

**San Antonio Independent School District**  
**Riverside Park Elementary**  
**2022-2023 Campus Improvement Plan**

# Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	3
Demographics	3
Student Learning	4
School Processes & Programs	5
Perceptions	7
Priority Problem Statements	9
Goals	11
Goal 1: INCREASE STUDENTS ATTENDING HIGH-QUALITY SCHOOLS 1a: Increase the District overall grade under State Accountability and the percent of campuses rated Accomplished or Higher on the SAISD School Performance Framework (SPF)	12
Goal 2: ENSURE PROFICIENCY 2a: Increase the percent of students kinder ready in Reading & Math (as identified by MAP BOY or subsequent State assessments)	14
Goal 3: ENSURE PROFICIENCY 2b: Increase the percent of Grade 3 students on grade level in Reading & Math STAAR	15
Goal 4: ENSURE PROFICIENCY 2c: Increase the percent of all students on grade level (all grades/all subjects at the Meets grade level standard)	18
Goal 5: ENSURE PROFICIENCY 2d: Increase % on-time, 4-year Graduation and decrease Dropout Rates	21
Goal 6: CULTIVATE HIGH-PERFORMING STUDENTS 3a: Increase the percent of Grade 8 students earning HS credit	22
Goal 7: CULTIVATE HIGH-PERFORMING STUDENTS 3b: Increase the percent of HS students earning college credit (AP, IB, DC, etc.)	23
Goal 8: TARGETED FOCUS ON POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS 4a: Increase the % meeting TSI/SAT/ACT college-ready performance	24
Goal 9: TARGETED FOCUS ON POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS 4b: Increase the % of HS students College, Career, & Military Ready (CCMR)	25
Goal 10: TARGETED FOCUS ON POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS 4c: Increase the percent of graduates attending College	26
Goal 11: District Purchases for Campuses Monitored at the District Level - ENSURE PROFICIENCY 2c: Increase the percent of all students on grade level (all grades/all subjects at the Meets grade level standard)	27
Title I	28
1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)	29
1.1: Comprehensive Needs Assessment	29
2. Campus Improvement Plan	29
2.1: Campus Improvement Plan developed with appropriate stakeholders	29
2.2: Regular monitoring and revision	30
2.3: Available to parents and community in an understandable format and language	30
3. Annual Evaluation	30
4. Parent and Family Engagement (PFE)	30
5. Targeted Assistance Schools Only	30
Campus Funding Summary	30

# Comprehensive Needs Assessment

## Demographics

### Demographics Summary

The total enrollment at Riverside Park is 281 students.

Demographics	# of Students	Demographics Percent
Hispanic	272	97%
Black	3	1%
White	2	1%
Other	4	1%
EB	142	25%
Bilingual	86	31%
ESL	4	1%
At Risk	89	32%
Eco Dis	261	93%
SPED	40	14%
Gifted	10	4%
Dyslexia	2	1%
Male	161	57%
Female	120	43%

### Demographics Strengths

The percentage of students who qualify as special education decreased from 19% to 14%.

Campus enrollment increased from 262 students 2022 to 281 students 2023.

### Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** Campus EOY ADA was 88%. **Root Cause:** There was not a system utilized to track and follow up on student attendance and tardies. Student

attendance was not tracked daily and families were not contacted regarding student attendance.

# Student Learning

## Student Learning Summary

Subject	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Reading	60%	32%	19%
Math	56%	21%	7%
Science	50%	11%	3%
Total	57%	24%	12%

2022 Achievement Domain

## Student Learning Strengths

School Progress Domain had a scale score of 91.

All tested content showed a 15+ increase in achievement domain.

A targeted intervention time designated in the master schedule, focused on closing gaps supported student growth in math and reading.

## Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** Student achievement in math (21% meets) falls below the district performance objective goal of 38%. **Root Cause:** Mathematics instruction has focused on below grade level instruction to fill student gaps. Professional development is needed to refine targeted intervention practices and intentional small group learning while making Tier 1 instruction at grade level standards.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Misalignment of student work to grade level standards prevents all students from meeting grade level expectations. **Root Cause:** Student lesson activities and assignments are not aligned to the verb and concept of the standard. Student work reflects below grade level work resulting in students not being exposed the the depth of knowledge expected of students according to the grade level standard. As a result student achievement meeting their grade level expectations is below 50%.

**Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized):** While the campus follows many effective data collection and disaggregation procedures, data driven instruction tier 1 instruction is below grade level expectations. **Root Cause:** Data reflects student learning gaps and the instructional practice is to address those learning gaps although they are below the student's current grade level. Professional development on how to plan and address pre-requisite skills needed to access grade level standards within a grade appropriate lesson is needed.

**Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized):** As a district, 35% of students are at meeting grade-level in reading and 22% in math. 30% of students are meeting grade level expectations in all tested content areas. **Root Cause:** As a district, we need to improve systems that involve assessments, how we evaluate the results of the assessments, and how we create targeted intervention plans for students with gaps in grade-level readiness.

