Garland Independent School District Lister Elementary School 2023-2024 Goals/Performance Objectives/Strategies

Mission Statement

We provide continuous growth through high-quality teaching & learning to empower our community of learners to thrive.

Title Plan presentation was conducted during the Annual Title Parent Meetings on 09/07/2023 and 09/15/2023.

Vision

We improve academic and socio-emotional outcomes for all students.

Value Statement

Our school values having a positive attitude and a willing spirit.

Table of Contents

Goals 4

Goal 1: Garland ISD will ensure ALL students graduate prepared for college, careers and life by increasing student performance measures, postsecondary readiness and graduation rates, and decreasing student management incidences.

Goals

Goal 1: Garland ISD will ensure ALL students graduate prepared for college, careers and life by increasing student performance measures, postsecondary readiness and graduation rates, and decreasing student management incidences.

Performance Objective 1: Percent of students in grades 3-5 demonstrating on grade level literacy skills as measured by STAAR performance will increase (based on STAAR 2023) from 70% to 75% for Approaches, 37% to 50% for Meets, 17% to 25% for Masters performance in 2024.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Grades 3-5 STAAR Reading Grades 3-5 Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) Grades 3-5 Curriculum Based Assessments (CBAs)

| Reviews | | | |
|-----------|-----|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Formative | | | Summative |
| Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| | | | |
| 40% | 60% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Formative Nov Feb | Formative Nov Feb Apr |

| Strategy 2 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|------|-----------|--|
| Strategy 2: Teachers will participate in three full day instructional planning days during the school year and | | Formative | | | |
| participate in weekly planning meetings with their teams and coaches. Teachers will have time during the planning days to make activities for their classes using the poster maker and laminator. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in the percentage of students meeting growth measures for MAP and STAAR, and performance targets for STAAR. | 30% | 60% | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin | | | | | |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 3 Funding Sources: Cycle 1 Planning Days PreK-5 - 6100 Payroll- Title I Funds - \$5,250 | | | | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | • | |
| Strategy 3: Teachers in their first-third year of teaching or those in need of additional support will participate in at least one | | Formative | | Summative | |
| full day of classroom observations and an additional planning day. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improvement in the quality of Tier 1 instruction | | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin & Coaches TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | 50% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade STAAR math, reading, and science Meets and Masters performance is below the school's targets. **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

Problem Statement 3: On average, 35-40% of students in each grade level were at Meets (target is 50% for math, reading and science). **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services represent 23% of discipline incidents although they only represent 18% of student population. **Root Cause**: Teachers and students need more effective strategies in increasing emotional regulation.

Performance Objective 2: Percent of ELL students demonstrating English language acquisition, as measured by earning yearly progress indicator on the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS), will increase from 51% in 2023 to 60% in 2024.

Evaluation Data Sources: TELPAS

| Strategy 1 Details | | Rev | iews | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|--|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Newcomer students will receive specialized intervention at least 4 times per week in a small group setting. | Formative | | | on at least 4 times per week in a small group setting. Formative | Summative |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Each student making one year's progress on TELPAS and increased language ability in academic settings. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, Emergent Bilingual Aide | 40% | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | | |
| Funding Sources: Resources for Emergent Bilinguals - 199 - PIC 25 Bil/ESL State Allotment Funds - \$4,704 | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | | |
| Strategy 2: Teachers, coaches, admin and the emergent bilingual aide will partner with district multilingual program staff to | | Formative | | | |
| provide multiple practice and goal-setting opportunities for students participating in TELPAS. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 60% of students taking TELPAS will meet their annual progress target | 1101 | 100 | 1101 | June | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, Emergent Bilingual Aide | 5% | 70% | | | |
| Title I: | | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy | | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | 1 | |

Performance Objective 3: Percent of students in grade 5 demonstrating scientific understanding as measured by STAAR performance will increase (based on Spring 2023) from 38% to 55% for Approaches, 16% to 50% for Meets, 5% to 20% for Masters performance in Spring 2024.

