# Ector County Independent School District Nimitz Middle School Improvement Plan

2020-2021

# **Mission Statement**

The mission of the ECISD Community, a passionate, unified, world class leader in education, is to develop world ready, life-long learners who discover their unique gifts, achieve personal success, and fuel their community by building unified, comprehensive community support and participation that fosters a standard of excellence: serving as advocate and steward for all students; ensuring relevant teaching, engaged leaning, and dynamic innovation; and maximizing ll available resources.

At Nimitz Middle School, we...

Nourish a lifelong commitment to learning by

Joining together to achieve excellence.

Motivating and respecting every individual for what they have to offer, and having the

Strength of will to stand shoulders above the rest!

# **Table of Contents**

| Comprehensive Needs Assessment   | 4  |
|--|----|
| Demographics   | 4  |
| Student Achievement  | 8  |
| School Culture and Climate   | 16 |
| Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention  | 17 |
| Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment  | 18 |
| Parent and Community Engagement  | 20 |
| School Context and Organization  | 21 |
| Technology   | 22 |
| Priority Problem Statements  | 23 |
| Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation  | 28 |
| Goals  | 30 |
| Goal 1 : Foundational Excellence: Nimitz will create an agile, forward-thinking organization that operates with excellence today, while continuously researching and innovating tomorrow's practices.  | 30 |
| Goal 2: Invest in Talent: Nimitz will recruit, develop and retain highly-effective individuals who are invested in looking at tomorrow to inform their practices today.  | 40 |
| Goal 3: Learning Journey: Nimitz will establish rigorous standards while balancing pressure and support for individuals to work hard and achieve goals they have yet to dream. Nimitz will equip students to be adaptable in an ever-changing society. | 44 |
| State Compensatory   | 60 |
| Budget for Nimitz Middle School  | 60 |
| Personnel for Nimitz Middle School   | 61 |
| Campus Funding Summary   | 62 |
| Addendums  | 64 |

# **Comprehensive Needs Assessment**

# **Demographics**

#### **Demographics Summary**

#### **Table 1 Ethnic Distribution**

| School  | At-Risk | African  | Hispanic | White | American | Asian | Two/More | Sped | Econ | LEP |
|---------|---------|----------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|------|------|-----|
| Year    |         | American |          |       | Indian   |       | Races    |      | Dis. |     |
| 2019-20 | 826     | 95       | 890      | 390   | 6        | 22    | 35       | 139  | 523  | 165 |
| 2018-19 | 681     | 86       | 779      | 371   | 8        | 28    | 28       | 116  | 463  | 108 |
| 2017-18 | 598     | 92       | 584      | 367   | 5        | 29    | 20       | 80   | 336  | 48  |
| 2016-17 | 608     | 82       | 544      | 368   | 7        | 32    | 15       | 81   | 338  | 72  |

#### **Table 2 Enrollment**

| Year | 6th -8th |
|------|----------|
| 2021 |          |
| 2020 |          |
| 2019 | 1440     |
| 2018 | 1301     |
| 2017 | 1097     |
| 2016 | 1050     |

| Year    | Special<br>Ed | ELL | At-Risk | GT  | СТЕ |
|---------|---------------|-----|---------|-----|-----|
| 2020-21 |               |     |         |     |     |
| 2019-20 | 139           | 133 | 826     | 315 | 163 |
| 2018-19 | 116           | 104 | 681     | 288 | 127 |
| 2017-18 | 80            | 46  | 598     | 220 | 145 |
| 2016-17 | 81            | 46  | 608     | 183 | 115 |

**Table 4 Attendance Rates**Our Special Education and At Risk student enrollement has greatly increased. Our English Language Learner population has continued to grow yet we are still below State and District averages.

| Year    | State | District | Campus | Н    | W    | AA   | EcoDis | Special | ELL  |
|---------|-------|----------|--------|------|------|------|--------|---------|------|
|         |       |          |        |      |      |      |        | Ed      |      |
|         |       |          |        |      |      |      |        |         |      |
| 2019-20 |       |          | 94.5   | 95.7 | 96.6 | 96.0 | 94.7   | 94.9    | 96.2 |
| 2018-19 |       |          | 94.7   | 94.3 | 95.4 | 93.7 | 93.3   | 92.8    | 94.8 |
| 2017-18 | 95.7  | 94.6     | 94.5   | 94.1 | 95   | 94.5 | 93     | 92.8    | 94.9 |
|         | 95.8  | 94.7     | 95.5   | 95.4 | 95.7 | 94.0 | 94.2   | 95.2    | 95.4 |
| 2016-17 |       |          |        |      |      |      |        |         |      |

## **Number of Employees**

| Year    | Employees |
|---------|-----------|
| 2020-21 | 87        |
| 2019-20 | 84        |
| 2018-19 | 74        |
| 2017-18 | 74        |
| 2016-17 | 73        |

Employee numbers are decreasing, while the number of students is increasing. This is due to unfilled vacancies.

#### **Employee Retention Percentages**

| % Remained From Year | Administrators (Principals/Asst. Prin) | Teachers | Instructional Paraprofessionals (Aides) |
|----------------------|--|----------|---|
| To Year              |  |          | (* 11405)                               |
| 14/15 to 15/16       | 50.00%                                 | 34.78%   | 50.00%                                  |
| 15/16 to 16/17       | 50.00%                                 | 63.93%   | 100.00%                                 |
| 16/17 to 17/18       | 75.00%                                 | 75.81%   | 66.67%                                  |
| 17/18 to 18/19       | 50.00%                                 | 56.16%   | 85.71%                                  |
| 18/19 to 19/20       | 25.00%                                 | 67.12%   | 57.14%                                  |

### **Table 10 Teachers by Years of Experiece**

| Year    | Beginning | 1 – 5 Years | 6 – 10 Years | > 10 Years | W/Masters Degree |
|---------|-----------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------------|
| 2019-20 | 14.67     | 28.00       | 17.33        | 40.00      | 12.00            |
| 2018-19 | 8.22      | 35.62       | 19.18        | 36.99      | 23.29            |
| 2017-18 | 11.11     | 26.98       | 23.81        | 38.10      | 15.87            |
| 2016-17 | 19.35     | 27.42       | 14.52        | 38.71      | 12.90            |
| 2015-16 | 13.11     | 22.95       | 11.48        | 52.46      | 16.39            |

Half of the teaching staff has 5 years or less of teaching experience. Teachers with between 1-5 & 6-10 year of teaching experience has a significant decrease.

#### **Demographics Strengths**

With increased enrollement comes increased revenue. The diversity of our student enrollment is an assett to our campus culture.

#### **Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** The number of students continues to rise while the number of HQ teachers continues to decline. **Root Cause:** The current economy in this area makes it difficult for teachers to support themselves on a teacher's salary. Many are moving to the private sector.

## **Student Achievement**

#### **Student Achievement Summary**

## 6th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year                      | State            | District | Н  | Campus | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or Mo | reEco Dis | Special E | d LEP |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------|----|--------|----|----|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| 2020<br>Spring<br>Benchma | <mark>.rk</mark> | 45       | 51 | 53     | 62 | 36 | 43    | 46      | 45        | 15        | 32    |
| 2019                      |                  | 48       | 51 | 55     | 65 | 40 | 88    | 58      | 45        | 15        | 23    |
| 2018                      | 69               | 48       | 59 | 60     | 65 | *  | *     | *       | 42        | *         | *     |
| 2017                      | 69               | 48       | 45 | 33     | 39 | 30 | *     | *       | 21        | *         | *     |

## 7th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year         | State | District | Н        | Campus   | W        | AA       | Asian    | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | LEP      |
|--------------|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|
| 2020<br>2019 |       | 49<br>56 | 70<br>69 | 61<br>72 | 67<br>79 | 49<br>55 | 86<br>71 | 43<br>100 | 52<br>63  | 14<br>30   | 39<br>29 |
| 2018         | 74    | 54       | 66       | 70       | 78       | *        | 77       | *         | 61        | *          | *        |
| 2017         | 73    | 53       | 51       | 64       | 73       | *        | 100      | *         | 51        | *          | *        |

