

Data Analysis

LEA Name: Waskom ISD	LEA Primary Contact: Margie Bell	Primary PSP:
CDN: 102903	ESC: 7	DCSI: Margie Bell

Section I: Area(s) of Low Performance and Target Groups

State								Federal				District PBM Staging				
Rating	Select One	Math	Science	Social Studies	Writing	Dropout	Completion	Stage	Select One	Math	Graduation Rate	Attendance	Participation	BE/ESL	Identified	Stage
	Reading								Reading							
All			72					All	82	73				CTE	Select One	Select One
AA			48					AA	67	55				NCLB	Select One	Select One
His			55					His	84	71				SPED	Yes	1
White			83					White	86	82				RF	Select One	Select One
Eco Dis			65					Eco Dis	78	66				DVM-L	Select One	Select One
								SPED	48	46				DVM-D	Select One	Select One
								LEP	81	69				DVM-SA	Select One	Select One

**SECTION I: Causal Factors for Low Performance
 Required for all districts**

1. Feeder Pattern Analysis: Identify low performing feeder systems. Using three years of historical data from the feeder schools, analyze by special program participation (BE/ESL, CTE, NCLB, special education) and by accountability subgroups, or other commonalities to determine significant factors that impact student performance. Consider state assessment, attendance, and discipline trends. Evaluate SSI Committee decisions, campus-to-campus transition plans, response to intervention (Rtl), etc. For elementary schools, perform the same type of analysis for each grade level. (Limit response to 500 characters)

The district has no feeder schools as it is a single campus per grade level district. Attendance for all accountability subgroups is over 95%. The positive behavior system implemented district wide has been effective as evidenced by the decrease each year for the past 3 years in the number of students assigned to DAEP. Each campus has an RTI process that is followed and has reduced the number of initial referrals for special education over the past 3 years.

2. Attendance: Analyze student level data to identify possible causal factors for low performance and/or failure to complete or graduate with the cohort group. For PBM interventions analyze students listed on the SLR Student Demographics worksheet and identify possible causal factors for low performance and/or failure to complete or graduate with the cohort group. Evaluate the effectiveness of the campus attendance system including the timeliness of administrative responses to unexcused absences, tardiness to class, the "recovery/re-teach" practices for students who are absent, and current practices to improve student attendance such as parent support/conferences, counseling, disciplinary and/or legal consequences. Evaluate systems and procedures in place to comply with TEC §25.092, Minimum Attendance for Class Credit as it relates to mastery of the TEKS (not applicable to charter schools). (Limit response to 500 characters)

The overall 2011-2012 attendance rate for African American students (96.7%) was slightly higher than attendance rate for white students (95.6%) and Hispanic students (96.6%) in the district. Therefore, on the surface attendance does not appear to be a causal factor for the lower performance of our black students. However, a disproportionate number of black students were absent from classroom instruction for disciplinary removal which could attribute to the lower performance on state assessments.

3. Discipline: (ISS, DAEP, OSS, JJAEP, and Expulsion): Analyze student level data related to disciplinary removals to identify possible causal factors for low performance and/or failure to complete or graduate with the cohort group. For PBM interventions analyze disciplinary removals for students listed on the SLR Students worksheet to identify possible causal factors for low performance and/or failure to complete or graduate with the cohort group. Evaluate the administration's effectiveness in the implementation of the Student Code of Conduct and the discipline management plan, including the equity and appropriateness of disciplinary removals. Evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of least restrictive environment (LRE), positive behavioral interventions and support, and behavior improvement plans (BIPs) as they relate to disciplinary actions. Evaluate the rigor/relevance of the instructional delivery in alternative settings in relation to the regular program. Evaluate the effectiveness of the transition plan from a disciplinary removal setting to the regular classroom, as well as the procedures to "accelerate" student learning if essential knowledge and skills were not mastered. (Limit response to 500 characters)

An analysis of disciplinary removals led the committee to conclude that disciplinary removal could contribute to low performance on state assessments. A disproportionate number of black students were removed from regular classroom settings for disciplinary reasons. Some research indicates that black students learn better through peer discussion and movement, none of which is allowed in ISS and DAEP.

