

Addendum

Bray

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

The data used for our needs assessment is derived directly from the results of our TAKS as well as the TEA Accountability tables, AEIS, data from PEIMS, ITBS scores, TPRI scores, District Assessments, classroom grades, and from teacher, student and parent surveys.

TAKS

The TAKS data **Without TPM** in **Figure 1** shows Bray Elementary strong in all tested areas. We are an Exemplary Campus for the fourth year in a row. We are also Exemplary without TPM, as figure 1 shows, again for the second year. Bray's scores as a school stay above the 90% range. The yellow highlights are areas that we decreased in scores in the years compared. Writing TAKS is the lowest subject. We decreased from 2009 and 2008. The action plan will show how we plan to increase the Writing TAKS. The subgroups do not count in writing for us otherwise we

would have lost the Exemplary rating in the White and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups.

Figure 1

Comparison of 2008, 2009, and 2010 TAKS Performance Without TPM Bray Elementary Campus																
	Reading					Math					Writing					
	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	
2010 Passed	97%	98%	96%	96%	98%	97%	96%	96%	100%	98%	91%	95%	91%	86%	86%	
2009 Passed:	96%	95%	95%	96%	93%	95%	93%	95%	96%	91%	98%	100%	89%	10%	95%	
2008 Passed	96%	91%	100%	100%	92%	94%	94%	100%	90%	90%	93%	91%	100%	94%	95%	
09-10 Passed difference:	+1	+3	+1	0	+5	+2	+3	+1	+4	+7	-7	-5	-2	-14	-9	
08-10 Passed Difference:	+1	+7	-4	-4	+6	+3	+2	-4	+10	+8	-2	+4	-9	-8	-9	

Figure 2 shows the school TAKS Commended scores. Bray scored higher in Reading and Math than other years. The Writing TAKS is lower than last year's scores, as seen in the yellow, with a 10% decrease. There were significant gains in some categories going as high as 34 points higher. The increase came mostly from the average student achievers from last year. The 'At-Risk' student scores remained close to the same.

Figure 2

Comparison of 2008, 2009, and 2010 TAKS Commended Performance Bray Elementary Campus																
	Reading					Math					Writing					
	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	
2010 Commended:	64%	61%	51%	81%	61%	56%	52%	48%	71%	60%	36%	47%	18%	36%	50%	
2009 Commended	56%	53%	58%	62%	43%	43%	37%	50%	44%	26%	46%	44%	22%	64%	32%	

		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
2008 Commended:	41%	40%	26%	49%	24%	34%	27%	21%	45%	28%	27%	29%	17%	31%	16%
2009-2010 Commended Difference:	+8	+8	-7	+19	+18	+13	+15	-2	+27	+34	-10	+3	-4	-28	+18
2008-2010 Commended Difference:	+23	+21	+25	+32	+37	+22	+24	+27	+26	+32	+9	+18	+1	+5	+34

Figure 3 shows 4th Grade TAKS data only (Without TPM). Again, the Writing TAKS is the low area. With personnel changes, the 4th grade team will be challenged to increase the Writing TAKS scores. Most of the students scored well on the editing part of the test. The essay was the part that decreased our scores. With professional development, raising expectations, and monitoring progress, 4th grade will increase the scores.

Figure 3

Comparison of 2008, 2009, and 2010 TAKS Performance Without TPM 4 th Grade															
	Reading					Math					Writing				
	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	All	AA	H	W	Ec.	All	AA	H	W	Ec.
2010 Passed:	94%	95%	91%	94%	93%	94%	90%	91%	100%	93%	91%	95%	91%	86%	86%
2009 Passed:	93%	92%	100%	91%	91%	93%	96%	89%	91%	91%	98%	100%	89%	100%	95%
2008 Passed:	91%	81%	100%	100%	86%	91%	91%	100%	88%	91%	93%	91%	100%	94%	95%
2009-2010 Passed Difference:	+1	+3	-9	+3	+2	+1	-6	+2	+9	+2	-7	-5	+2	-14	-9
2008-2010 Passed Difference:	+3	+14	-9	-6	+7	+3	-1	-9	+12	+2	-2	+4	-9	-8	-9
Comparison of 2008, 2009, and 2010 TAKS Commended Performance 4 th Grade															
2010 Commended:	48%	50%	27%	62%	53%	54%	45%	45%	75%	60%	36%	47%	18%	36%	50%
2009 Commended:	26%	24%	11%	45%	9%	39%	44%	22%	36%	36%	46%	44%	22%	64%	32%
2008 Commended:	30%	29%	14%	35%	26%	41%	29%	29%	59%	32%	27%	29%	17%	31%	16%
2009-2010 Commended Difference:	+22	+26	+16	+17	+44	+15	+1	+23	+39	+24	-10	+3	-4	-28	+18
2008-2010	+18	+31	+13	+27	+27	+13	+16	+16	+16	+28	+9	+18	+1	+5	+34