## 8th Grade STAAR Reading Approaches Grade Level

| Year | State | District | Н     | Campus | W     | AA    | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | LEP   |
|------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| 2020 |       | 56       | 71    | 74     | 81    | 64    | 78    | 89        | 65        | 33         | 41    |
| 2019 |       | 73       | 71.43 | 73.8   | 83.87 | 57.69 | 71.43 | *         | 65.19     | 20         | 37.93 |
| 2018 | 86    | 73       | 83    | 86     | 91    | *     | *     | *         | 74        | *          | *     |

| 8th Grad        | de STAAR     | Reading A                     | approaches              | Grade Lev     | el            |              |                   |               |   |                  |             |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|---|------------------|-------------|
| 2017            | 86           | 75                            | 73                      | 92            | 97            | 82           | *                 | *             | 85  | *                | *           |
|                 |              |                               |                         |               |               |              |                   |               |   |                  |             |
| 7th Grad        | de STAAR     | Writing A                     | pproaches (             | Grade Levo    | el            |              |                   |               |   |                  |             |
| Year            | State        | District                      | Н                       | Campus        | W             | AA           | Asian             | 2 or More     | Eco Dis   | Special Ed       | LEP         |
| 2020            |              | 46                            | 57                      | 59            | 63            | 59           | 87                | 50            | 55  | 5                | 33          |
| 2019            |              | 49                            | 58                      | 62            | 72            | 38           | 71                | 100           | 55  | 10               | 22          |
| 2018            | 69           | 51                            | 61                      | 66            | 74            | *            | *                 | *             | *   | *                | *           |
| 2017            | 70           | 51                            | 62                      | 62            | 66            | *            | *                 | *             | 50  | *                | *           |
| 8th Grad        | de Science   | Annroache                     | es Grade Le             | evel          |               |              |                   |               |   |                  |             |
|                 |              |                               |                         |               | ***           |              |                   | 2 16          | Б. Б.   | G : 151          | LED         |
| Year            | State        | District                      | Н                       | Campus        | W             | AA           | Asian             | 2 or More     | Eco Dis   | Special Ed       | LEP         |
| 2020            |              | 57                            | 74                      | 76            | 83            | 67           | 89                | 70            | 65  | 42               | 49          |
| 2019            |              | 64                            | 75                      | 75            | 84            | 50           |                   |               |   | • •              | 39          |
| 2018            | 76           |                               |                         | , 0           | -             | 50           | 71                | 88            | 67  | 30               | 39          |
|                 |              | 62                            | 70                      | 73            | 80            | 50<br>*      | 71<br>100         | 88<br>*       | 67<br>56  | *                | *           |
| 2017            | 76           | 62<br>62                      | 70<br>78                |               |               |              |                   |               |   |                  |             |
|                 | 76 Reading N | 62                            | 78                      | 73            | 80            | *            | 100               | *             | 56  | *                | *           |
|                 |              | 62                            | 78                      | 73            | 80            | *            | 100               | *             | 56  | * * Special      | *           |
| Grade 6         | Reading N    | 62<br>Aeets Grad              | 78<br>e Level           | 73<br>84      | 80<br>91      | *            | 100               | *     * 2 or  | 56<br>76  | * * Special      | * 73        |
| Grade 6<br>Year | Reading N    | 62<br>Meets Grade<br>District | 78<br>e Level<br>Campus | 73<br>84<br>H | 80<br>91<br>W | *<br>*<br>AA | 100<br>*<br>Asian | *  2 or  More | <ul><li>56</li><li>76</li><li>Eco Dis</li></ul> | *  *  Special Ed | * 73<br>LEP |

48

Grade 7 Reading Meets Grade Level

20

36

29

37

2017

21

| Year | State | District | Campus | Н  | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or<br>More | Eco Dis | Special<br>Ed | LEP |
|------|-------|----------|--------|----|----|----|-------|--------------|---------|---------------|-----|
| 2020 |       | 23       | 25     | 33 | 44 | 21 | 57    | 22           | 25      | 2             | 15  |
| 2019 |       | 29       | 44     | 39 | 53 | 29 | 71    | 83           | 31      | 7             | 16  |
| 2018 | 48    | 27       | 41     | 35 | 53 | *  | 54    | *            | 24      | *             | *   |
| 2017 | 42    | 21       | 32     | 25 | 40 | *  | 78    | *            | 17      | *             | *   |

## Grade 8 Reading Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | District | Campus | Н  | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | 1 LEP |
|------|-------|----------|--------|----|----|----|-------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| 2020 |       | 30       | 47     | 44 | 53 | 36 | 67    | 67        | 38        | 0          | 15    |
| 2019 |       | 32       | 47     | 43 | 60 | 31 | 50    | 75        | 32        | 5          | 25    |
| 2018 | 49    | 28       | 44     | 38 | 54 | *  | *     | *         | 28        | *          | *     |
| 2017 | 50    | 30       | 51     | 46 | 61 | *  | *     | *         | 36        | *          | *     |

## Grade 7 Writing Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | District | Campus | Н  | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or Mor | re Eco Dis | Special E | d LEP |
|------|-------|----------|--------|----|----|----|-------|----------|------------|-----------|-------|
| 2020 |       | 23       | 37     | 34 | 48 | 22 | 71    | 33       | 28         | 0         | 9     |
| 2019 |       | 22       | 37     | 34 | 43 | 17 | 71    | 67       | 27         | 3         | 5     |
| 2018 | 43    | 25       | 39     | 33 | 53 | *  | *     | *        | *          | *         | *     |
| 2017 | 39    | 20       | 27     | 24 | 33 | *  | *     | *        | 15         | *         | *     |

#### Grade 6 Math Meets Grade Level

| Year | State | District | Campus | Н  | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | l LEP |
|------|-------|----------|--------|----|----|----|-------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| 2020 |       | 21       | 32     | 27 | 46 | 8  | 43    | 46        | 18        | 3          | 25    |
| 2019 |       | 25       | 37     | 34 | 46 | 23 | 50    | 33        | 26        | 6          | 20    |
| 2018 | 44    | 25       | 34     | 32 | 37 | *  | *     | *         | 20        |            | 32    |

Nimitz Middle School Generated by Plan4Learning.com

| Grade   | 6 Math Me   | ets Grade L | evel         |      |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |
|---------|-------------|-------------|--------------|------|----|----|-------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| 2017    | 43          | 20          | 33           | 28   | 39 | *  | *     | *         | *         | *          | *     |
| Grade ' | 7 Math Me   | ets Grade L | evel         |      |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |
| Year    | State       | District    | Campus       | Н    | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | l LEP |
| 2020    |             | 15          | 27           | 25   | 35 | 6  | 83    | 23        | 15        | 0          | 17    |
| 2019    |             | 26          | 32           | 27   | 44 | 14 | 40    | 33        | 22        | 3          | 11    |
| 2018    | 40          | 22          | 30           | 25   | 37 | *  | *     | *         | *         | *          | *     |
| 2017    | 40          | 20          | 27           | 25   | 29 | *  | *     | *         | *         | *          | *     |
| Grade   | 8 Math Me   | ets Grade L | evel         |      |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |
| Year    | State       | District    | Campus       | Н    | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | LEP   |
| 2020    |             | 16          | 24           | 24   | 27 | 15 | 50    | 0         | 23        | 4          | 19    |
| 2019    |             | 22          | 30           | 29   | 28 | 28 | 55    | 25        | 24        | 5          | 18    |
| 2018    | 51          | 18          | 24           | 25   | *  | *  | *     | *         | *         | *          | *     |
| 2017    | 45          | 13          |              |      |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |
| Grade   | 8 Science I | Meets Grade | Level        |      |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |
| Year    | State       | District    | Campus       | Н    | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | LEP   |
| 2020    |             | 25          | 45           | 39   | 55 | 37 | 89    | 70        | 35        | 8          | 15    |
| 2019    |             | 28          | 43           | 39   | 54 | 35 | 43    | 75        | 33        | 5          | 10    |
| 2018    | 52          | 33          | 49           | 43   | 59 | *  | 88    | *         | 31        | *          | *     |
| 2017    | 48          | 27          | 49           | 42   | 58 | *  | *     | *         | 40        | *          | 39    |
| 8th Gra | ade Social  | Studies Mee | ets Grade Le | evel |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |
| Year    | State       | District    | Campus       | Н    | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More | e Eco Dis | Special Ed | LEP   |
| 2020    |             | 12          | 15           | 11   | 24 | 10 | 44    | 0         | 10        | 0          | 5     |
| 2019    |             | 13          | 25           | 19   | 40 | 15 | 29    | 50        | 16        | *          | 7     |
| 2018    | 53          | 33          | 21           | 16   | 28 | *  | 88    | *         | 12        | *          | *     |
| 2017    | 49          | 29          | 28           | 19   | 39 | *  | 60    | *         | 22        | *          | *     |
|         |             |             |              |      |    |    |       |           |           |            |       |