# School Processes & Programs

## School Processes & Programs Summary

Teachers are supported within the following systems and structures:

Monitor the effectiveness of teachers' instructional practices by frequent walk-through's and coaching sessions with all teachers.

Provide opportunities for collaboration and planning using student achievement data 3 times per semester.

Transparent and clear communication between teachers and administrators.

Weekly campus based professional development for teachers (Deconstructing TEKS, Planning aligned student activities, Student Work Analysis Protocol, Real-Time Intervention)

IA's with professional development ( BOY training, MOY Training, EOY Training)

Daily Assessment of mastery of student learning

Weekly data review of student mastery by teachers and instructional leadership

Instructional administration vetting process of assessments to ensure alignment to the TEKS is adhered to in all areas.

Campus expectation is the Backwards Planning Model to create lesson plans off of assessments.

Students are supported in their learning through the practices of:

Analyzing individual student data/work to determine appropriate activities.

Providing individualized/small group learning sessions.

Making real-world connections for students within learning with embedded enrichment and intervention activities.

## School Processes & Programs Strengths

Vetted grade level assessments with open-ended student response requirements.

Teacher daily formative assessment trackers with weely planning time to address students needs based on data.

Dedicated master schedule time for targeted intervention to address student learning gaps in primary grade levels.

Extended instructional blocks in intermidiate grade levels with increased instructional minutes in math and science.

Teachers receive real time feedback during classroom observations.

All teachers participate in a coaching cycle with Instructional Administration.

### **Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs**

**Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized):** Teacher response to student data/performance does not always align to grade level standards. **Root Cause:** Tier 1 instruction focus on filling instructional gaps of previous grade levels before addressing grade level standards. Therefore, pacing of teaching grade level standards is behind and majority of instruction is spend teaching below grade level rather than on grade level.

**Problem Statement 2:** Instructional vetting and professional development is only conducted by instructional administration such as Principal, Assistant Principal, and Instructional Coach. Teachers are not trained to be the instructional leaders on the campus. **Root Cause:** Vetting of assessments and professional development of effective instructional practices are all conducted and presented by the instructional administration. Teachers are not empowered to take ownership in the practices or lead colleagues in the implementation of highly effective strategies, resulting in low buy-in and low implementation.

# Perceptions

## Perceptions Summary

The campus has implemented Positive Behavior Initiatives and Support (PBIS) for the past twelve years. Behavior incidents have been reduced since last year as well as the number of suspensions.

Teachers are creative, open, and willing to share ideas about innovative ways to improve the school climate, culture, and student academics on campus.

Teachers participate in committees that develop positive student interaction and align our campus in academics.

The campus culture is one of shared leadership for all staff. The culture promotes creating experts on campus in different areas that support student achievement.

Campus programs are in place to recognize staff members contributing to attaining campus goals, recognizing outstanding students in the areas of academics, behavior, growth, and attendance.

Teacher time is valued by providing planning time every six weeks during the day for teachers to have more of a work life balance.

Building relationships between all stakeholders is one key action that our FACE Specialist leads. As our FACE Specialist builds open lines of communication we develop opportunities for parental involvement. Face Specialist to work with parents based on needs and interests for the benefit of the children's successes RSP provides a Positive Safe environment for ALL by utilizing the red carpet training strategies that were provided by the district. Build relationships among family, community members, and school staff that foster trust and collaboration through academic activities.

## Perceptions Strengths

Campus-wide culture and climate are positive and supportive of students and colleagues.

Increase in parent/teacher communication.

Outside city agencies partner with RSP (San Antonio PD, Texas A&M Agrilife Program, SA YES, BOOKS are Fun, Food Bank)

All communication is sent home in English and Spanish as well as presentations and meetings.

PBIS Program with systems to recognize students, reinforce positive interactions, and connect staff and students.

Social Worker food pantry and clothing closet for families.



## **Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs**

**Problem Statement 1:** Insight survey reflects -1.6 variance in the district average in professional development that is beneficial to improved instructional practice. **Root Cause:** Professional development focused on systems and tasks rather than instructional practices based on student data.

**Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized):** Insight survey reflect -1.0 variance in the district average in instructional planning for student growth. **Root Cause:** Instructional leaders review student assessments and teacher lesson plans; however, there is not a system for reviewing student work samples on a regular feedback to provide feedback to teachers.

# Priority Problem Statements

**Problem Statement 5:** Campus EOY ADA was 88%.

**Root Cause 5:** There was not a system utilized to track and follow up on student attendance and tardies. Student attendance was not tracked daily and families were not contacted regarding student attendance.

**Problem Statement 5 Areas:** Demographics

**Problem Statement 1:** Student achievement in math (21% meets) falls below the district performance objective goal of 38%.