Passing																
2009 Bray Passing	98%	98%	100%	96%	96%	99%	100%	100%	96%	98%						
2010 4 th Grade Passing	98%	100%	100%	94%	100%	98%	95%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	94%	100%	
2009 4 th Grade Passing	96%	96%	100%	91%	91%	98%	100%	100%	91%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
2010 3 rd Grade Passing	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%						
2009 3 rd Grade Passing	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%						

Figures 6, 7, 8, 9 show the Special Education student scores. Under NCLB (No Child Left Behind Act), there is an increased responsibility to teach to all students. We have a population of 11 Special Education students in grades 3 and 4. One student was absent during the TAKS testing. With a small population, percentages vary up to 50 points for one student not passing a TAKS test. TAKS Acc and TAKS Modified show the lowest scores. The Formative Assessment scores and Classroom Grades show one student performing poorly. Bray Elementary had two students out of 10 that performed below expectations.

Figure 6

Bray Elementary Special Education TAKS, TAKS Acc, TAKS Mod 2009-2010			
	Number of Students	Met Standard Reading TAKS	Met Standard Math TAKS
Bray	10	80%	90%
4 th Grade	5	80%	100%
3 rd Grade	5	80%	80%

Figure 7

Bray Elementary Special Education TAKS 2009-2010			
	Number of Students	Met Standard Reading TAKS	Met Standard Math TAKS
Bray	5	100%	100%
4 th Grade	3	100%	100%

3rd Grade	2	100%	100%
-----------------------------	---	------	------

Figure 8

Bray Elementary Special Education TAKS Acc 2009-2010			
	Number of Students	Met Standard Reading TAKS	Met Standard Math TAKS
Bray	3	66%	100%
4th Grade	2	50%	100%
3rd Grade	1	100%	100%

Figure 9

Bray Elementary Special Education TAKS Mod 2009-2010			
	Number of Students	Met Standard Reading TAKS	Met Standard Math TAKS
Bray	2	50%	50%
4th Grade	1	100%	100%
3rd Grade	1	0%	0%

ITBS

Figure 10 shows the data from the ITBS equating to the percentage score. The target for each student is 50% or better on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). The norm-referenced test uses the fiftieth percentile as the normal range for student scores. Our goal is to have all grade levels achieving at the fiftieth percentile, or more. This is a general look at the test as it relates to Bray Elementary. We increased every grade level to the next, vertically, except Reading and Language 1st to 2nd (Kinder to 1st, 1st to 2nd, 2nd to 3rd, and 3rd to 4th) as the chart indicates. Although we did increase, our math scores are still low in grades 1 through 3 (Kinder is a surprise because of no training prior to school). Horizontally we increased in several grade levels also.

Figure 10

ITBS Percentage Score Comparison and 2010 Goals

Grade	Reading			Language			Mathematics		
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
Kinder	36 VOC	40 VOC	40	41	50	50	33	36	36
1	64	53	55	53	46	50	35	34	40

2	43	60	62	29	48	50	24	37	40
3	41	57	59	37	53	55	35	42	45
4	48	63	65	37	42	50	40	57	60

DISTRICT ASSESSMENTS

Figure 11-27 shows the District Assessments. The district goal was 70% of students Meeting Expectations in 08-09, 80% in 09-10. Bray had the expectations of 90% in the 09-10 because we are a high performing campus and the expectation was reasonable. The combined average of all District Assessments with all grade levels was 85%. We missed our overall goal by 5%. Science and Social Studies pulled our scores down as a school. We met the district goal with ELA, just under our school goal, and surpassed the 90% in math. The district average is calculated with 1st through 4th grade scores. The comparisons of the subgroups show strengths and weaknesses in our instructions and students skills. Each subgroup had its highs and lows. All the scores in Social Studies are low.

Figure 11 Bray scored above the district average in most tables but failed to meet the campus goal in ELA, Science, and Social Studies. Bray met the campus goal for math.

Figure 11

District Assessments							
2009-2010							
	Kindergarten	1 st Grade	2 nd Grade	3 rd Grade	4 th Grade	School Average	District Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
ELA	88%	96%	88%	87%	80%	88%	76%
Math	88%	100%	94%	95%	91%	94%	89%
Science	N/A	93%	91%	82%	68%	84%	75%
Social	N/A	87%	86%	83%	37%	73%	61%

Figures 12 – 15 shows 4th Grade District Assessment scores with their subgroups compared to Bray Elementary 4th Grade scores with their subgroups. The subgroups bounce back and forth with strengths and weaknesses. Social Studies and Science is all around low scoring.