Evaluation Data Sources: 5th Grade STAAR Science

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Teachers will participate in hands-on lab experiences weekly and use STAAR formatted questions to support | Formative | | | Summative |
| students as they move from concrete to abstract concepts in 3rd through 5th grade Science. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in meets grade level performance on Science STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, and Admin TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3 Funding Sources: IReady Science for 5th Grade - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds - \$900 | Nov 35% | Feb 60% | Apr | June |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Revi | ews | • |
| Strategy 2: 5th grade student | | Formative | | Summative |
| | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| | N/A | 35% | | |
| No Progress Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade STAAR math, reading, and science Meets and Masters performance is below the school's targets. **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: On average, 15-20% of students in each grade level were at Masters (target is 20% for science and 25% for math and reading). **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

Problem Statement 3: On average, 35-40% of students in each grade level were at Meets (target is 50% for math, reading and science). **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

Performance Objective 4: Percent of students in grades demonstrating 3-5 mathematical proficiency as measured by STAAR performance will increase (based on Spring 2023) from 67% to 75% for Approaches, 36% to 50% for Meets, 15% to 25% for Masters performance in Spring 2024.

Evaluation Data Sources: Grades 3-5 Math STAAR Grades 3-5 Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Grades 3-5 Curriculum Based Assessments (CBAs)

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs with admin and coaches to disaggregate MAP, CBA, and weekly | Formative | | | Summative |
| demonstration of learning (DoL) data to create and implement small group, targeted reteach instruction (with a special emphasis on target areas such as performance of Asian and Hispanic students). | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased percentage of students will meet their growth measure on MAP math, and an increased percentage of students will perform at the meets level for math STAAR. | 50% | 60% | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches & Admin | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3 | | | | |

| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | riews | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Strategy 2: Teachers will participate in three instructional planning days during the school year and | Formative | | | ol year and Formative Summa | Summative |
| participate in weekly planning meetings with their teams and coaches. Teachers will have time during the planning days to make activities for their classes using the poster maker and laminator. | Nov | Nov Feb Apr | | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches & Admin | 40% | 60% | | | |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3 | | | | | |
| Funding Sources: Laminator and Poster Maker Supplies - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds - \$8,200, Additional Resources - 199 - PIC 23 SPED State Allotment Funds - \$1,748 | | | | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | | |
| Strategy 3: Teachers in their first-third year of teaching or those in need of additional support will participate in at least one a full day of classroom observations. | | 1 A | Summative | | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in the quality of Tier 1 instruction. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coaches & Admin | 50% | 100% | 100% | | |
| TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy | | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 2 | | | | | |
| Funding Sources: Classroom Observations - 6100 Payroll- Title I Funds - \$1,500 | | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify | X Discon | 4: | 1 | | |

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade STAAR math, reading, and science Meets and Masters performance is below the school's targets. **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: On average, 15-20% of students in each grade level were at Masters (target is 20% for science and 25% for math and reading). **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

Problem Statement 3: On average, 35-40% of students in each grade level were at Meets (target is 50% for math, reading and science). **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services represent 23% of discipline incidents although they only represent 18% of student population. **Root Cause**: Teachers and students need more effective strategies in increasing emotional regulation.

Performance Objective 5: Percent of student management incidents resulting in exclusionary consequences [i.e., In School Suspension (ISS), Out of School Suspension (OSS), and Reassignment Rooms] will decrease being implemented 17% from of the time to being implemented 12% or less of the time.