4. Student Data: Disaggregate and analyze data by special program participation (BE/ESL, CTE, NCLB, special education), accountability subgroups, or other commonalities. Determine if student classroom grades align with 1) local benchmark assessment results, 2) local curriculum-based assessment (CBA) results, and 3) previous state assessment results. Determine if local assessments used to track student progress are aligned with TEKS objectives and are written at STAAR rigor. Determine if decisions regarding student interventions, special education placements and ARD committee decisions regarding state assessments are based on local assessment results. (Limit response to 500 characters)

An analysis of district trend data regarding grades awarded in high school science classes compared to the state assessment results indicated that all of the black students who failed TAKS 2011 passed their science classes for that school year. The trend data also showed lower performance by students in special education. These data lead to the conclusion that local assessments are not as rigorous as state assessments.

5. Curriculum: Analyze the curriculum for each area of low performance. Determine if the curriculum is based on TEKS objectives and provides sufficient rigor and relevance. Evaluate the vertical and horizontal alignment of local curriculum with TEKS. Evaluate the implementation of the curriculum. Conduct item analysis for state assessment objectives/student expectations (SE) to determine strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Consider the effectiveness and pacing of the district's scope and sequence. Evaluate the alignment of local assessments to state assessments. (Limit response to 500 characters)

The curriculum is based on TEKS objectives and is vertically and horizontally aligned. Teachers are using Cscope but need more training on how to use it most effectively as a supplemental tool for the curriculum. Teachers use DMAC to develop CIA notebooks and to conduct an analysis of state objectives and student expectations to determine strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Some local assessments are not at the level of rigor of STAAR.

6. Instructional Program: Analyze the instructional program for each area of low performance. Use the item analysis developed in #5 to determine strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program. Determine if the curriculum is implemented consistently district-wide. Evaluate the effectiveness of instructional delivery in the area(s) of low performance, including the lesson cycle, learning styles and/or brain compatibility strategies, formative assessment and questioning, and individualized instructional methodologies, sheltered instruction, etc. Evaluate the effectiveness of the academic interventions and teacher support strategies. Evaluate the availability, utilization, and effectiveness of instructional materials and resources.

Analyze the causal factors for the low performance on the state assessment of students who were exited from the special education and/or BE/ESL programs during the previous year. Evaluate the effectiveness of special services and programs available to provide timely interventions to students. Determine if all requirements of TEC §28.0211 (Accelerated Instruction), TEC §28.0212 (Personal Graduation Plan - PGP), and TEC §28.0213 (Intensive Program of Instruction) have been met. Review campus procedures for identifying targeted students. (Limit response to 500 characters)

An analysis of the instructional program for the areas of low performance led to the conclusion that formative assessment and in-depth questioning are the two instructional processes most in need of change through professional development for teachers and instructional leaders. Formative assessments and questioning occur, but not at the depth needed for the rigor of STAAR. Daily monitoring of student progress is not happening consistently throughout the district.

SECTION II: COMPLETION/DROPOUT RATE
(Required for districts with low completion and/or dropout rate)

1. Identify the students that did not complete or graduate with their cohort groups for the past three years. Evaluate the quality of leaver data and student tracking systems. Determine the characteristics of students impacting the completion and/or dropout rates for these years. Identify factors and trends which impacted the completion and/or dropout rate (i.e. demographics, attendance, discipline, academic performance data, state assessment exemptions, etc). By subpopulations, identify the special programs in which students in the targeted group participated (i.e., PEP, homeless, BE/ESL, CTE, special education, migrant, etc), and determine reasons for not graduating. Analyze the data of the feeder campuses and identify trends/issues that impact completion rates. Identify students who were placed in their grade level which includes those at SSI grade levels. (Limit response to 500 characters)

<enter text>

2. Evaluate the effectiveness of special services and programs available to assist students from prior cohorts with timely interventions. Determine if all requirements of TEC §28.0211 (Accelerated Instruction), TEC §28.0212 (Personal Graduation Plan - PGP), and TECg §28.0213 (Intensive Program of Instruction) have been met, including convening LPAC and ARD committees. Review campus procedures for identifying targeted students. Analyze the effectiveness of support services and drop out recovery programs available. Review campus procedures for accurately documenting and reporting student leavers. (Limit response to 500 characters)