Figure 12

District Assessment Fourth Grade ELA									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					70%	73%	63%	80%	72
Bray	75.35%	86.80%	76.90%	75.46%	74%	80%	75%	91%	80
Ec. Dis	69.95%	82.70%	72.83%	72.31%	74%	75%	70%	84%	76
AA	71.68%	85.54%	73.70%	74.64%	86%	82%	78%	96%	86
Hisp	75.90%	85.90%	74.50%	74.50%	64%	80%	73%	90%	77
White	81.92%	89.42%	85%	76.31%	82%	82%	82%	89%	84

Figure 13

District Assessments Fourth Grade Math									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					80%	86%	89%	88%	86
Bray	70.63%	78.85%	83.08%	83.27%	88%	90%	93%	94%	91
Ec. Dis	67.62%	73.95%	81%	80.50%	91%	81%	90%	100%	91
AA	68.40%	77.85%	83.04%	82.43%	91%	91%	91%	91%	91
Hisp	71.50%	80.67%	79.20%	82.30%	100%	91%	100%	100%	98
White	72.92%	78.33%	85.92%	84.54%	88%	88%	89%	94%	90

Figure 14

District Assessments Fourth Grade Science									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations

District					73%	54%	49%	83%	65
Bray	60.58%	67.63%	51.26%	70.43%	77%	47%	65%	83%	68
Ec. Dis	55.86%	63.50%	49.42%	68.38%	65%	38%	50%	81%	59
AA	59.80%	66.67%	49.96%	69.46%	73%	46%	73%	78%	68
Hisp	59%	64.80%	48.50%	70.33%	73%	36%	55%	100%	66
White	62.08%	71.36%	57.82%	71.54%	82%	59%	65%	83%	72

Figure 15

District Assessments Fourth Grade Social Studies									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test #1	Test #2	Test #3	Test #4 Summative	Test #1	Test #2	Test #3	Test #4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					44%	47%	38%	35%	41
Bray	66.15%	56.26%	46.88%	52.85%	58%	37%	18%	38%	38
Ec. Dis	64.29%	51%	47.17%	50%	36%	24%	20%	33%	28
AA	66.64%	55.41%	45%	54.14%	55%	41%	14%	39%	37
Hisp	64.20%	47.90%	45%	49.20%	40%	18%	9%	18%	21
White	66.67%	63.25%	51.36%	51.38%	77%	47%	28%	50%	51

Figures 16-19 shows 3rd Grade District Assessment scores with their subgroups compared to Bray Elementary 3rd Grade scores with their subgroups. These scores show a gap between the subgroup of White and the others. All subgroups were above the district average.

Figure 16

District Assessments Third Grade ELA									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	Test # 1	Test #2 Summative	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					44%	47%	38%	35%	41
Bray	66.15%	56.26%	46.88%	52.85%	58%	37%	18%	38%	38
Ec. Dis	64.29%	51%	47.17%	50%	36%	24%	20%	33%	28
AA	66.64%	55.41%	45%	54.14%	55%	41%	14%	39%	37
Hisp	64.20%	47.90%	45%	49.20%	40%	18%	9%	18%	21
White	66.67%	63.25%	51.36%	51.38%	77%	47%	28%	50%	51

District					65%	63%	69%	70%	67
Bray	78.90%	74.12%	72.97%	66.17%	83%	72%	91%	98%	86
Ec. Dis	73.85%	69.10%	66.68%	58.23%	76%	65%	86%	97%	81
AA	77%	72.88%	70.58%	63.77%	78%	75%	86%	97%	84
Hisp	79.25%	73.92%	72.83%	68.17%	85%	46%	100%	100%	83
White	82.06%	77.60%	77.10%	68.68%	100%	83%	92%	100%	94

Figure 17

District Assessments Third Grade Math									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				09-10 Average Met Expectations
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	
District					70%	87%	91%	88%	84
Bray	64.75%	65.08%	71.84%	80.13%	89%	92%	94%	100%	94
Ec. Dis	58.58%	58.23%	66.17%	77.72%	87%	86%	91%	100%	91
AA	60.15%	60%	67.32%	75.04%	89%	89%	91%	100%	92
Hisp	66.08%	64.23%	72.08%	86%	85%	92%	100%	100%	94
White	69.61%	72.75%	77.53%	83.10%	92%	100%	100%	100%	98

Figure 18

District Assessments Third Grade Science									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					74%	49%	67%	85%	69
Bray	63.82%	73.91%	70.03%	78.90%	96%	57%	77%	97%	82
Ec. Dis	53.85%	69.79%	64.66%	75.34%	92%	39%	69%	97%	74
AA	61.75%	69.44%	65.88%	77.54%	95%	47%	74%	100%	79
Hisp	58.33%	80%	74.92%	82.92%	92%	42%	67%	92%	73
White	70%	75.79%	72.45%	78.40%	100%	92%	85%	92%	92

Figure 19

District Assessments Third Grade Social Studies									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					53%	48%	44%	64%	52
Bray	76%	55.55%	56.75%	63.03%	89%	79%	63%	97%	82
Ec. Dis	71.54%	45.74%	48.88%	57.03%	82%	75%	51%	94%	76
AA	73.50%	51.09%	52.46%	60.96%	84%	72%	60%	97%	78
Hisp	75.83%	59.55%	60.33%	63.31%	92%	75%	42%	92%	75
White	80%	58.75%	60.60%	65.55%	100%	100%	85%	100%	96

Figures 20-23 shows 2nd Grade District Assessment scores with their subgroups compared to Bray Elementary 2nd Grade scores with their subgroups. The Hispanic subgroup topped several scores. All subgroups were above the district average.