STAAR Percent at Masters (previously advanced level III) All Subjects

|        | ,                    |             |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
|--------|----------------------|-------------|--------|------|----|----|-------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----|
| Year   | State                | District    | Campu  | ıs H | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or<br>More  | Eco Dis   | Special<br>Ed | ELL |
| 2020   | No Data<br>Available | 2           |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| 2019   |                      |             | 17     | 13   | 24 | 10 | 39    | 34            | 10        | 2             | 10  |
| 2018   | 22                   | 11          | 15     | 12   | 20 | 5  | 40    | 27            | 7         | 7             | 10  |
| 2017   | 20                   | 10          |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| 3-EOC  | Reading Ma           | sters Level |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| Year   | State                | District    | Campus | Н    | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More Eco | Dis Spe   | cial Ed ELL   |     |
| 2019   |                      |             | 21     | 17   | 28 | 14 | 38    | 36 13         | 2         | 10            |     |
| 2018   | 19                   | 10          | 20     | 17   | 25 | 9  | 39    | 41 11         | *         | 14            |     |
| 2017   | 19                   | 10          |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| 3-EOC  | Math Master          | rs Level    |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| Year   | State                | District    | Campus | Н    | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More Eco | Dis Spe   | cial Ed ELL   |     |
| 2019   |                      | 13          | 12     | 9    | 18 | 3  | 37    | 25 5          | 4         | 10            |     |
| 2018   | 24                   | 11          | 11     | 8    | 15 | *  | 39    | * 5           | 7         | 11            |     |
| 2017   | 23                   | 11          |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| 4&7 W1 | riting Master        | rs Level    |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| Year   | State                | District    | Campu  | ıs H | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or Mor      | e Eco Dis | Special Ed    | ELL |
| 2020   | No Data<br>Available |             |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
| 2019   |                      | 6           | 16     | 13   | 21 | 8  | 50    | 50            | 9         | 0             | 9   |
| 2018   | 13                   | 6           | 7      | 4    | 11 | *  | *     | *             | *         | *             | *   |
| 2017   | 12                   | 5           |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |
|        |                      |             |        |      |    |    |       |               |           |               |     |

#### 5-EOC Science Masters Level

| Year    | State        | District    | Campus  | Н  | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or<br>More | Eco Dis   | Special<br>Ed | ELL |
|---------|--------------|-------------|---------|----|----|----|-------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----|
| 2019    |              |             | 23      | 17 | 34 | 17 | 46    | 50           | 16        | *             | 9   |
| 2018    | 23           | 11          | 22      | 18 | 27 | *  | 75    | *            | 10        |               | *   |
| 2017    | 19           | 10          |         |    |    |    |       |              |           |               |     |
| 8-EOC S | Social Studi | ies Masters | s Level |    |    |    |       |              |           |               |     |
| Year    | State        | District    | Campus  | Н  | W  | AA | Asian | 2 or More    | e Eco Dis | Special Ed    | ELL |
| 2019    |              |             | 13      | 10 | 19 | 12 | 31    | 25           | 9         | 0             | 9   |
| 2018    | 31           | 15          | 11      | 8  | 16 | *  | 63    | *            | 5         | *             | *   |
| 2017    | 27           | 12          |         |    |    |    |       |              |           |               |     |

|  | Composite | <b>Scaled Score</b> |   |
|--|-----------|---------------------|---|
| Overall                                |           | 67                  | D |
|  |           | 7.4                 |   |
| Student Achievement                    |           | 74                  | C |
| STAAR Performance                      | 42        | 74                  |   |
| College, Career and Military Readiness |           |                     |   |
| Graduation Rate                        |           |                     |   |
| School Progress                        |           | 63                  | D |
| Academic Growth                        | 63        | 63                  | D |
| Relative Performance (Eco Dis: 35.6%)  | 42        | 56                  | F |
|  |           |                     |   |
| Closing the Gaps                       | 7         | 50                  | F |

Nimitz Middle School is identified for targeted support and improvement.

| <b>2019 STAAR</b> | Approaches     | Meets | Masters 20 | 018 STAAR | Approaches | Meets | Masters | 2020 Spring Benchmark | Approaches     | Meets | Masters |
|-------------------|----------------|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-------|---------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|---------|
|                   | (6th Grade) 72 | 37    | 14         |           | 72         | 31    | 9       |                       | (6th Grade) 53 | 25    | 10      |
| Math              | (7th Grade) 67 | 32    | 10         |           | 67         | 29    | 10      | Math                  | (7th Grade) 49 | 30    | 14      |
|                   | (8th Grade) 87 | 30    | 3          |           | 83         | 27    | 3       |                       | (8th Grade) 80 | 49    | 25      |
|                   | (6th Grade) 56 | 28    | 12         |           | 59         | 32    | 14      |                       | (6th Grade) 73 | 32    | 10      |
| Reading           | (7thGrade) 72  | 44    | 25         |           | 68         | 39    | 24      | Reading               | (7th Grade) 60 | 27    | 10      |
|                   | 8th Grade) 82  | 23    | 10         |           | 86         | 41    | 22      |                       | (8th Grade) 81 | 49    | 25      |
| Writing           | 62             | 37    | 16         |           | 66         | 39    | 7       | Writing               | 59             | 38    | 17      |
| Science           | 75             | 43    | 21         |           | 73         | 49    | 15      | Science               | 76             | 45    | 26      |
| Social Studies    | 59             | 25    | 13         |           | 49         | 21    | 10      | Social Studies        | 55             | 15    | 7       |

#### **Student Achievement Strengths**

6th grade Reading was on track to surpass previous year. In February we were already at 25% Meets, and we were at 28% Meets on the 2019 STAAR test.

8th grade Reading was at 47% Meets after scores from two STAAR tests. 8th grade was already at 47% on Spring Benchmark in February.

7th Grade Writing was on track to surpass 7th Grade Meets on 2019 STARR with a 37%.

Science scores had already suprpassed last year's STAAR with a 45% in February and a 43 on the STAAR in 2019.

#### **Problem Statements Identifying Student Achievement Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** Reading scores did not show significant gains. **Root Cause:** The 45 minute class period was not enough time to implement Guided Reading/Comprehension effectively.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Overall Math scores are below state average. **Root Cause:** There is a decrease in the amount of time spent on math skills from 5th to 6th grade. English Learners transition to English for the first time. Frequent transitions are new for 6th grade students and instructional time is lost.

**Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized):** ELAR and Math scores are below the state average. **Root Cause:** The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully implement Guided Comprehension and Guided Math.

**Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized):** Decrease in STAAR Reading scores in 6th grade **Root Cause:** Lack of time spent on Reading skills, English learners transition to English for the first time

**Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized):** Special Education students score below state average **Root Cause:** Students do not receive adequate individualized instruction to meet their needs.

**Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized):** 8th Grade Reading scores did not show significant gains. **Root Cause:** PLC time was not available in the master schedule.

Problem Statement 7 (Prioritized): 8th Grade Science scores did not show significant gains. Root Cause: Resources are not utilized by all teachers.

**Problem Statement 8 (Prioritized):** 6th through 8th STAAR scores are below state average. **Root Cause:** Students need individualized learning in small group setting.

**Problem Statement 9 (Prioritized):** 13% of all OSS and ISS students are AA while the total African American population is only 6.8%. **Root Cause:** Discipline reports were not reviewed by Campus Behavior Coordinator and team and interventions were not in place.

#### **School Culture and Climate**

#### **School Culture and Climate Summary**

Nimitz staff members share a belief in the vision, mission, and values the campus has previously established. With new staff members, the climate is positive with a focus on student success. Teachers and the Administrative team work together to support all students. A team of teachers and Administrators participated in Relay training and have implemented protocals (transitions, entering the classroom, entering the building) that improved school culture. This summer, all remaining administrators participated in the Relay training.

#### **School Culture and Climate Strengths**

The Nimitz cultural is very data driven which results in an awareness of the needs of sub groups. Professional development is embraced and strategies are utilized to meet the needs of sub groups with the expectation that they will perform at the same level as their peers. Daily PLC's have been implemented for all grade levels in ELAR and math. Our fine arts department contributes to our positive school culture by performing at events both in school and in the community.

#### **Problem Statements Identifying School Culture and Climate Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** There is a communication gap between the school and parents with regards to parental involvement **Root Cause:** Time constraints with regards to attending meetings and attending school functions.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Teachers are not always prepared for situations that arise regarding student's emotional well being . **Root Cause:** Some staff view these trainings (Safe Schools, SEL) as simply a "to do" list rather than taking them seriously.

## Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

#### Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Summary

Nimitz works closely with our HR department to recruit highly qualified teachers. Teacher certification programs are contacted for possible teacher candidates. Teacher salary is compatible if not higher than other districts. The Odessa Pathway program provides teacher recruits through a mentor program.

#### Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Strengths

The majority of returning teacher's experience ranges from 5-30 years. These teachers are dedicated to the success of our students and mentor our new teachers. The Instructional Specialists are key to helping our new teachers. Opportunity Culture will be implemented in 6th Reading, 6 & 8 Science and Social Studies providing teachers with coaching support.

