Discontinue | |

Performance Objective 6: Implement innovative instructional models which enable personalized learning for all students.

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson plans, walkthoughs, MAP growth assessments

Summative Evaluation: None

Strategy 1: Implement assessment models that ensure teachers and students are able to monitor their learning and growth. Assessment models will include the following: MAP Growth Assessments, Formative Assessments, and Aggressive Monitoring

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student achievement imp | proves as teachers and students monitor growth together. | Formative |
|--|---|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ICs, Teachers, Principals | | Oct |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4 | Problem Statements: None | Jan |
| TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools Funding Sources: | Mar | |
| ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers | F Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers MAP Training Title One School-wide | |
| | | May |

Strategy 2: Implement research based instructional models which enable personalized learning for all students, including the following: Blended Learning, Balanced Literacy, Enriched Advanced Academics, and/or Project Based Learning

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: student achievement increase on STAAR and MAP tests. | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, ICs, Principals | | | |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 | Problem Statements: None | Jan | |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | Funding Sources: Training on instructional models and technology Title One School- | Mar | |
| ESF Levers: Lever 2: Effective, Well-Supported Teachers, Lever 4: High-Quality Curriculum, Lever 5: Effective Instruction | wide | Summative May | |

Strategy 3: Principal will implement Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) where teams implement the Data-Driven Instructional process, develop TEKS knowledge (Know/Show charts), implement the coaching model of Observation/Feedback, and plan for student mastery of learning objectives through a personalized learning path

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in STAAR & MAP scores at EOY Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals and ICs | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | | |
| Funding Sources: Big rocks and relay training Donated Funds | | | |
| | Summative | | |
| | May | | |
| | Problem Statements: None | | |

Targeted Support Strategies

| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Description | |
|------|-----------|----------|---|--|
| 1 | 5 | 1 9 | Burleson will follow ECISD guidelines for serving Migrant, GT and ELL students and supporting college and career readiness. | |

Campus Funding Summary

| | | | Donated Funds | | |
|------|-----------|----------|--|--------------|----------|
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | Big Rocks & Relay Training, Burleson Google classroom | | \$0.00 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | Big Rocks training & Relay Training, Burleson google classsroom. | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | 6 | 3 | Big rocks and relay training | | \$0.00 |
| | | • | | Sub-Total | \$0.00 |
| | | | Local | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | SEL training & kinder roundup. | | \$60.00 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | Google classroom, seesaw and class dojo | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | SEL training and darkness to light training | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | Darkness to light training & SEL training by counselor. | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | cleaning supplies, maintenance items | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 7 | 1 | Big Rocks and Relay training, Google Classroom, techy tribe | | \$0.00 |
| | | • | | Sub-Total | \$60.00 |
| | | | Title One School-wide | | |
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Student prizes, trophies to pass out to classes with highest attendance, attendance party. | | \$150.00 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | Big Rocks & relay training | | \$0.00 |
| 1 | 5 | 8 | | | \$500.00 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | District curriculum | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | district curriculum | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | district curriculum & number talks training | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | district curriculum, literacy block and Number Talks training | | \$0.00 |

| Title One School-wide | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|---|--------------|--------|
| Goal | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | district curriculum, literacy block and Number Talks training | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | 6 | 1 | MAP Training | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | 6 | 2 | Training on instructional models and technology | | \$0.00 |
| Sub-Total | | | \$650.00 | | |
| Grand Total | | | \$710.00 | | |

Addendums