Figure 20

District Assessments Second Grade ELA									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					63%	63%	81%	79%	72

Bray	64.19%	78.13%	74.47%	76.66%	81%	84%	98%	93%	89
Ec. Dis	59.03%	73.61%	70.24%	72.39%	79%	79%	94%	94%	87
AA	66.80%	78.84%	73.94%	78%	72%	72%	94%	88%	82
Hisp	59.10%	72.25%	70.50%	70.18%	89%	100%	100%	100%	97
White	61%	80.47%	78%	77.65%	85%	92%	100%	92%	92

Figure 21

District Assessments Second Grade Math									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				09-10 Average
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	
District					80%	87%	89%	94%	88
Bray	73.85%	84.92%	86.34%	89.80%	79%	100%	95%	100%	94
Ec. Dis	71.35%	80.22%	84.24%	88.10%	89%	100%	94%	100%	96
AA	73.29%	83.42%	85.58%	89.69%	72%	100%	88%	100%	90
Hisp	72.64%	78.33%	84.67%	88.36%	89%	100%	100%	100%	97
White	75.71%	92.18%	88.82%	90.76%	77%	100%	100%	100%	94

Figure 22

District Assessments Second Grade Science									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				09-10 Average
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	
District					69%	77%	82%	90%	80
Bray	63.40%	74.48%	82.82%	85.05%	88%	88%	90%	100%	92
Ec. Dis	60.52%	72.47%	80.24%	82.71%	89%	89%	88%	100%	92
AA	63.61%	74.52%	83.69%	84.81%	83%	78%	88%	100%	87
Hisp	67.55%	66.75%	77.08%	79.91%	89%	100%	89%	100%	97
White	59.88%	78.82%	85.12%	88.53%	92%	92%	92%	100%	94

Figure 23

District Assessments Second Grade Social Studies									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test #4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					80%	73%	68%	52%	68
Bray	66.83%	65.67%	66.94%	60.77%	88%	93%	93%	78%	88
Ec. Dis	67.74%	61.87%	64.70%	57.39%	84%	79%	88%	61%	78
AA	67.74%	67.72%	66.41%	60.72%	83%	89%	88%	63%	81
Hisp	64.55%	59.55%	66.25%	60.73%	89%	89%	89%	89%	89
White	66.47%	66.38%	68.82%	60.47%	92%	100%	100%	85%	94

Figures 24-27 shows 1st Grade District Assessment scores with their subgroups compared to Bray Elementary 1st Grade scores with their subgroups. This is the strongest showing for the district and Bray with high scores from all. Bray met or exceeded district averages in all subgroups.

Figure 24

District Assessments First Grade ELA									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					95%	93%	93%	96%	94
Bray	85.93%	90%	91.70%	94.81%	95%	98%	98%	98%	97
Ec. Dis	82%	90.14%	91.57%	94.26%	97%	100%	94%	97%	97
AA	86.47%	88.50%	89.94%	93.82%	90%	96%	96%	96%	95
Hisp	83.33%	88.83%	91.08%	92.27%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100
White	88.33%	92.91%	94.25%	97.25%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100

Figure 25

District Assessments First Grade Math									
---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					96%	98%	98%	98%	98
Bray	51.09%	95.56%	92.19%	93.71%	97%	100%	100%	100%	99
Ec. Dis	47.14%	95.42%	92.55%	92.63%	97%	100%	100%	100%	99
AA	46.28%	95.24%	91.29%	90.82%	93%	100%	100%	100%	98
Hisp	47.08%	93.83%	91.58%	94.40%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100
White	61.17%	97.30%	93.83%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100

Figure 26

District Assessments First Grade Science									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					89%	93%	80%	92%	89
Bray	56.81%	75%	85.79%	90.48%	86%	100%	94%	92%	93
Ec. Dis	51.32%	75.53%	83.42%	89.35%	81%	100%	94%	94%	92
AA	49.82%	72.71%	83.06%	88.24%	83%	100%	92%	88%	91
Hisp	54.75%	74.73%	86.09%	90.08%	85%	100%	91%	92%	92
White	68.91%	78.09%	88.17%	93.67%	92%	100%	100%	100%	98

Figure 27

District Assessments First Grade Social Studies									
	2008-2009				2009-2010				
	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	Test # 1	Test # 2	Test # 3	Test # 4 Summative	09-10 Average
	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectation s	Met Expectations	Met Expectations
District					87%	80%	75%	87%	82
Bray	79.77%	81.83%	83.53%	87.95%	77%	92%	84%	96%	87
Ec. Dis	77%	78.63%	80.63%	86%	73%	94%	81%	94%	86
AA	78.89%	79.06%	82.50%	87.06%	72%	100%	85%	96%	88
Hisp	80%	79.18%	81.60%	83.75%	85%	75%	83%	92%	84
White	78.18%	88.70%	87.92%	92.92%	77%	92%	82%	100%	88

TPRI

Figure 28 This reading inventory through the state shows scores of our Kindergarten through 2nd grades. The percent developed at the end of the year is very good. The Fluency Rate for 1st and 2nd grade students need to be increased for better success in the classroom and subsequent grade levels. The number of students on Story 5 shows a good increase from the beginning of the year.