#### Problem Statements Identifying Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Needs

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** The number of HQ teachers is declining while the demand for teachers is on the rise. **Root Cause:** Number of teachers in alternative certification is increasing. There is a lack of certified teachers due to the economy.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Lack of quality Tier 1 instruction resulting in low student performance **Root Cause:** Teachers have not had the opportunity for day-to-day quality coaching

## **Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**

#### **Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summary**

Collaborative teams will disaggregate data in order to determine strengths and weakness of both students and instruction. With this data they will plan effective lessons during PLC time. TEKS Resource, AVID strategies, Lead4Ward strategies, and Kagan strategies are being utilized in classrooms to maximize student performance.

#### Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Strengths

6th, 7th, and 8th grade ELAR and Math meet daily for PLC's to disaggregate student data for instructional purposes. Block scheduling will be utilized in 6th and 7th ELAR and 6th and 7th Math to enable teachers to reteach, implement small groups, and provide guided instruction. At Nimitz, we utilize Instructional Coaches and department chairs that collaborate during PLC's. Opportunity Culture groups have been added to 6th ELAR, 6&8 Science and 6&8 Social Studies.

#### Problem Statements Identifying Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Needs

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** The lack of a structured PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** There is insufficient time for teachers to plan due to teachers covering classes as a result of the shortage of teachers and substitutes.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Students are not engaged during lessons and do not show academic growth. **Root Cause:** Not all teachers utilize District provided Unit Overviews.

**Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized):** Students are not receiving quality Tier I instruction. **Root Cause:** It is difficult to get teachers to attend training during the summer when they are off contract. During the school year it is difficult to send teachers to PD due to lack of substitutes.

**Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized):** Teachers are unable to attend a daily PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** The master schedule will not allow Science teachers to have a daily PLC.

**Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized):** Students are not reading enough science passages. **Root Cause:** Science and Reading teachers are not consistently working together to integrate curriculum.

**Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized):** Reteach lessons are not effective after disaggregating data. **Root Cause:** Data is not utilized effectively to drive instruction.

## **Parent and Community Engagement**

#### Parent and Community Engagement Summary

Nimitz Middle School encourages family involvement through parent portal, our new Nimitz website, Facebook, Twitter, Parent Link, weekly grade level parent newsletters, VIPS, Booster Clubs, Open House, parent nights, parent and student orientation, Fine Arts concerts, athletic events. and our PTO.

#### Parent and Community Engagement Strengths

We have a very active PTO that works to provide our students with activities and rewards for their hard work. They also support teachers and build teacher morale. Our athletic booster clubs are very supportive of our teams and assist coaches with their needs.

#### **Problem Statements Identifying Parent and Community Engagement Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** It is difficult to implement successful community involvement activities. **Root Cause:** Time constraints make effective planning difficult for successful implementation of community involvement activities.

## **School Context and Organization**

#### **School Context and Organization Summary**

The leadership structure at Nimitz is organized with a principal, 3 assistant principals, department chairs, 2 Instructional Specialists, and teachers/staff. The leadership team consists of administrators, department chairs and Instructional Specialists. The decision making process consists of department chairs meeting with teacher and gathering input regarding instruction, instructional needs, and concerns. The input collected is reviewed and discussed with the leadership team in order to provide teachers with the support needed. Opportunity Culture will be utilized in 6th ELAR, 6 & 8 Science and Social Studies allowing coaching to improve instruction.

#### **School Context and Organization Strengths**

The instructional leadership team is actively involved in all areas of curriculum and instruction. Opportunity Culture teams will provide coaching for teachers.

#### **Problem Statements Identifying School Context and Organization Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** Not all of the leadership team is always present during meetings. **Root Cause:** Members of the leadership team are supervising students after school.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures, inconsistent expectations for student performances

## **Technology**

#### **Technology Summary**

Nimitz Middle School has Smart boards and document cameras in all classrooms. We have one computer lab available for classroom use, 90 ipads and 11 mobile labs. We also have a classroom set of student computers in the library. The district is supplying students with devices in order to be 1 to 1. Portable classrooms do not have wifi capabilities.

#### **Technology Strengths**

Teachers utilize technology in every classroom. Technology specialists provide instruction in the use of new programs. All teachers will utilize Google Classroom.

#### **Problem Statements Identifying Technology Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** Not all classrooms have access to WiFi. **Root Cause:** The increased student population has resulted in the need for portable classrooms.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Not all students have access to technology on a daily basis. **Root Cause:** The number of students exceeds the amount of technology available.

**Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized):** Lesson delivery was inadequate for remote learning. **Root Cause:** Not all teachers are proficient with remote learning platforms.

# **Priority Problem Statements**

**Problem Statement 1**: The number of students continues to rise while the number of HQ teachers continues to decline.

Root Cause 1: The current economy in this area makes it difficult for teachers to support themselves on a teacher's salary. Many are moving to the private sector.

**Problem Statement 1 Areas**: Demographics

**Problem Statement 2**: Reading scores did not show significant gains.

Root Cause 2: The 45 minute class period was not enough time to implement Guided Reading/Comprehension effectively.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 3**: Overall Math scores are below state average.

**Root Cause 3**: There is a decrease in the amount of time spent on math skills from 5th to 6th grade. English Learners transition to English for the first time. Frequent transitions are new for 6th grade students and instructional time is lost.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 4**: There is a communication gap between the school and parents with regards to parental involvement

Root Cause 4: Time constraints with regards to attending meetings and attending school functions.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Culture and Climate

**Problem Statement 5**: The number of HQ teachers is declining while the demand for teachers is on the rise.

**Root Cause 5**: Number of teachers in alternative certification is increasing. There is a lack of certified teachers due to the economy.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

**Problem Statement 6**: The lack of a structured PLC's in order to plan with fidelity.

Root Cause 6: There is insufficient time for teachers to plan due to teachers covering classes as a result of the shortage of teachers and substitutes.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 7**: It is difficult to implement successful community involvement activities.

Root Cause 7: Time constraints make effective planning difficult for successful implementation of community involvement activities.

**Problem Statement 7 Areas**: Parent and Community Engagement

**Problem Statement 8**: Not all of the leadership team is always present during meetings.

**Root Cause 8**: Members of the leadership team are supervising students after school.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: School Context and Organization

**Problem Statement 9**: Not all classrooms have access to WiFi.

**Root Cause 9**: The increased student population has resulted in the need for portable classrooms.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: Technology

**Problem Statement 10**: Not all students have access to technology on a daily basis.

Root Cause 10: The number of students exceeds the amount of technology available.

**Problem Statement 10 Areas**: Technology

**Problem Statement 11**: The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures.

Root Cause 11: Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures, inconsistent expectations for student performances

Problem Statement 11 Areas: School Context and Organization

**Problem Statement 12**: ELAR and Math scores are below the state average.

Root Cause 12: The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully implement Guided Comprehension and Guided Math.

Problem Statement 12 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 13**: Lesson delivery was inadequate for remote learning.

Root Cause 13: Not all teachers are proficient with remote learning platforms.

**Problem Statement 13 Areas**: Technology

**Problem Statement 14**: Students are not engaged during lessons and do not show academic growth.

Root Cause 14: Not all teachers utilize District provided Unit Overviews.

Problem Statement 14 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Problem Statement 15: Teachers are not always prepared for situations that arise regarding student's emotional well being .

Root Cause 15: Some staff view these trainings (Safe Schools, SEL) as simply a "to do" list rather than taking them seriously.

Problem Statement 15 Areas: School Culture and Climate

**Problem Statement 16**: Lack of quality Tier 1 instruction resulting in low student performance

Root Cause 16: Teachers have not had the opportunity for day-to-day quality coaching

Problem Statement 16 Areas: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

**Problem Statement 17**: Decrease in STAAR Reading scores in 6th grade

Root Cause 17: Lack of time spent on Reading skills, English learners transition to English for the first time

Problem Statement 17 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 18**: Special Education students score below state average

Root Cause 18: Students do not receive adequate individualized instruction to meet their needs.

Problem Statement 18 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 19**: Students are not receiving quality Tier I instruction.

Root Cause 19: It is difficult to get teachers to attend training during the summer when they are off contract. During the school year it is difficult to send teachers to PD due to lack of substitutes.

Problem Statement 19 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Problem Statement 20: 8th Grade Reading scores did not show significant gains.

**Root Cause 20**: PLC time was not available in the master schedule.

Problem Statement 20 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 21**: Teachers are unable to attend a daily PLC's in order to plan with fidelity.

Root Cause 21: The master schedule will not allow Science teachers to have a daily PLC.

Problem Statement 21 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 22**: Students are not reading enough science passages.

Root Cause 22: Science and Reading teachers are not consistently working together to integrate curriculum.

Problem Statement 22 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 23**: 8th Grade Science scores did not show significant gains.

Root Cause 23: Resources are not utilized by all teachers.

Problem Statement 23 Areas: Student Achievement

**Problem Statement 24**: 6th through 8th STAAR scores are below state average.

Root Cause 24: Students need individualized learning in small group setting.