<enter text>

3. Apply the characteristics identified in #1 and the findings in #2 above to the current student cohorts to identify the target group. For PBM interventions enter the names on the SLR document (Student Demographics worksheet tab) and complete the demographic information for each student. Analyze the process used to monitor student progress prior to failure and before students have dropped out of school. (Limit response to 500 characters)

<enter text>

SECTION III: SPECIAL EDUCATION
(Required for districts with special education considerations)

1. Determine the number/percentage of students with disabilities who had low performance on state assessments. Review data concerning their referral to special education and examine its relationship to performance on state assessments. (Limit response to 500 characters)

The 2012 percentage of SPED STAAR passing rate at TAKS equivalency for math was 64, reading 71, science 53, and social studies 100. There were 25 students added in the district's special education program in the 2011-2012 school year, and only one of the 25 were initial referrals. The other 24 were transfer students who were already receiving special education services in other districts.

2. Analyze the students with disabilities who receive special education services in an inclusive setting. Examine the specific services of each student and examine the effectiveness of the LEA's inclusionary practices and supports services offered to students in less restrictive environments. (Limit response to 500 characters)

Special education students are being placed in less restrictive environments at a rate higher than the state average. Special education students have GCS lab as a support for academic performance. Support is also available from the inclusion teacher.

3. Analyze the continuum of services for students, ages 3 to 5. Determine the degree to which the LEA has supplemental aids, services, and supports available in the general education classroom. Examine the effectiveness of support services offered to students in less restrictive environment. (Limit response to 500 characters)

<enter text>Students ages 3-5 are offered services through Head Start that operates under the direction of ESC7 and with the support of the district.

Needs Assessment

LEA Name Waskom ISD	LEA Primary Contact: Margie Bell	Primary PSP: 0
CDN: 102903	ESC: 7	DCSI: Margie Bell

Section I: Area(s) of Low Performance and Target Groups

State								Federal					District PBM Staging			
Rating	Select One							Stage	Select One					Identified	Stage	
	Reading	Math	Science	Social Studies	Writing	Dropout	Completion		Reading	Math	Graduation Rate	Attendance	Participation	BE/ESL	Select One	Select One
All	0	0	72	0	0	0	0	All	82	73	0	0	0	CTE	Select One	Select One
AA	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	AA	67	55	0	0	0	NCLB	Select One	Select One
His	0	0	55	0	0	0	0	His	84	71	0	0	0	SPED	Yes	1
White	0	0	83	0	0	0	0	White	86	82	0	0	0	RF	Select One	Select One
Eco Dis	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	Eco Dis	78	66	0	0	0	DVM-L	Select One	Select One
								SPED	48	46	0	0	0	DVM-D	Select One	Select One
								LEP	81	69	0	0	0	DVM-SA	Select One	Select One

SECTION II: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Systems	Guidelines and Procedures Relevant to Each Area of Insufficient Performance	Needs Identified	Addressed in the Improvement Plan Select Yes or No	Is PD needed? Select Yes or No	Other Comments
---------	---	------------------	---	-----------------------------------	----------------

Curriculum and Assessment

Is the curriculum:	aligned with the TEKS; vertically; horizontally?	Yes, CScope is available.	Yes	Yes	Teachers receive Cscope training through ESC7.
	sequenced and paced appropriately?	The sequence follows CScope; however teachers adjust the pacing of Cscope.	Yes	Yes	Teachers receive Cscope training through ESC7.
	implemented according to policy on all campuses?	Yes, CScope is available.	Yes	Yes	Teachers receive Cscope training through ESC7.
	viable and relevant to students?	Sometimes. The curriculum is not always relevant to students.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	integrated, interdisciplinary, project based, constructivist, and/or brain compatible?	Little, if any, project based, constructivist, or brain compatible learning is present in the district. Occasionally, interdisciplinary units occur.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
Is the assessment system:	a good predictor of state assessment success?	No. For example, an analysis of high school AA students science scores in 2011 showed that all of the students who failed the state assessment had passed their science classes (local assessment) for that	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	used formatively to guide instruction?	Primarily used to identify students needing tutorials.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	used to monitor daily student progress?	No.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	of STAAR rigor?	No	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	implemented according to policy on all campuses?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>

