

# Addendum

Highlands  
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

A variety of data sources are used for continuous improvement planning and to conduct our needs assessment. Some primary data sets are: common campus assessments in conjunction with formative and summative District assessments, Logramos, ITBS, TAKS, AEIS, PEIMS, as well as qualitative staff, student and parent survey results.

Highlands continues to give the Logramos (Spanish companion test to the ITBS). Data is used to follow cohort progressions.

**Table 1-Percent of Students Met Performance Standards for Logramos**

Grade	Reading			Mathematics		
	Fall 2008 Actual	Fall 2009 Target	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2008 Actual	Fall 2009 Target	Fall 2009 Actual
K	35 (Voc)	50	56	71	75	42
1	48	50	60	31	50	39
2	NA	50	61	NA	50	49

The overall increases in NPR scores for reading is significant for K to 1 (25 percentiles) and grades 1 to 2 (13 percentiles). These increases may be related to application of phonemic awareness skills and use of pictorial and auditory clues to derive meaning or recognize words. The math NPR score reveals drastic regression from kindergarten to first (32 percentiles) but a double digit increase from first to second (18 percentiles). There was no verifiable evidence of what accounted for the exceptionally high NPR score in kindergarten. Monitoring of use of concrete models will continue to address the instance of regression.

**Table 2: Percent of Students Met Performance Standards for ITBS**

Grade	Reading			Mathematics		
	Fall 2008 Actual	Fall 2009 Target	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2008 Actual	Fall 2009 Target	Fall 2009 Actual
K	37 (Voc)	50	32	46	50	42
1	24	50	18	28	50	28
2	34	50	36	19	50	23
3	32	50	42	33	50	33
4	49	50	46	40	50	45

**Table 2** shows there is a decrease of 19 percentiles in the NPR reading score by students entering grade one. This could be attributed to the fact that the kindergarten score only reflects vocabulary acquisition and the first grade reading score reflects students' abilities to apply phonemic awareness, pictorial, and auditory clues along with word recognition to derive meaning. This decrease may also imply instructional pacing discrepancies. The reading NPR increases of 12 percentiles by students entering grade two, 8 percentiles for students entering grade three, and 14 percentiles for students entering grade four indicate responsiveness to instructional strategies. It is significant that students who enter first grade experience a NPR math decrease of 18 percentiles and students who enter grade 2 decrease NPR by 5 percentiles. However, at grades 3 and 4 there is a math NPR increase of 4 and 12 percentiles respectively. The implications suggest that students experience difficulty making the transition from concrete/pictorial math forms to more symbolic and abstract representations in the early childhood grades. Possibly more attention needs to focus on the use of effective strategies for developing early childhood math concepts.

**Table 3: Percent Commended Score Comparisons For TAKS Reading Grade**

Year	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	37	41	33	20	32
09	38	44	29	NA	34
% Change	-1	-3	+4	-	-2

Table 3 shows the commended level of performance increased slightly for Hispanic students and dropped slightly for all other referenced populations except for Whites.

**Table 4: Percent Commended Score Comparisons For TAKS Reading Grade 4**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	19	14	21	100	14
09	16	10	15	NA	19
% Change	+3	+4	+6	-	-5

Table 4 shows the commended performance level posted a slight to moderate gain for all referenced populations except for economically disadvantaged which had a moderate decrease of 5%.

**Table 5: Percent Commended Score Comparisons For TAKS Math Grade 3**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	22	26	18	0	21
09	28	33	19	33	26
% Change	-6	-7	-1	-33*	-5

Table 5 shows commended performance levels made slight to moderate decreases for all referenced populations.

**Table 6: Percent Commended Score Comparisons For TAKS Math Grade 4**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	18	11	26	50	18
09	30	27	33	40	32
% Change	-12	-16	-7	+10*	-14

Table 6 shows no population met the target goal of 30 for commended performance. There is significant regression for all referenced populations except Whites.

**Table 7: Percent Commended Score Comparisons For TAKS Writing Grade 4**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
---------------	-----	----	----------	-------	----

10	16	14	18	0*	13
09	19	19	12	20	20
% Change	-3	-5	+6	-20*	-7

Table 7 shows that no population met the target goal of 30. There is slight to moderate regression for all populations except for Hispanic which had a moderate increase.

**Table 8: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Reading Grade 3 w/TPM**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	90	92	89	80	90
09	88	91	84	100	84
% Change	+2	+1	+5	-20*	+6

Table 8 shows slight to moderate reading gains for all student populations except Whites.

**Table 9: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Reading Grade 3 w/o TPM**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	88	87	89	80	87
09	88	91	84	100	84
% Change	-	-4	+5	-20*	+3

Table 9 shows slight reading increases for Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students.

**Table 10: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Reading Grade 4 w/TPM**

Student Group	All	AA	Hispanic	White	ED
10	90	86	95	100	89
09	88	81	94	100	90
% Change	+2	+5	+1	-	-1

Table 10 shows slight reading increases for all populations except for Whites and Economically Disadvantaged.