Figure 28

2009-2010 Campus Summary TPRI Report					
Grade	Students Tested (End of Year #)	Students Developed Beginning of the Year	Students Developed at End of the Year	Percentage Developed at the End of the Year	Reading Fluency Rate (on grade level) at the End of the Year WPM/#students
Kindergarten	52	39	50	96%	N/A
1 st Grade	58	37	55	93%	60+/26/45%
2 nd Grade	45	41	N/A	91%	90+/18/40%
	Students on Story 1 during the year	Students on Story 2 during the year Beginning/ End	Students on Story 3 during the year Beginning/ End	Students on Story 4 during the year Beginning/ End	Students on Story 5 during the year Beginning/ End

1 st Grade	Beginning/ End									
	26	N / A	6	N/A	3	N/A	1	8	10	39
2 nd Grade	1	N / A	3	N/A	2	1	14	6	22	37

ADVANCED ACADEMIC

Figures 29-32 The Advanced Academic classes are homogenously grouped. For Bray Elementary, that means one out of three classes in a grade level is designated for the high achievers which includes the Gifted and Talented students. The classes are to give more depth and complexity in instruction to meet the higher academic need of these students. The tables show the progress of each class compared to the regular classroom. The disparity between class scores show there is a difference in student achievement.

Figure 29 Scores are compared using the TAKS tests. The Commended Levels show the biggest gap. The Advanced Academic classes outperform the regular classrooms. All classes increased in Reading and Math. The regular 4th grade classes decreased in the Writing TAKS test with the Advanced Academic class decreasing in the Writing Commended scores. The TAKS Mathematics Commended score of the 3rd grade Math Advanced Academic class decreased while the Mathematics Commended score of the regular classrooms increased.

**Figure 29 TAKS
Comparison Chart for Advanced Academic Classes 2009 and 2010**

TAKS Reading	Met Expectations		Commended Performance	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
4th Grade Advanced Academic	100%	100%	47%	71%
4th Grade L	77%	77%	0%	15%

4th Grade R	95%	100%	26%	43%
3rd Grade Advanced Academic	95%	100%	82%	100%
3rd Grade P	79%	100%	42%	70%
3rd Grade S	83%	100%	17%	65%
TAKS Mathematics	Met Expectations		Commended Performance	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
4th Grade Advanced Academic	100%	100%	65%	86%
4th Grade L	92%	92%	15%	31%
4th Grade R	84%	86%	26%	29%
3rd Grade Advanced Academic	91%	100%	68%	64%
3rd Grade P	79%	100%	11%	60%
3rd Grade S	89%	100%	26%	50%
TAKS Writing	Met Expectations		Commended Performance	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
4th Grade Advanced Academic	100%	100%	63%	57%
4th Grade L	87%	77%	53%	23%
4th Grade R	95%	87%	21%	13%

Figure 30 shows the Percent Score for the ITBS. The focus is on the Advanced Academic scores compared to the Regular Classroom scores. Each Advanced Academic class increased scores except the 1st grade class. There are some increases and decreased in the regular classroom scores as well as some increases and decreases from one grade to the next. The Advanced Academic classes are at or above the 50th percentile.

Figure 30 ITBS

Class	Fall ITBS Reading		Fall ITBS Language		Fall ITBS Mathematics	
	Percent Score		Percent Score		Percent Score	
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
4 th Grade Advanced Academic	69%	85%	%	63%	44%	77%
4 th Grade Regular Class L	35%	34%	32%	26%	34%	38%
4 th Grade Regular Class R	40%	51%	19%	30%	31%	36%
3 rd Grade Advanced Academic	72%	81%	66%	72%	67%	69%
3 rd Grade Regular Class P	28%	42%	31%	40%	24%	23%
3 rd Grade Regular Class S	24%	38%	17%	47%	17%	36%
2 nd Grade Advanced Academic	66%	76%	57%	68%	41%	60%
2 nd Grade Regular Class	28%	39%	15%	27%	16%	20%
1 st Grade Advanced Academic	82%	75%	73%	64%	53%	47%
1 st Grade Regular Class A	31%	27%	37%	36%	20%	25%
1 st Grade Regular Class H	31%	35%	37%	39%	20%	30%

Kinder Advanced Academic	37% VOC	49% VOC	40%	64%	39%	46%
Kinder Regular Class B	36% VOC	34% VOC	36%	45%	29%	31%
Kinder Regular Class H	36% VOC	34% VOC	48%	40%	33%	30%

Figure 31 shows the percent average of the four District Assessment tests in each content area. The Advanced Academic classes increased in all areas. The regular classrooms show strengths and weaknesses as their scores increased and decreased. Tracking Advanced Academic students from 08-09 to 09-10, students in those classes for the most part increased their scores.