Instruction

Does the instructional planning process include:	a lesson cycle?	Most of the time.	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	collaborative planning?	Sometimes. Not often enough.	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	data informed decision making?	Moderately	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	well planned to meet the needs of the students?	In some cases	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	provisions for students with special needs?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	provide for data informed instructional placement?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
Is the instruction:	rigorous and relevant?	Not all of the time	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	student centered and empowering?	Not often. More teacher directed than student centered.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	self-directed and engaging?	Not often. More teacher directed than student centered.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	integrated and interdisciplinary?	Seldom	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	differentiated to meet student needs?	To a degree. Mostly as required for 504 or SPED students.	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	collaboratively planned?	Infrequently	Yes	Yes	<enter text>

Does the instruction include:	modeling and or mentoring?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	integrated use of technology?	in some classrooms	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	specific, timely feedback to students?	Most of the time.	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	questioning strategies to guide instruction?	Not nearly enough or to the depth required for STAAR rigor	Yes	Yes	<enter text>
	active learning strategies?	Sometimes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a focus on high-impact strategies?	Infrequently	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
Do the instructional leaders:	have a shared vision that is articulated across the campuses of the district?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	participate in professional development with staff members?	Sometimes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	ensure appropriate placement for special needs students?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	monitor and evaluate instruction?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	provide timely feedback regarding instructional quality to teachers?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	assist teachers in the development of professional growth?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	effectively allocate resources?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	designate a guidance counselor, teacher, or other appropriate individual to develop and administer a personal graduation plan for at-risk students in middle, junior high, and high schools (TEC §28.0212)?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>

Student Support and Interventions

Does the district provide:	a formal response to interventions (RTI) process?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	data driven, timely, and targeted support?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	effective intervention strategies, such as:	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*adult advocate, mentor, or advisor?	Only district staff	No	Select One	A county advocacy center is available for families.
	*extended learning opportunities?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*acceleration and/or credit recovery programs?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*alternative school of choice?	single campuses per grade level district	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*flexible scheduling?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a system to monitor implementation of support services and interventions?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a system to evaluate results of support service and interventions?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a counseling program that:	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*promotes career and college planning?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*ensures at-risk students are receiving required services?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*complies with requirements of TEC §33, Subchapter A School Counselors and Counseling Programs	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>

Culture and Climate

Does the district culture and climate	professional learning communities?	No	No	Select One	The district does have book studies but not formally as a part of PLC.
	mutual respect between and among staff and students?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	teacher collaboration?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	adults acting as advocates, mentors, or advisors for struggling students?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a safe and orderly school with effective discipline management?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	invitational climate?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	high expectations for:	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>

Does the district promote:	*teacher and student learning responsibilities?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*engagement in school activities?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*student and staff attendance?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	*academic focus?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	organization and procedures?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	positive behavioral support?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
Parents and Community					
Does the district promote:	parent involvement?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	community involvement and partnerships?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	volunteerism?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	parent and community support?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	participation in parent and/or community organizations?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
Does the district provide:	social services?	Not directly	No	Select One	Counselor contacts social services when needed.
	parent education and/or adult education?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	parenting training?	Yes	Select One	Select One	Participate in P.A.B.A.

Data Systems					
Does the district:	provide campuses with written procedures?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	have a process to hold staff accountable for implementation of the written procedures and accurate PEIMS coding?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	ensure accurate coding including all PBM systems?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	have an accountability process to ensure accurate coding in PEIMS?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	have a system for ongoing monitoring of data systems and PEIMS coding?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	have a system for periodic auditing of data systems and PEIMS coding?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
Dropout Prevention and Recovery					
Does the district have:	an effective dropout prevention program?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	an effective dropout recovery program?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a targeted intervention plan for continuing students?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a targeted intervention plan to recover no-show students during the school start window?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>
	a process to review underreported student reports (PEIMS Edit+ reports #PRF0B032: Presumed Underreported Students List and PRF0B033: Preliminary Presumed Underreported Students List) and rectify underreported students?	Yes	Select One	Select One	<enter text>