**Table 11: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Reading Grade 4 w/o TPM**

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>AA</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>ED</b>
10	90	86	95	100	89
09	86	79	91	100	88
% Change	+4	+7	+4	-	+1

Table 11 shows slight to moderate reading increases for all populations except Whites.

**Table 12: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Math Grade 4 w/TPM**

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>AA</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>ED</b>
10	94	95	95	80	94
09	92	90	94	100	92
% Change	+2	+5	+1	-20*	+2

Table 12 shows slight math gains for all populations except Whites.

**Table 13: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Math Grade 4 w/o TPM**

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>AA</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>ED</b>
10	84	84	84	80	86
09	81	81	85	60	81
% Change	+3	+3	-1	+20*	+5

Table 13 shows slight math gains for all populations except Hispanics and Whites.

**Table 14: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Writing Grade 4 w/ TPM**

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>AA</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>ED</b>
10	100	100	100	100	100
09	100	100	100	100	100
% Change	-	-	-	-	-

Table 15 shows that writing scores remained the same.

**Table 15: Percent Score Comparisons For TAKS Writing Grade 4 w/o TPM**

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>AA</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>ED</b>
10	95	95	95	100	95
09	93	89	97	100	97
% Change	+2	+6	-2	-	-2

Table 15 shows slight to moderate writing gains for All and African American students with a slight decrease for Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged students.

**Table 16: 2010 TAKS Scores All Grades w/TPM**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Reading %</b>	<b>Math %</b>	<b>Writing %</b>
<b>3</b>	90	94	NA
<b>4</b>	90	90	100
<b>Total</b>	90	92	100

Table 16 shows combined scores for all three TAKS Tests fall within the range for the State Recognized rating.

**Table 17: 2010 TAKS Scores All Grades w/oTPM**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Reading %</b>	<b>Math %</b>	<b>Writing %</b>



<b>3</b>	88	84	NA
<b>4</b>	83	79	95
<b>Total</b>	86	82	95

Table 17 shows that without TPM application Highlands would have made a Recognized rating; however the math score is borderline.

**Table 18: 2010 TAKS Scores3rd Grade**

<b>Student Groups</b>	<b>Reading %</b>	<b>Math %</b>
<b>All Students</b>	88	83
<b>African-American</b>	88	84
<b>Hispanic</b>	89	81
<b>White</b>	80	80
<b>Ec. Dis.</b>	87	85

Table 18 indicates that all group performance scores are in the Recognized range.

**Table 19: 2010 TAKS Scores4th Grade**

<b>Student Groups</b>	<b>Reading %</b>	<b>Math %</b>	<b>Writing %</b>
<b>All Students</b>	84	79	95
<b>African-American</b>	79	73	96
<b>Hispanic</b>	90	90	95
<b>White</b>	*	*	*
<b>Econ. Disadv.</b>	85	78	95

Table 19 shows significant gaps between the performance of African- American and Economic Disadvantaged

groups as compared to Hispanic students in reading and math.

**Table 20: Comparison between 2009 and 2010 TAKS Performance**

	Subject	Year		Change
		08-09 10	09-	
<b>3rd</b>	Reading	88	90	<b>+2</b>
	Math	86	94	<b>+8</b>
<b>4th</b>	Reading	92	90	<b>-2</b>
	Math	71	90	<b>+19</b>
	Writing	100	100	<b>-</b>
<b>Campus</b>	Reading	90	90	<b>-</b>
	Math	79	92	<b>+13</b>
	Writing	100	100	<b>-</b>

Table 20 shows significant double-digit gains in math for grade 4 and the campus at large. Grade 3 posted a moderate gain in math. There is a slight regression in grade 4 reading and writing scores remain strong.

**Table 21: District Summative Assessment Data Percent of Students Meeting Expectations**

Subject	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Math	95	100	94	94
Reading	94	82	76	73
Science	85	94	95	71
Soc. Studies	72	64	70	11

Table 21 indicates that the standard of 70% was met in each area with the exception of social studies in grades two, three and four.

### Demographic Data Analysis

Achieving the 98% attendance goal continues to be a challenge as evidenced by falling short by 2% points each year. Strategies to improve attendance must target pre-k and kindergarten parents to achieve this goal. Campus withdrawal and entry logs indicate that approximately 23% of the students come and leave during the course of the year; however, there are no official PEIMS records to corroborate the campus data. Within 2 years the percent of economically disadvantaged students has increased by 14% (56%-70%) and the Hispanic population has increased by 7% (43-49%) as the White population has decreased by approximately the same percentage.