Figure 31
2009-2010 District Assessments

	Reading		Math		Science		Social Studies	
	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10	08-09	09-10
4 th Grade Advanced Academic	87%	98%	84%	100%	70%	92%	64%	63%
4 th Grade Regular Class L	73%	62%	72%	92%	57%	39%	45%	12%
4 th Grade Regular Class R	75%	74%	80%	76%	70%	59%	64%	25%
3 rd Grade Advanced Academic	87%	94%	83%	99%	86%	94%	77%	94%
3 rd Grade Regular Class P	64%	81%	62%	92%	63%	76%	57%	75%
3 rd Grade Regular Class S	68%	83%	66%	91%	64%	71%	54%	81%
2 nd Grade Advanced Academic	87%	100%	92%	99%	85%	99%	75%	96%
2 nd Grade Regular Class S	65%	75%	80%	88%	71%	82%	61%	77%
1 st Grade Advanced Academic	94%	100%	88%	100%	82%	100%	86%	99%
1 st Grade Regular Class A	88%	91%	79%	99%	72%	85%	80%	72%
1 st Grade Regular Class H	88%	97%	79%	99%	72%	91%	80%	87%

Figure 32 This comparison uses the TPRI scores to show the differences between the lower elementary Advanced Academic classes when compared to the lower elementary regular classrooms. In first and second grade, the Fluency Rate and the number of students who started on Story 5 show a remarkable gap between the Advanced Academic class and the regular class.

Figure 32

2009-2010 Campus Summary TPRI Report					
Grade And Class	Students Tested (End of Year #)	Students Developed Beginning of the Year	Students Developed at End of the Year	Percentage Developed at the End of the Year	Reading Fluency Rate (on grade level) at the End of the Year WPM/#students/%
Kindergarten	52	39	50	96%	N/A
Kinder Adv Aca	19	18	19	100%	N/A
Kinder B	17	11	16	94%	N/A

Kinder H	16	10	15	94%	N/A
1st Grade	58	37	55	93%	60+/26/45%
1st Adv Acad	22	19	22	100%	60+/18/82%
1st Grade A	18	5	15	83%	60+/03/17%
1st Grade H	18	13	18	100%	60+/05/28%
2nd Grade	45	41	N/A	91%	90+/18/40%
2nd Adv Acad	23	23	N/A	100%	90+/15/65%
2nd Grade S	22	18	N/A	82%	90+/03/14%
	Students on Story 1 during the year Beginning / End	Students on Story 2 during the year Beginning / End	Students on Story 3 during the year Beginning / End	Students on Story 4 during the year Beginning / End	Students on Story 5 during the year Beginning / End
1st Grade	26 / N/A	6 / N/A	3 / N/A	1 / 8	10 / 39
1st Adv Acad	6 / N/A	1 / N/A	3 / N/A	1 / 0	9 / 16
1st Grade A	7 / N/A	2 / N/A	0 / N/A	0 / 5	0 / 10
1st Grade H	13 / N/A	3 / N/A	0 / N/A	0 / 3	1 / 13
2nd Grade	1 / N/A	3 / N/A	2 / 1	14 / 6	22 / 37
2nd Adv Acad	0 / N/A	2 / N/A	1 / 0	4 / 2	16 / 20
2nd Grade S	1 / N/A	1 / N/A	1 / 1	10 / 4	6 / 17

Discipline

Through our implementation of the Character Education Program, effective instruction, and active engagement of students, Bray Elementary discipline referrals, as reported by PEIMS, decreased in 2009-2010 to 73. That number came down from 112 in the 2008-2009 school year. This year we will implement Boys Town to bring the number of incidences down again.

Summary Analysis

Although the building is old, it has been well maintained. Bray has three separate buildings for the campus plus some additional portable buildings. This configuration has its strengths and weaknesses. The strength for this configuration is that the grade levels are housed together making horizontal teaming very strong. A big part of our academic success comes from the grade level teams working very well together. Being located next to each other helps with this successful strategy. On the other hand, the challenge with this

configuration is to get teachers to work vertically with other grade levels. The buildings separate the grades making a visual/physical deterrent to working with teachers from other grades. We have to make a concerted effort to build our vertical teams for further success in instruction.

In teaching to all students, we also bring in the dynamic of developing the whole student. Bray Elementary has features that are conducive to their academic success. We have relatively new computers in the computer lab, new computers for teachers, projectors in each classroom, document cameras in each classroom, digital cameras, digital microscopes, and digital movie video recording equipment as well as student computers in every classroom. This helps to bring Bray to a high standard of technological astuteness. We have the physical education program to help build stature and fitness in every child. We will be starting the Physical Fitness emphasis for students, parents of our campus, and community members. We have the String Orchestra, Art program (solely run by volunteers from the community for Bray), vocal program, dance program, and the Character Chorus to expose the students to cultural events with participation opportunities.