Problem Statement 24 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 25: Reteach lessons are not effective after disaggregating data.

**Root Cause 25**: Data is not utilized effectively to drive instruction.

Problem Statement 25 Areas: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 26**: 13% of all OSS and ISS students are AA while the total African American population is only 6.8%.

Root Cause 26: Discipline reports were not reviewed by Campus Behavior Coordinator and team and interventions were not in place.

Problem Statement 26 Areas: Student Achievement

# **Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation**

The following data were used to verify the comprehensive needs assessment analysis:

#### **Improvement Planning Data**

• District goals

#### **Accountability Data**

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Effective Schools Framework data
- Federal Report Card Data

#### **Student Data: Assessments**

- State and federally required assessment information (e.g. curriculum, eligibility, format, standards, accommodations, TEA information)
- State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR Released Test Questions
- STAAR EL Progress Measure data
- Student Success Initiative (SSI) data for Grades 5 and 8
- State-developed online interim assessments

#### **Student Data: Student Groups**

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- EL/non-EL or LEP data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, and gender data
- Career and Technical Education (CTE), including coherent sequence coursework aligned with the industry-based certifications, program growth and student achievement by race, ethnicity, and gender data
- Dyslexia Data

• Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

#### **Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators**

• School safety data

## **Employee Data**

- State certified and high quality staff data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Professional development needs assessment data
- TTESS data
- T-PESS data

## Goals

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

**Performance Objective 1:** Nimitz Middle School will ensure efficient systems are in place to increase productivity to meet the needs of all that we serve.

Evaluation Data Sources: PIEMS Incident Data, PLC agendas

**Summative Evaluation:** None

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Alignment v  | vith planning, resulting in increased student performance  | Formativ               |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administratio   | n, IS, MCL, PLC Leads  | Oct                    |  |  |  |  |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan                    |  |  |  |  |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1  | Mar                    |  |  |  |  |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources: Instructional Specialist Title Two Professional Development \$75,000  |                        |  |  |  |  |
| Targeted Support Strategy   | msu actional specialist Title Two Fforessional Development \$75,000  |                        |  |  |  |  |
|   | cols/strategies to ensure progress and efficiency for teachers and students.   | May                    |  |  |  |  |
| rategy 2: Implement and monitor Relay protoc  | cols/strategies to ensure progress and efficiency for teachers and students.  d procedures implemented will result in improved teacher and student productivity. |                        |  |  |  |  |
| rategy 2: Implement and monitor Relay protoc  | d procedures implemented will result in improved teacher and student productivity.   |                        |  |  |  |  |
| rategy 2: Implement and monitor Relay protoconstrategy's Expected Result/Impact: Routines and   | d procedures implemented will result in improved teacher and student productivity.   | Formativ               |  |  |  |  |
| rategy 2: Implement and monitor Relay protoconstrategy's Expected Result/Impact: Routines and Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrator                                   | d procedures implemented will result in improved teacher and student productivity. s and Relay team, IS, MCL, teachers   | Formativ<br>Oct        |  |  |  |  |
| rategy 2: Implement and monitor Relay protoconstrategy's Expected Result/Impact: Routines and Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrator Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | d procedures implemented will result in improved teacher and student productivity. s and Relay team, IS, MCL, teachers  Problem Statements:                      | Formativ<br>Oct<br>Jan |  |  |  |  |

**Strategy 3:** Develop a master schedule that allows for daily PLC time for ELAR and Math all grade levels and double blocks of instructional time for Math and ELAR in 6th and 7th grades.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Maximize      | trategy's Expected Result/Impact: Maximized instructional and planning time to improve student and teacher performance |           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration | ors, MCL, IS   | Oct       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None                | <b>Problem Statements:</b>   | Jan       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TEA Priorities: None                             | Student Achievement 3  | Mar       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ESF Levers: None                                 | Funding Sources: None  | Summative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | May       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| % No Progress                                    | Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue   | I         |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **Student Achievement**

**Problem Statement 3:** ELAR and Math scores are below the state average. **Root Cause:** The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully implement Guided Comprehension and Guided Math.

## Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 1:** The lack of a structured PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** There is insufficient time for teachers to plan due to teachers covering classes as a result of the shortage of teachers and substitutes.

## **School Context and Organization**

**Problem Statement 2:** The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures, inconsistent expectations for student performances

**Performance Objective 2:** Nimitz Middle School will provide differentiated processes for academically priority classrooms/students.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** Crisis Coding, MAP results

**Summative Evaluation:** None

Strategy 1: Plan and implement effective transitions for 5th grade to maintain academic learning and support the social-emotional learning of students. **Formative** Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Smooth transition to the next grade level Oct **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administration, Counselors, Department Chairs, Jan Title I Schoolwide Elements: None **Problem Statements:** School Context and Organization 2 **TEA Priorities:** None Mar **Funding Sources: ESF Levers:** None Summative None May **Strategy 2:** Provide students with instruction that is relevant and appropriate for diverse learners. **Formative** Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved student growth Oct Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, IS, MCL Jan Title I Schoolwide Elements: None **Problem Statements:** Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1, 3 TEA Priorities: None Mar **Funding Sources: ESF Levers:** None **Summative** State Comp Ed \$75,000 Mav % No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 1:** The lack of a structured PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** There is insufficient time for teachers to plan due to teachers covering classes as a result of the shortage of teachers and substitutes.

**Problem Statement 3:** Students are not receiving quality Tier I instruction. **Root Cause:** It is difficult to get teachers to attend training during the summer when they are off contract. During the school year it is difficult to send teachers to PD due to lack of substitutes.

## **School Context and Organization**

Problem Statement 2: The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures,

inconsistent expectations for student performances

Performance Objective 3: Nimitz Middle School will embed technology for anytime, anywhere teaching and learning.

Evaluation Data Sources: Google Classroom, Remind 101, Sport U,

**Summative Evaluation:** None

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Every teacher and student will participate in Google Classroom. |   | Formative             |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, I  | S, MCL, Department Chairs   | Oct                   |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:   | Jan                   |
| TEA Priorities: None   | Technology 1, 2, 3  | Mar                   |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources: Local  | Summative             |
|  |   | May                   |
| No Progress (100%)   | Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue                                    | 2                     |
|  | Technology  |                       |
| blem Statement 1: Not all classrooms have access to WiFi. R  | toot Cause: The increased student population has resulted in the need for porta | ble classrooms.       |
| blem Statement 2: Not all students have access to technology                                       | on a daily basis. Root Cause: The number of students exceeds the amount of      | technology available. |
|  | e learning. Root Cause: Not all teachers are proficient with remote learning pl |                       |

Performance Objective 4: Nimitz Middle School will provide a rigorous, relevant and engaging curriculum.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** PLC minutes

**Summative Evaluation:** None

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student engagement and growth, MAP growth |  | Formative               |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, MCL, IS, teachers                   |  | Oct                     |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None TEA Priorities: None                                | Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1, 2 Funding Sources: None                       | Jan<br>Mar              |
| ESF Levers: None  |  | Summative May           |
| trategy 2: Teachers will attend training and impl                                     | lement the Laying the Foundations curriculum for honor students.   |                         |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase the n                                     | umber of students meeting masters across all subject areas on 2020-2021 STAAR                                | Formative               |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators,                                     | Honors/GT teachers, IS, MCL  | Oct                     |
|   | Problem Statements:  | Jan                     |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1  |                         |
|   | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  | Mar                     |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  TEA Priorities: None  ESF Levers: None             |  | Mar<br>Summative        |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  Funding Sources:  | Mar<br>Summative<br>May |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  Funding Sources:  | Summative               |
| TEA Priorities: None  ESF Levers: None  No Progress                                   | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  Funding Sources: None   | Summative               |
| TEA Priorities: None  ESF Levers: None  No Progress  Cui                              | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  Funding Sources: None  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue | Summativ<br>May         |

**Performance Objective 5:** Nimitz Middle School will provide a safe and supportive school environment.

**Evaluation Data Sources: PIEMS data** 

**Summative Evaluation:** None

**Strategy 1:** Teachers will complete annual Safe Schools training including new trainings throughout the year such as COVID 19 training, attend Ethics and Sexual Harassment training, and receive trauma informational training.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students and   | teachers will have a safe environment that is conducive to learning.   | Formativ               |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Department Chairs, IS   |  | Oct                    |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan                    |
| TEA Priorities: None  | School Culture and Climate 2 School Context and Organization 2   | Mar                    |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources:   | Summativ               |
|   | <u>e</u>   | Mari                   |
| ategy 2: Teachers will utilize CHAMPS in cla  | SAS Counselor State Comp Ed \$75,000 assrooms and throughout the building.   | May                    |
|   | <u> </u>   |                        |
|   | assrooms and throughout the building.  have a safe environment that is conducive to learning.  |                        |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will  | have a safe environment that is conducive to learning.  MCL, Department Chairs, IS, Teachers  Problem Statements:                              | Formativ               |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators                                   | have a safe environment that is conducive to learning.  MCL, Department Chairs, IS, Teachers  Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 2 | Formativ               |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | have a safe environment that is conducive to learning.  MCL, Department Chairs, IS, Teachers  Problem Statements:                              | Formativ<br>Oct<br>Jan |

**Strategy 3:** Administrators, IS and MCL's will provide coaching using the Relay coaching model to improve school wide routines and procedures.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve stud  | ent safety and student performance | Formative |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators | , IS, MCL                          | Oct       |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None                | <b>Problem Statements:</b>         | Jan       |
| TEA Priorities: None                             | School Context and Organization 2  | Mar       |
| ESF Levers: None                                 | Funding Sources: Local             | Summative |
|  |                                    | May       |

**Strategy 4:** Awareness training for staff and students will be provided in the area of sexual abuse and other maltreatment of children. All new staff will be trained during required new employee training on prevention programs. SAS Counselors will train all staff during campus professional development on prevention and reporting requirements. Required child abuse awareness posters for students will be displayed throughout the campus.