Improvement Plan

LEA Name: Waskom ISD	LEA Primary Contact: Margie Bell	Primary PSP: 0
CDN: 102903	ESC: 7	DCSI: Margie Bell

Section I: Area(s) of Low Performance and Target Groups

State								Federal					District PBM Staging		
Rating	Select One							Stage	Select One					Identified	Stage
	Reading	Math	Science	Social Studies	Writing	Dropout	Completion		Reading	Math	Graduation Rate	Attendance	Participation	BE/ESL	Select One
All	0	0	72	0	0	0	0	All	82	73	0	0	0	CTE	Select One
AA	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	AA	67	55	0	0	0	NCLB	Select One
His	0	0	55	0	0	0	0	His	84	71	0	0	0	SPED	Yes
White	0	0	83	0	0	0	0	White	86	82	0	0	0	RF	Select One
Eco Dis	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	Eco Dis	78	66	0	0	0	DVM-L	Select One
								SPED	48	46	0	0	0	DVM-D	Select One
								LEP	81	69	0	0	0	DVM-SA	Select One

LEA Board Approval of Improvement Plan

<enter date>

Section II: Improvement Plan Development

Area Targeted	Major Systems	Components	Critical Success Factors: <i>Accountability Only</i>	Strategies, Initiatives, and Redesign (Limit to 400 characters)	Start Date	Projected Completion Date	Evidence of Implementation	Resources Required and Persons Responsible
SPED Representation	Student_Support	Effective Intervention Strategies	Academic_Performance	Continue to use iStation for early intervention in reading and follow the RTI model across the curriculum.	August, 2012	July, 2014	iStation usage reports - The number of special education has decreased 1.2% since beginning this strategy in 2011.	iStation online program - teachers and campus principals
SPED Representation	Culture_Climate	Targeted Professional Development (PD) with Support	Academic_Performance	Continue to provide professional development for teachers regarding culturally relevant and brain compatible teaching strategies. The AA representation in special education decreased in 2011-2012. Only one initial referral was begun for the school year 2011-12 and that was not an AA student. Of the 24 transfer students in special education for 2011-12,	June, 2012	July, 2014	sign-in sheets and/or other documentation from training	Curriculum Director and Copies of books HOW TO TEACH STUDENTS WHO DON'T LOOK LIKE YOU, TEACHING WITH THE BRAIN IN MIND, and ACTIVE LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT
State Assessment	Curriculum_Assessment	Monitoring of Implementation (PD)	Academic_Performance	Campus principals will monitor use of Cscope to evaluate its effectiveness.	August, 2012	May, 2013	Walkthrough reports - Improved student performance on local assessments and state assessments	Campus principals
State Assessment	Instruction	Student Centered / Empowered	Academic_Performance	Teachers will allow students to be self-directed and engaged in a group project that teachers other students science concepts and/or terms. (i.e. Interactive whiteboard presentation or bulletin board display of science words, processes, etc.)	August, 2012	May, 2014	Observation of students engaged in project. Improved test scores.	technology, bulletin board materials - teacher

State Assessment	Instruction	Differentiation to Meet Needs	Academic_Performance	Provide opportunities for learning that meet individual needs, i.e. in GCS lab.	August, 2012	May, 2014	Student sign-in on Easy Time for GCS lab. Improved 6-weeks grades and test scores.	GCS lab - Core subject teachers and GCS lab teachers
State Assessment	Culture_Climate	Targeted Professional Development (PD) with Support	Academic_Performance	Teachers will participate in multicultural and differentiated instruction professional development.	August, 2012	July, 2014	sign-in sheets and/or other documentation from training - Improved student test scores	Professional development presenter(s) and materials (books, webinars, videos,etc.) - Principals
State Assessment	Curriculum_Assessment	Targeted Professional Development (PD) with Support	Academic_Performance	Provide professional development following the principles of the lead4ward training, STAAR 3D.	November, 2012	July, 2014	sign-in sheets and/or other documentation from training - Improved student test scores	Campus principals and Curriculum Director
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>

Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>
Select One	Select One	Select One	Select One	<enter text>				<enter text>