**Table 22**  
**Student Attendance**  
**Percent School-wide**

Year	Rate
07-08	96.0
08-09	96.0
09-10	96.0

## 10 Components of a Title I Program

1. **Comprehensive needs assessment** – All data were reviewed for all students and student groups. The results and conclusions of this review are reflected in the three SMART goals and the Executive Summary for the next school year. 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 98% 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 faculty 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)		Number of Parents	
Number of School-based Staff (1/3)		Number of Community Members	
Number of Non-Instructional Staff		Number of Business Members	
Name of SDMC Member		Position (Term expires)	
		Business Member	
Jana McCann		Classroom Teacher (2 years)	
Regina Patton		Classroom Teacher	
Jenia Smith		Classroom Teacher	
Carolina Portales		Classroom Teacher	
Tami Sanchez		Classroom Teacher	
Thalida Carter		Classroom Teacher	
Vacant		Classroom Teacher	
Stephanie Lane		Classroom Teacher	
Kimberlye Aaron		Classroom Teacher	
Patricia Bonds		Community Member (2 years)	
Tonia Hastings		Non-Instructional Staff	
Pamela Polk		Parent (2year)	
Sylvia Lewis		Principal	
Marco Hinojosa		School-Based Staff	
		School-Based Staff	

State Compensatory Education	
Total amount of State Compensatory Education Funds.	<b>\$40,294.00</b>
Personnel funded with State Compensatory Education Funds (number of FTEs.)	
Literacy Coach and Math Teacher	<b>2.0</b>
Instructional Aide	<b>1.0</b>
Total FTEs funded with State Compensatory Education Funds.	<b>3.0</b>

**These funds are used to supplement instruction for students as a RTI beyond the school-wide instructional programs.**  
 State Compensatory Funds are coded in the *Resources Needed* column of the campus goals as SCE \$40,294.00.

### 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 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.

### Violence Prevention and Intervention Goal

For 2010-2011, discipline referrals for drugs, alcohol, and tobacco will be reduced by 5% from the previous year each year. High school G/T students will be scheduled into at least 1 advanced core classes each year.

**Formative** Each grading period, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine the percent of referrals for tobacco, alcohol, and other drug use or possession.

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

**Summative** At the end of the school year, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine the percent of referrals for tobacco, alcohol, and other drug use or possession.

**Strategy** Monitor and provide counseling and differentiated instruction for students to perform above grade level.  
**Strategy** Discipline Advisory Team (DAT) will review PEIMS data each 6 weeks and recommend adjustments to the campus discipline plan

### Parent and Community Involvement Goal

For 2010-2011, the percent of parents and community members attending PTO meetings will increase by 5%.

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

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

**Strategy** Monitor attendance at events and estimate average attendance through the use of sign in sheets



### Violence Prevention Goal

For 2010-2011, the discipline referrals for inappropriate physical contact 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 for inappropriate physical contact.

**Strategy**

Discipline Advisory Team (DAT) will review PEIMS data each 6 weeks and recommend adjustments to the campus discipline plan

### Attendance Goal

For 2010-2011, the ADA student attendance will be at or above **96%**.

- 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 year end ADA will be reviewed to determine if the annual attendance objective was met.
- Strategy** Student Attendance review committee will meet monthly to recommend interventions to address individual student and grade level attendance concerns

### Special Education Goal

For 2010-2011, the percent of students achieving AYP standards will be  $\geq 73$  of all special education students for reading and  $\geq 67$  for math to achieve AYP Standards

- Formative** Each grading period, students' progress will be monitored and reviewed through IEP goals and objectives and performance on District assessments
- Summative** Results of the TAKS and/or TAKS ACC and/or TAKS-M tests will be reviewed and Formative/Summative Assessment data will be reviewed.
- Strategy** Implement supplemental programs that offer a rigorous and differentiated curriculum in the resource classrooms (Reading, Language Arts, and Math). Provide quality staff development to facilitate the implementation of instructional strategies that focus on improving student performance and narrowing the achievement gap.

### Dyslexia Program Goals

For 2010-11, 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.

<b>Formative</b>	Various objective data examples: in-service/meeting agendas and sign-in sheets; campus data files; documentation of procedures, instructional services, campus parent education program; student records; program evaluation;
<b>Summative</b>	Various objective data examples: student progress monitoring data; program evaluation; in-service/meeting agendas and sign-in sheets; campus data files; documentation of procedures, Tier II and Tier III instruction, campus parent education program data; student records; program evaluation
<b>Strategy</b>	Various strategies as determined by needs of campus. (Refer to Dyslexia Program Supplement for possible strategies.

### Highly Qualified Teacher Goal

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

<b>Formative</b>	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.
<b>Summative</b>	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.
<b>Strategy</b>	Hire highly qualified teachers

**Highlands Elementary  
Staff Development Plans**

Date	Who should attend	Purpose
<b>Full Day Staff Development</b>		
August 19, 2010 1:00 – 3:30	Professional Development for all staff	Creating Cohesive Campus Teams
October 8, 2010 8:00 – 3:30	Teachers	Parent Conferences
November 8, 2010 8:00 – 3:30	Teachers	Reading Comprehension
January 3, 2010	Teachers	Lesson Planning C-Scope Progress Monitoring
February 21, 2010 8:00 – 3:30		Topic TBD based on Mid-year progress monitoring data
<b>Early Release Staff Development</b>		
September 24, 2010		Math Concept Development
January 14, 2010		PLCs Results Now Review
February 18, 2010		PLCs