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff will kno to eliminate the potential for child abuse and neglect | w the symptoms of abuse, understand the necessary actions to take, and take action | Formative Oct |
|--|--|---------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assis   | tant Principals, SAS and Academic Counselors                                       | Jan           |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:  | Mar           |
| TEA Priorities: None   | School Culture and Climate 2   |               |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources:   | Summative     |
| EST Devels. None   | None   | May           |

**Strategy 5:** The ECISD comprehensive Guidance and Counseling curriculum will continue to be implemented in PK-12 to implement lessons that will include dating violence, child abuse, bullying, conflict resolution, substance abuse, self-efficacy, decision-making, behavior, and other social-emotional topics.

| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: SAS Counselo | r, Academic Counselors                           | Jan      |
|--|--|----------|
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None              | Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 2 | Mar      |
| TEA Priorities: None ESF Levers: None          | Funding Sources:                                 | Summativ |
| EST LEVELS. NOIC                               | None   | May      |

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Less than 5% of all OSS and ISS will be African American Placements.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Campus Behavior Coordinator and team

Title I Schoolwide Elements: None

Problem Statements:

Student Achievement 9

Funding Sources:
None

Summative

May

0%

No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



**X** Discontinue

#### **Student Achievement**

**Problem Statement 9:** 13% of all OSS and ISS students are AA while the total African American population is only 6.8%. **Root Cause:** Discipline reports were not reviewed by Campus Behavior Coordinator and team and interventions were not in place.

### School Culture and Climate

**Problem Statement 2:** Teachers are not always prepared for situations that arise regarding student's emotional well being . **Root Cause:** Some staff view these trainings (Safe Schools, SEL) as simply a "to do" list rather than taking them seriously.

## **School Context and Organization**

**Problem Statement 2:** The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures, inconsistent expectations for student performances

**Performance Objective 6:** Annual student attendance will increase from 94.5 in 2020 to 95.0 in 2021.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** Weekly Attendance Report from the Weekly Attendance and Dropout Dashboard (COC)

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strategy's ex                        | pected results are an increased awareness by parents of students with attendance | Formativ |
|---|--|----------|
| issues and improved attendance rates for students.                      |  | Oct      |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrative                        | e Lead for Attendance, Principal, Assistant Principals, Attendance Clerks        | Jan      |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None                                       | Problem Statements:  | Mar      |
| TEA Priorities: None  | School Culture and Climate 1   |          |
| ESF Levers: None  | School Context and Organization 2  | Summat   |
| ZST Zeversy read  | Funding Sources:<br>Local  | May      |
| ategy 2: Nimitz will provide attendance incen                           | ntives for students each six weeks.  | '        |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve stud                         | dent attendance to 95%   | Format   |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Attendance cle                        | erks, Administration, Discipline Clerk, SAS Counselor                            | Oct      |
|   |  | Jan      |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None                                       | Problem Statements:  | Van      |
|   | School Context and Organization 2  | Mar      |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None TEA Priorities: None ESF Levers: None |  |          |

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved stude  | ent attendance   | Formative           |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: CIS Representati   | ive  | Oct                 |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:  | Jan                 |
| TEA Priorities: None   | School Context and Organization 2  | Mar                 |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources: CIS Representative State Comp Ed \$35,000                           | Summative           |
|  |  | May                 |
| % No Progress  | Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue   |                     |
|  | School Culture and Climate   |                     |
| <b>blem Statement 1:</b> There is a communication gap between the nding meetings and attending school functions. | e school and parents with regards to parental involvement Root Cause: Time constrain | nts with regards to |
|  |  |                     |

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

**Performance Objective 1:** In 2020-21, Nimitz will offer a job-embedded, personalized professional learning systems for teachers and administrators.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** Employee Performance Evaluations

Staff Retention Rates Eduphoria STRIVE

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved cla  | ssroom instruction which will result in increased student performance  | Formati             |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators   |  | Oct                 |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:  | Jan                 |
| ΓΕΑ Priorities: None   | School Context and Organization 2  | Mar                 |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources: None  | Summa               |
|  | INOTIC   |                     |
|  | d the reach of excellent teachers and their teams during 2020-2021.  |                     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved cla  | If the reach of excellent teachers and their teams during 2020-2021.  Assroom instruction which will result in increased student performance                                       | Forma               |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved class Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators                                   | If the reach of excellent teachers and their teams during 2020-2021.  Sussing instruction which will result in increased student performance is, IS, MCL                           | Format Oct          |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved class Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators Fitle I Schoolwide Elements: None | If the reach of excellent teachers and their teams during 2020-2021.  Assroom instruction which will result in increased student performance                                       | Forma<br>Oct<br>Jan |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved class Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators                                   | If the reach of excellent teachers and their teams during 2020-2021.  It is stroom instruction which will result in increased student performance is, IS, MCL  Problem Statements: | Forma               |

## Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

**Problem Statement 1:** The number of HQ teachers is declining while the demand for teachers is on the rise. **Root Cause:** Number of teachers in alternative certification is increasing. There is a lack of certified teachers due to the economy.

**Problem Statement 2:** Lack of quality Tier 1 instruction resulting in low student performance **Root Cause:** Teachers have not had the opportunity for day-to-day quality coaching

## **School Context and Organization**

**Problem Statement 2:** The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures, inconsistent expectations for student performances

**Performance Objective 2:** The campus teacher retention rate will increase from 69.39% in 2020 to 80.00% in 2021.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** TAPR Report

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: RELAY will I                          | nelp retain and grow highly effective teachers in the classrooms.   | Formative                       |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration                         | Team, RELAY team, IS, MCL   | Oct                             |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:   | Jan                             |
| TEA Priorities: None   | Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1, 2 School Context and Organization 2  | Mar                             |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources:  | Summative                       |
|  | None  | May                             |
| Strategy 2: Nimitz Middle School will implement                          | Opportunity Culture to support teachers.  |                                 |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Opportunity c                         | ulture will retain and grow highly effective teachers in the classroom  | Formative                       |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration                         | ream, MCL, TRT, IS  | Oct                             |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:   | Jan                             |
| TEA Priorities: None   | Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1, 2  | Mar                             |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources:  | Summative                       |
|  | Local   |                                 |
| % No Progress  | Local  Accomplished   | May                             |
|  | •   |                                 |
|  | If Quality, Recruitment, and Retention while the demand for teachers is on the rise. Root Cause: Number of teachers by. | in alternative certification is |
| <b>Problem Statement 2:</b> Lack of quality Tier 1 instruction resulting | g in low student performance Root Cause: Teachers have not had the opportu  | unity for day-to-day quality    |
|  | School Context and Organization   |                                 |

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

**Performance Objective 1:** Nimitz will implement innovative instructional models which enable personalized learning for all students.