Also, in developing the whole child, we have a very big Character Program, which includes the Character Chorus, that brings a sense of responsibility with an emphasis on giving to the community in which they live. In the past couple of years we raised over \$15,000 for Race for the Cure Cancer Research and over \$900 for the Cedar Hill Police Department's Canine Unit Vest, greeted troops from Iraq, collected over 14 boxes of blankets for the homeless, supplied our local animal shelter with needed items, and helped fill the pantries for the Cedar Hill Food Bank Distribution Program, visited the Russell Home for people with Profound disabilities, and much more. One of the benefits from this program that impacted our campus is that it was instrumental in decreasing the number of AEIS Discipline referrals over the past year by five percent or more.

To meet the academic development of students we offer differentiation in the classroom. Each teacher is Gifted and Talented trained to enhance their classroom for better and more diverse learning experiences. We have special support personnel to meet individual academic needs. We have the Literacy Lab available to reach more students effectively. We enhance our math program with teacher training from the Math Camp. Our students have science experiences which include the WeatherBug program and the science lab two times a week. Bray Elementary has a full continuum of Special Education services and Special Programs, (including an intervention class for behavioral remediation for district students).

To make more time for success for the students, Bray Elementary this past summer extended the school year by offering again summer tutoring and the Fine Arts Camp. We expect to see better results in the ITBS testing in the extended year activities. Bray Elementary is extending the school day to bring about more academic success with tutoring as well as offering extra curricular activities. These elements and a dedicated faculty/staff make Bray Elementary School a wonderful place to work and learn.

To continue to move forward in all these areas of student success Bray Elementary wants and encourages the support of parents, guardians and community members. Volunteers run the Art program and the yearbook. The Parent-Teachers Association (PTA) has seen a marked improvement in enrollment and attendance and maintained their financial support with vital fundraisers. More volunteers supported the classrooms this past year. The community gave \$25,000 in support of the Strings/ Music program. We will begin the Parent Connect Program to coincide with the district initiative of the Parent University brought out by the Strategic Planning Committee recommendations. The community is needed in our quest to continue building successful students.

Inquiry Process

After reviewing our Comprehensive Needs Assessment to determine our SMART goals, Bray Elementary has identified specific goals to increase success in student learning. Our goal is to increase our TAKS commended performance and Special Education TAKS performance. Since our scores are already at an Exemplary level, Bray will work to eliminate the gap for non-commended students. We will utilize differentiated instruction, progress monitoring, innovative and creative technology, and assessment results to address specific needs. We will provide various measures of student assessments by analyzing disaggregated data. By disaggregating data, we can closely monitor student weaknesses and develop specific tailored instructional strategies to augment student performance.

10 Components of a Title I Program

1. **Comprehensive needs assessment** – All data was 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 100% of our classroom teachers are appropriately certified for the position they hold.
6. **Strategies to increase parental involvement** – Family Math, Science and Literacy Nights are held to increase parents in the school's programs. Open Houses, frequent telephone contact and weekly folder updates/newsletters are methods of recognizing parents as partners. In addition, parents are offered classes to meet their needs, for example ESL classes or TAKS information programs. We will implement the Parent Connect Program for Bray Elementary to increase parental and community involvement within the school and district.
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. The Pre-Kindergarten class prepares students for classroom success.

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 PTA 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.

Name of SDMC Member

Position (Term expires)

Membership Composition of the Shared Decision-Making Committee

Number of Classroom Teachers (2/3)	8	Number of Parents	2
Number of School-based Staff (1/3)	1	Number of Community Members	3
Number of Non-Instructional Staff	3	Number of Business Members	1
Name of SDMC Member		Position (Term expires)	
Tammy Easterling		Business Member	
Elizabeth Podany		Classroom Teacher	
Tracey Willyard		Classroom Teacher	
Christy Davis		Classroom Teacher	
		Classroom Teacher	
Marchelle Sterling		Classroom Teacher	
Kristy Quinn		Classroom Teacher	
Bridgett Smith		Classroom Teacher	
Deidrea Schnabel		Classroom Teacher	
		Community Member	
Susan Keylon		Community Member	
		Community Member	
Melony Booher		Non-Instructional Staff	
Susana Sanchez		Parent	
Michelle Hernandez		Parent	
Robert Johansen		Principal	
Sherese Nix-Walker		School-Based Staff	
Ken Peach		Administrative Representative	

Intervention Goal

For 2010-2011, there will not be any discipline referrals for drugs, alcohol, and tobacco on the Bray Elementary Campus.

Formative Each grading period, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to determine if any student received the infraction.

Summative At the end of the school year, the discipline referrals will be reviewed to see if any student received the infraction.

Strategy Implement and monitor the school wide safety and security plan.

Parent and Community Involvement Goal

For 2010-2011, increase parent and community involvement with the school. Provide opportunities to partner together with the PTA, Character Chorus, and the Parent Connect Program.

Formative Monthly monitor meetings and activities for parent and community involvement. Provide activities and programs to invite parent and community members to Bray Elementary. Establish a welcoming climate for parents and community members. Monitor PTA meeting attendance and involvement by parents.

Summative Review activity and program attendance for success. Survey parents and the community members for satisfaction of school experience.