Evaluation Data Sources: Exclusionary discipline data

| Strategy 1 Details | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------|------|-----------|-----------|
| egy 1: We will implement year 2 of the Positive Behavior & Intervention Supports (PBIS) systems and processes | Formative | | | | Summative |
| including CHAMPS strategies in each classroom and monthly student management trainings. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Decrease in the amount of discipline incidents and exclusionary consequences | | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PBIS Team, Admin, Coaches | 45% | 65% | | | |
| TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools | | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | | |
| Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2, 3, 4 | | | | | |
| Funding Sources: PBIS Resources - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds - \$2,500, Push-In CHAMPS Support | | | | | |
| Teacher - 6100 Payroll- Title I Funds - \$13,150 | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | iews | | |
| Strategy 2: The counselor will work with teachers to help guide students in setting weekly social & emotional learning | | Formative | | Summative | |
| goals each week. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student's ability to regulate their emotions | 1,0, | 100 | P- | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Admin, Teachers | 40% | 55% | | | |
| | 40,0 | 33% | | | |
| TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | | |
| Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 | | | | | |
| Funding Sources: SEL Resources - 6300 Supplies and Materials- Title I Funds - \$2,500 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished — Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | | |
| 110 Trogress Troomphoned Continue, Would | 2 15 15 COII | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Nearly 40% of discipline incidents were for disorderly conduct. Root Cause: Students do not have proper strategies for emotional coping.

Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services represent 23% of discipline incidents although they only represent 18% of student population. **Root Cause**: Teachers and students need more effective strategies in increasing emotional regulation.

Problem Statement 3: 87% of discipline incidents are reported for male students although they are only 53% of the student population. **Root Cause**: Teachers and students need more effective strategies in increasing emotional regulation.

Problem Statement 4: Data shows 40% of incidents were reported were for students of African American decent, which is a total of 19% of the school population Root Cause: Teachers need more support in following campus behavior strategies and maintaining cultural awareness and responsiveness.

Performance Objective 6: By May 2023, at least 70% of parents will participate in at least one parent engagement event.

Evaluation Data Sources: Sign-in sheets from parent events

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Parents will be offered volunteer opportunities at least monthly. | Formative | | | monthly. Formative Sumn | Summative |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased parental involvement on campus Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Admin TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 1 | Nov 35% | Feb 50% | Apr | June | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | | |
| Strategy 2: The counselor and school administration will work with families to create and implement a school and family engagement policy and school & parent compact to be made available in English, Spanish & Vietnamese. | Nov | Formative Feb | A | Summative | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Continued, consistent and meaningful involvement of parents in their students' education. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin & Counselor | 100% | 100% | Apr | June 100% | |
| TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 2 | | | | | |

| | Reviews | | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|---|--|
| Formative | | | Summative | |
| Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| 30% | 50% | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Rev | iews | | |
| | Formative | | Summative | |
| Nov 30% | Feb 50% | Apr | June | |
| | | | | |
| | 30% | Rev Formative Nov Feb Nov Feb Nov Feb | Formative Nov Feb Apr 30% 50% Reviews Formative Nov Feb Apr | |

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Nearly 40% of discipline incidents were for disorderly conduct. **Root Cause**: Students do not have proper strategies for emotional coping.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Only 80% of parents feel they are encouraged to be involved in school activities, and their ideas are accepted and used. **Root Cause**: We need to provide more opportunities for parents to volunteer during the school day.

Problem Statement 2: Only 79% of parents feel the parent compact and parent involvement policy were explained to them. **Root Cause**: These documents are discussed at the Annual Title 1 meeting and only a small percentage of parents attend this meeting.

Performance Objective 7: FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY (Targeted School of Improvement): Due to one or more consistently under-performing student group in 2023 accountability, STAAR student performance in the following areas need to increase to meet the student performance targets:

AA/ Black Students: Reading Academic Achievement from 39 (2023) to at least 45 (min target)

AA/ Black Students: Mathematics Academic Achievement from 29 (2023) to at least 33 (min target)

Hispanic Students: Reading Academic Achievement from 28 (2023) to at 39 (min target)

Hispanic Students: Mathematics Academic Achievement from 34 (2023) to at 44 (min target)

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: We will individually track progress of all student populations through TELPAS, CBAs, MAP and other | | Formative | | Summative |
| mative assessments to create individual student reteach plans. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The Meets performance level for AA/Black and Hispanic students will meet or exceed the minimum target. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, Coaches & Teachers | 35% | 50% | | |
| TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 | | | | |
| No Progress Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | • | • |

Performance Objective 7 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade STAAR math, reading, and science Meets and Masters performance is below the school's targets. **Root Cause**: There was inconsistency in monitoring of student progress and follow up of reteach and intervention efforts.