Evaluation Data Sources: Imagine Learning, Imagine Math, Brainchild

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase score   | es in TELPAS and /or exit the ESL program.   | Formativ            |
|---|--|---------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration  | team, teachers, ESL facilitator  | Oct                 |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan                 |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Student Achievement 4 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  | Mar                 |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources:   | Summati             |
|   |  |                     |
| ategy 2: Nimitz will utilize Imagine Math and   | Local  Imagine Learning to scaffold the students individualized learning   | <u> </u>            |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Close the ach  | Imagine Learning to scaffold the students individualized learning ievement gap in reading and math   | g.                  |
|   | Imagine Learning to scaffold the students individualized learning ievement gap in reading and math   | g. Formati          |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Close the ach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration                                   | Imagine Learning to scaffold the students individualized learning ievement gap in reading and math team, IS, teachers                      | g.  Formati Oct     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Close the ach Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | Imagine Learning to scaffold the students individualized learning ievement gap in reading and math team, IS, teachers  Problem Statements: | g.  Formati Oct Jan |

| vement gap with our SPED students.  | Formative   |
|---|---|
| ram, SPED teachers, teachers  | Oct   |
| Problem Statements:   | Jan   |
| Student Achievement 5   | Mar   |
| Funding Sources:  | Summative   |
| Local   |   |
|   | May   |
| ndation curriculum for our honors/GT students.  | •   |
| struction to ensure the students meet, master, or maintain the grade-level  | Formative   |
| <u> </u>  | Oct   |
| Administration team, teachers, MCL  | Jan   |
| Problem Statements:   | Mar   |
| Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2, 3  |   |
| Funding Sources:  | Summative   |
| Local   | May   |
| Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue  |   |
| Student Achievement   |   |
| ins. <b>Root Cause:</b> The 45 minute class period was not enough time to implement G   | huided  |
| ge. <b>Root Cause:</b> There is a decrease in the amount of time spent on math skills from a renew for 6th grade students and instructional time is lost. | m 5th to 6th grade. English   |
| average. Root Cause: The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully in   | nplement Guided   |
| grade Root Cause: Lack of time spent on Reading skills, English learners transition   | on to English for the first   |
|   |   |
| te average Root Cause: Students do not receive adequate individualized instruction; iculum, Instruction, and Assessment                                   | on to meet their needs.   |
| i   | Problem Statements: Student Achievement 5 Funding Sources: Local  Indiation curriculum for our honors/GT students.  Struction to ensure the students meet, master, or maintain the grade-level administration team, teachers, MCL  Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2, 3 Funding Sources: Local  Accomplished  Continue/Modify Discontinue  Student Achievement  ins. Root Cause: The 45 minute class period was not enough time to implement Go are new for 6th grade students and instructional time is lost.  average. Root Cause: The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully in |

Problem Statement 3: Students are not receiving quality Tier I instruction. Root Cause: It is difficult to get teachers to attend training during the summer when they are off

contract. During the school year it is difficult to send teachers to PD due to lack of substitutes.

**Performance Objective 2:** 6th grade Reading "Meets" percentages will increase from 30% in 2019 to 34% as measured by the 2021 STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR Results, MAP results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase the   | e Meets percentage in Reading on the STAAR test.   | Formative                        |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration  | on team, teachers, IS, MCL, TRT  | Oct                              |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan                              |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Student Achievement 3  | Mar                              |
| ESF Levers: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 School Context and Organization 2  | Summativ                         |
|   | Funding Sources:   | May                              |
|   | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000  | iviay                            |
|   | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000<br>ing in 6th-grade reading allowing for more teaching time in the EL  | AR classroom.                    |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in F  | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000  Ing in 6th-grade reading allowing for more teaching time in the EL Reading and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR  | AR classroom.                    |
|   | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000  Ing in 6th-grade reading allowing for more teaching time in the EL Reading and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR  | AR classroom.  Formative Oct     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in F  | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000  Ing in 6th-grade reading allowing for more teaching time in the EL Reading and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR on team, teachers, IS, MCL, TRT  Problem Statements:                       | AR classroom.                    |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in Estaff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration                                    | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000  Ing in 6th-grade reading allowing for more teaching time in the EL Reading and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR on team, teachers, IS, MCL, TRT  Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1 | AR classroom.  Formative Oct     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in F Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | Dyslexia teacher State Comp Ed \$75,000  Ing in 6th-grade reading allowing for more teaching time in the EL Reading and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR on team, teachers, IS, MCL, TRT  Problem Statements:                       | AR classroom.  Formative Oct Jan |

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Opportunity O | Culture will build teacher capacity which will show student growth/progress. | Formative |
|--|--|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration | team, MCL, TRT   | Oct       |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None                | Problem Statements:  | Jan       |
| TEA Priorities: None                             | Student Achievement 1  Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1             | Mar       |
| ESF Levers: None                                 | Funding Sources:   | Summativ  |
|  | Local  | May       |

#### **Student Achievement**

**Problem Statement 1:** Reading scores did not show significant gains. **Root Cause:** The 45 minute class period was not enough time to implement Guided Reading/Comprehension effectively.

**Problem Statement 3:** ELAR and Math scores are below the state average. **Root Cause:** The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully implement Guided Comprehension and Guided Math.

### Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

**Problem Statement 1:** The lack of a structured PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** There is insufficient time for teachers to plan due to teachers covering classes as a result of the shortage of teachers and substitutes.

#### **School Context and Organization**

**Problem Statement 2:** The problem is inefficient organizational routines and structures. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent implementation of school wide routines and structures, inconsistent expectations for student performances

**Performance Objective 3:** 6th grade Math "Meets" percentages will increase from 39% in 2019 to 43% as measured by the 2021 STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR Results, MAP results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase the  | Meets percentage in Math on the STAAR test.  | Formati                    |
|--|--|----------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration   | n team, IS, Teachers   | Oct                        |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:  | Jan                        |
| TEA Priorities: None   | Student Achievement 2, 3  Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1  | Mar                        |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources:   | Summat                     |
|  |  |                            |
| ategy 2: Nimitz will continue block scheduling   | Local  ng in 6th-grade Math allowing for more teaching time in the Math  |                            |
| ategy 2: Nimitz will continue block scheduling Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in Market                               | ng in 6th-grade Math allowing for more teaching time in the Math   | classroom.                 |
|  | ng in 6th-grade Math allowing for more teaching time in the Math Math and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR  | classroom.  Format         |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in M   | ng in 6th-grade Math allowing for more teaching time in the Math Math and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR In team, IS, teachers  Problem Statements:                       | classroom.  Format Oct Jan |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in M Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration                                  | ng in 6th-grade Math allowing for more teaching time in the Math Math and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR In team, IS, teachers  Problem Statements: Student Achievement 3 | classroom.  Format Oct     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Growth in M Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administratio Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | ng in 6th-grade Math allowing for more teaching time in the Math Math and a higher percentage of Meets on STAAR In team, IS, teachers  Problem Statements:                       | classroom.  Format Oct Jan |

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Target needed skills to increase student performance |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration team, IS, teachers                     |  |     |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None Problem Statements:                                   |  | Jan |
| <b>TEA Priorities:</b> None Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1, 3                |  |     |
| ESF Levers: None  Funding Sources: Local  |  |     |
|   |  | May |

#### **Student Achievement**

**Problem Statement 2:** Overall Math scores are below state average. **Root Cause:** There is a decrease in the amount of time spent on math skills from 5th to 6th grade. English Learners transition to English for the first time. Frequent transitions are new for 6th grade students and instructional time is lost.

**Problem Statement 3:** ELAR and Math scores are below the state average. **Root Cause:** The 45 minute class period was not enough time to fully implement Guided Comprehension and Guided Math.

#### **Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**

**Problem Statement 1:** The lack of a structured PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** There is insufficient time for teachers to plan due to teachers covering classes as a result of the shortage of teachers and substitutes.

**Problem Statement 3:** Students are not receiving quality Tier I instruction. **Root Cause:** It is difficult to get teachers to attend training during the summer when they are off contract. During the school year it is difficult to send teachers to PD due to lack of substitutes.

**Performance Objective 4:** 8th grade Reading "Meets" percentages will increase from 49% in 2019 to 53% as measured by the 2021 STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR results, MAP results

| Strategy 1: 8th grade ELAR will have PLC time   | es to disaggregate data, plan, and discuss next steps.                         |      |
|---|--|------|
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Target needed skills to increase student performance |  |      |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration  | n team, IS, teachers   | Oct  |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan  |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Student Achievement 6  | Mar  |
| ESF Levers: None  | ESF Levers: None  Funding Sources: Local                                       |      |
|   |  | May  |
| No Progress   | Accomplished — Continue/Modify X Discontinue                                   | ie   |
|   | Student Achievement  |      |
| Problem Statement 6: 8th Grade Reading scores did not show                              | significant gains. Root Cause: PLC time was not available in the master schedu | ıle. |

**Performance Objective 5:** 8th grade Math "Meets" percentages will increase from 32% in 2019 to 36% as measured by the 2021 STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR results, MAP results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Target needed skills to increase student performance |  | Formative   |
|---|--|-------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration team, IS, teachers                     |  |             |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | lements: None Problem Statements:  |             |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2  | Mar         |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources: None  |             |
|   |  | May         |
| % No Progress   | Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue                                       | l l         |
| Cur   | riculum, Instruction, and Assessment   |             |
|   | nd do not show academic growth. Root Cause: Not all teachers utilize District prov | 1 177 1 0 1 |