Strategy Provide a variety of methods and in appropriate languages to communicate opportunities for parent and community involvement throughout the year to attend school events, functions, and activities.

Violence Prevention Goal

For 2010-2011, the discipline referrals for PIEMS reporting incidences will be reduced 5% from the previous school year (73 for 2009-2010).

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 reduction. .
Strategy	Implement and monitor the school wide safety and security plan. Implement Boys Town Behavior Program school wide.

Special Education Goal

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

Formative	Each grading period, students' progress will be monitored and reviewed through IEP goals and objectives.
Summative	Results of the TAKS and/or TAKS ACC and/or TAKS-M tests 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. Provide instruction differentiation for student success including use of innovative and creative technology.

Dyslexia Program Goals

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

Formative

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;

Summative

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;

Strategy

Various strategies as determined by needs of campus. (Refer to Dyslexia Program Supplement for possible strategies.)

Attendance Goal

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

Formative	Monthly attendance rates by grade level and total school will be reviewed in addition to a list of students with more than three absences per month.
Summative	The year-end ADA will be reviewed to determine if the annual attendance objective was met.
Strategy	Send letters to parents of students with three or more unexcused absences. Initiate attendance referrals for students with more than five unexcused absences. Offer activities and programs for both students and parents to create an atmosphere conducive to wanting to be in school.

State Compensatory Education

Total amount of State Compensatory Education Funds.	\$138,899.00
Personnel funded with State Compensatory Education Funds (number of FTEs.)	1.5
Full-time Professional Literacy Specialist	1.0
Full-time Paraprofessional Literacy Teacher's Aide	0.5
Total FTEs funded with State Compensatory Education Funds.	1.5

With State Compensatory Funds, one Professional Literacy Specialist and one Paraprofessional Literacy Teacher's Aide provide intervention services to students who are academically at-risk in reading. These students receive services daily during the school day. The funds are also used to service students diagnosed as at-risk in the after school tutoring programs.

Gifted/Talented Program Goal

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

Formative	Differentiated strategies for instruction and assessment are documented weekly in lesson plans. District Assessments, TPRI, DRA, TAKS Tests, ITBS Tests, classroom grades, teacher and parent recommendations/conferences are used to monitor students and their progress.
Summative	Students identified as G/T shall be expected to score above grade level on the district

required ITBS; EXPLORE OR PLAN; and score at the commended level on TAKS.

Strategy

Provide instruction in a homogeneous classroom for the advanced learners using the TEKS with greater depth and complexity. Provide enrichment opportunities for the students that enhance critical thinking skills and greater academic experiences.

Bray Elementary Cedar Hill Independent School District Staff Development Plans		
Date	Who should attend	Purpose
Full Day Staff Development		
July 28	Secretary	Secretary Training
August 2	Nurse	Drug Recognition Training
August 3	Secretary/ Attendance Clerk	Registration Training
August 4	Attendance Clerk	Attendance Clerk Training
August 4	Textbook Coordinator	Textbook Training
August 5	New Teachers	C Scope Training
August 5	Secretary/ Attendance Clerk	Kindergarten Registration Begins
August 5	Special Education	ARD Decision Making Process and Confidentiality
August 5	Secretary	P.O. and AESOP Training
August 9	New Teachers	Orientation
August 9	New Teachers	PDAS Training
August 9	Paraprofessionals	Region X Paraprofessional Training (Aug 9-11)
August 10	Counselor	Counseling and CPS Training
August 12	All Staff	Convocation
August 12	All Staff	Campus TEA Updates
August 13/August 16	All Staff	Boys Town Discipline Program Training
August 17	All Staff	Campus C Scope
August 17	All Staff	ID Badges
August 17	Emergency Campus Team	Emergency Operations Plan Training

August 18	Campus Emergency Response Team	CPR Training
August 18	All Staff	Operations Manual, Counseling/ CPS, CIP, Science Lab Safety, Herald, Solar Training
August 19	All Staff	Emergency Response, Technology, C Scope, PDAS, ARD Decision Making Process and Confidentiality, Blood Borne Pathogen, Sexual Harassment Training.
August 20	All Staff	Teacher Workday
September 2	All Staff	Open House
September 13	Literacy Specialist	Literacy Leadership Institute
October 8	All Staff	Parent Conference/ Staff Development
November 8	All Staff	Team Building, Vertical Alignment Planning, Writing Traits Workshop
January 3	All Staff	Staff Development TBD
February 21	All Staff	Staff Development TBD
Half Day Staff Development		
September 24	All Staff	Technology Training
January 14	All Staff	Staff Development TBD
February 18	All Staff	Staff Development TBD

Wednesday Staff Development

September 1	All Staff	Technology Training
September 8	All Staff	Technology Training
September 15	All Staff	Technology Training
September 22	All Staff	Technology Training
September 29	All Staff	Technology Training
December 8	All Staff	TBD
April 6	All Staff	TAKS Training
April 20	All Staff	TAKS Training
May 11	All Staff	End of Year Closeout Training