**Performance Objective 6:** 8th grade Science "Meets" percentages will increase from 46% in 2019 to 51% as measured by the 2021 STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR results, MAP results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students scores in science will increase in STAAR  Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration team, IS, teachers |   |                       |
|---|---|-----------------------|
|   |   |                       |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2, 3, 4   |                       |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources: None   | Mar<br>Summati        |
|   |   | 3.4                   |
| ategy 2: Nimitz will integrate science into EL  | AR during their non-fiction units.  | May                   |
|   | AR during their non-fiction units.  Ince curriculum through ELAR to increase knowledge and Science STAAR Scores |                       |
|   | ence curriculum through ELAR to increase knowledge and Science STAAR Scores                                     | Formati Oct           |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Support Scie   | ence curriculum through ELAR to increase knowledge and Science STAAR Scores                                     | Formati               |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Support Scie Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration  | nce curriculum through ELAR to increase knowledge and Science STAAR Scores n team, IS,                          | Formati               |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Support Scie Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration Title I Schoolwide Elements: None                        | nce curriculum through ELAR to increase knowledge and Science STAAR Scores in team, IS,  Problem Statements:    | Formati<br>Oct<br>Jan |

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student growth and enrichment to scaffold the learning and increase STAAR scores  Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration team, teachers |  |           |
|--|--|-----------|
|  |  |           |
| TEA Priorities: None   | Student Achievement 7  | Mar       |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources: Local   | Summative |
|  |  | May       |
| % No Progress  | Accomplished — Continue/Modify X Discontinue                             |           |
|  | Student Achievement  |           |
| <b>olem Statement 7:</b> 8th Grade Science scores did not show sig   | gnificant gains. Root Cause: Resources are not utilized by all teachers. |           |
|  | riculum, Instruction, and Assessment                                     |           |
| Cur  | riculum, firsti uction, and Assessment                                   |           |

**Problem Statement 3:** Students are not receiving quality Tier I instruction. **Root Cause:** It is difficult to get teachers to attend training during the summer when they are off contract. During the school year it is difficult to send teachers to PD due to lack of substitutes.

**Problem Statement 4:** Teachers are unable to attend a daily PLC's in order to plan with fidelity. **Root Cause:** The master schedule will not allow Science teachers to have a daily PLC.

**Problem Statement 5:** Students are not reading enough science passages. **Root Cause:** Science and Reading teachers are not consistently working together to integrate curriculum.

**Performance Objective 7:** 8th grade Algebra I "Meets" percentages will increase from 76% in 2019 to 80% as measured by the 2021 STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR results, MAP results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will  | l correctly utilize functions on the Inspire calculator for increased scores on EOC. | Formative |
|---|--|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators  | s, IS, Math Department Chair   | Oct       |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan       |
| TEA Priorities: None Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 6                                |  | Mar       |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources: None  | Summative |
|   |  | May       |
| ategy 2: Algebra teacher will collaborate with Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Algebra "Me |  | Formative |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrator,  | -  | Oct       |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Problem Statements:  | Jan       |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3  | Mar       |
|   | Funding Sources: None  | Summative |
| ESF Levers: None  |  |           |
|   |  | May       |
|   | Accomplished — Continue/Modify X Discontinue   | May       |

**Performance Objective 8:** The percentage of students that Met Standard on all subject/grades tested will increase from 39% (2019 STAAR) to 43% as measured by the 2021 STAAR assessment.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR results, MAP results

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved str   | udent achievement on district assessments and STAAR.   | Format                    |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Leadership team   |  |                           |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None   | Jan  |                           |
| TEA Priorities: None  | Student Achievement 1, 3, 4  | Mar                       |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources: None  | Summa                     |
|   | None   | May                       |
|   |  | ıvia,                     |
| ategy 2: Teachers will provide targeted STA   |  |                           |
|   | AR tutoring for students as needed.  udent achievement on district assessments and STAAR.      | Forma                     |
|   | udent achievement on district assessments and STAAR.   | Forma                     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved str   | udent achievement on district assessments and STAAR.   | Forma                     |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved str<br>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrator<br>Title I Schoolwide Elements: None | udent achievement on district assessments and STAAR. s, Department Chairs                      | Forma Oct                 |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved strategy Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrator                                    | udent achievement on district assessments and STAAR. s, Department Chairs  Problem Statements: | Formation October Jan Mai |

| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers v  | vill have time to plan, discuss data, and students, which will result in student growth.                      | Formative |
|--|---|-----------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrate   | ors, IS, MCL, TRT   | Oct       |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None  | Problem Statements:   | Jan       |
| TEA Priorities: None   | Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 6   | Mar       |
| ESF Levers: None   | Funding Sources: Local  | Summativ  |
|  | 2004.   | May       |
| % No Progress  | Accomplished — Continue/Modify X Discontinue  |           |
| No Progress  | Accomplished   Continue/Modify   X Discontinue  Student Achievement   |           |
|  | <u> </u>  |           |
| <b>oblem Statement 1:</b> Reading scores did not show significant and ing/Comprehension effectively.   | Student Achievement   | ruided    |
| bblem Statement 1: Reading scores did not show significated ading/Comprehension effectively.  bblem Statement 3: ELAR and Math scores are below the mprehension and Guided Math. | Student Achievement ant gains. Root Cause: The 45 minute class period was not enough time to implement Guided |           |

**Performance Objective 9:** The percentage of students meeting or exceeding the growth target will increase from 63% (2019 STAAR) to 66% as measured by the 2021 STAAR assessment.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR results, MAP results

| Strategy 1: Nimitz will use data driven instruction to              | o more effectively plan, teach, and reteach.   |           |
|---|--|-----------|
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved studen                  | Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved student achievement on district assessments and STAAR. |           |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, IS, MCL, TRT      |  |           |
| Title I Schoolwide Elements: None Problem Statements:               |  | Jan       |
| TEA Priorities: None  | orities: None  Student Achievement 8  Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 6                    |           |
| ESF Levers: None  | Funding Sources:   | Summative |
|   | None   | May       |
| % No Progress (100%) A  | ccomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue  | I         |
|   | Student Achievement  |           |
| Problem Statement 8: 6th through 8th STAAR scores are below sta     | ate average. Root Cause: Students need individualized learning in small group setting.             |           |
| Curri   | culum, Instruction, and Assessment   |           |
| Problem Statement 6: Reteach lessons are not effective after disagg | gregating data. Root Cause: Data is not utilized effectively to drive instruction.                 |           |

## **State Compensatory**

## **Budget for Nimitz Middle School**

| Account Code       | Account Title  |              |
|--------------------|--|--------------|
| 6100 Payroll Costs |  |              |
| 164 11 00 46 6119  | 6119 Salaries or Wages - Teachers and Other Professional Personnel | \$196,599.00 |
|                    | 6100 Subtotal:   | \$196,599.00 |

## **Personnel for Nimitz Middle School**

| <u>Name</u>      | <u>Position</u> | <u>Program</u>       | <u>FTE</u> |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|
| Abigail Martinez | Liaison         | Community In Schools | 1          |
| Anthony Garza    | Counselor       | SAS                  | 1          |
| Shalin White     | Teacher         | Dyslexia             | 1          |

# **Campus Funding Summary**

| Local |           |          |                               |             |
|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Goal  | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed Account Code | Amount      |
| 1     | 3         | 1        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 1     | 5         | 3        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 1     | 6         | 1        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 1     | 6         | 2        |                               | \$1,000.00  |
| 2     | 1         | 2        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 2     | 2         | 2        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 1         | 1        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 1         | 2        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 1         | 3        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 1         | 4        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 2         | 2        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 2         | 3        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 3         | 1        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 3         | 2        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 3         | 3        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 4         | 1        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 6         | 3        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 8         | 2        |                               | \$0.00      |
| 3     | 8         | 3        |                               | \$0.00      |
| •     |           | <u> </u> | Sub-Total                     | \$1,000.00  |
|       |           |          | State Comp Ed                 |             |
| Goal  | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed Account Code | Amount      |
| 1     | 2         | 2        |                               | \$75,000.00 |

| State Comp Ed |           |          |                                    |                  |
|---------------|-----------|----------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Goal          | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed Account Code      | Amount           |
| 1             | 5         | 1        | SAS Counselor                      | \$75,000.00      |
| 1             | 6         | 3        | CIS Representative                 | \$35,000.00      |
| 3             | 2         | 1        | Dyslexia teacher                   | \$75,000.00      |
|               |           | •        | Sub-To                             | tal \$260,000.00 |
|               |           |          | Title Two Professional Development |                  |
| Goal          | Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed Account Code      | Amount           |
| 1             | 1         | 1        | Instructional Specialist           | \$75,000.00      |
|               |           |          | Sub-To                             | \$75,000.00      |
| Grand Total   |           |          |                                    | tal \$336,000.00 |

# **Addendums**