**Root Cause 1:** Mathematics instruction has focused on below grade level instruction to fill student gaps. Professional development is needed to refine targeted intervention practices and intentional small group learning while making Tier 1 instruction at grade level standards.

**Problem Statement 1 Areas:** Student Learning

**Problem Statement 3:** Teacher response to student data/performance does not always align to grade level standards.

**Root Cause 3:** Tier 1 instruction focus on filling instructional gaps of previous grade levels before addressing grade level standards. Therefore, pacing of teaching grade level standards is behind and majority of instruction is spent teaching below grade level rather than on grade level.

**Problem Statement 3 Areas:** School Processes & Programs

**Problem Statement 6:** Misalignment of student work to grade level standards prevents all students from meeting grade level expectations.

**Root Cause 6:** Student lesson activities and assignments are not aligned to the verb and concept of the standard. Student work reflects below grade level work resulting in students not being exposed to the depth of knowledge expected of students according to the grade level standard. As a result student achievement meeting their grade level expectations is below 50%.

**Problem Statement 6 Areas:** Student Learning

**Problem Statement 7:** Insight survey reflect -1.0 variance in the district average in instructional planning for student growth.

**Root Cause 7:** Instructional leaders review student assessments and teacher lesson plans; however, there is not a system for reviewing student work samples on a regular feedback to provide feedback to teachers.

**Problem Statement 7 Areas:** Perceptions

**Problem Statement 2:** While the campus follows many effective data collection and disaggregation procedures, data driven instruction tier 1 instruction is below grade level expectations.

**Root Cause 2:** Data reflects student learning gaps and the instructional practice is to address those learning gaps although they are below the student's current grade level. Professional development on how to plan and address pre-requisite skills needed to access grade level standards within a grade appropriate lesson is needed.

**Problem Statement 2 Areas:** Student Learning

**Problem Statement 4:** As a district, 35% of students are at meeting grade-level in reading and 22% in math. 30% of students are meeting grade level expectations in all tested content

areas.

**Root Cause 4:** As a district, we need to improve systems that involve assessments, how we evaluate the results of the assessments, and how we create targeted intervention plans for students with gaps in grade-level readiness.

**Problem Statement 4 Areas:** Student Learning

# Goals

**Goal 1: INCREASE STUDENTS ATTENDING HIGH-QUALITY SCHOOLS**

1a: Increase the District overall grade under State Accountability and the percent of campuses rated Accomplished or Higher on the SAISD School Performance Framework (SPF)

**Performance Objective 1:** Increase student achievement from an F to a D/C.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** MAP, STAAR, Circle, APA, and SLO

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> Provide targeted professional development on on aligned lesson planning, student activities, and assessment to the TEKS.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> DFAs, STAAR, MAP, Circle, APA, SLO, and Campus Assessment</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Administrators, Instructional Coach, Teachers</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 2:</b> Purchase aligned resources, materials, and assessments in all core content areas aligned to grade level TEKS.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> DFAs, STAAR, MAP, Circle, APA, SLO, and Campus Assessment</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Administrators, Instructional Coach, Teachers</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

**Title I:**

2.4, 2.6

**- TEA Priorities:**

Improve low-performing schools


**- ESF Levers:**


Lever 5: Effective Instruction

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4

**Funding Sources:** Math, reading and science resources - 164 - State Compensatory Education (SCE) - \$3,000

 No Progress

 Accomplished

 Continue/Modify

 Discontinue

**Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:**

**Student Learning**





**Problem Statement 4:** As a district, 35% of students are at meeting grade-level in reading and 22% in math. 30% of students are meeting grade level expectations in all tested content areas. **Root Cause:** As a district, we need to improve systems that involve assessments, how we evaluate the results of the assessments, and how we create targeted intervention plans for students with gaps in grade-level readiness.

**Goal 1: INCREASE STUDENTS ATTENDING HIGH-QUALITY SCHOOLS**

1a: Increase the District overall grade under State Accountability and the percent of campuses rated Accomplished or Higher on the SAISD School Performance Framework (SPF)

**Performance Objective 2:** Increase family participation under campus programming facilitated by the FACE specialist to engage learners beyond the school day and connect families with strategies and resources to support their children.

- Evaluation Data Sources:** Sign-In sheets  
 Agendas  
 Surveys  
 Parent feedback  
 Parent Newsletter Connection Analysis





Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> Host monthly parent engagement events aligned to the academic and social emotional needs of the campus to leverage family involvement in the whole child development.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> Parent/Student Surveys                      Title 1 Agendas</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Principal                      AP                      Counselor                      Social Worker                      FACE Specialist</p> <p><b>Title I:</b>                      2.4, 4.2</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b>                      Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b>                      Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress                           Accomplished                           Continue/Modify                           Discontinue                 </p>				

**Goal 2: ENSURE PROFICIENCY**

2a: Increase the percent of students kinder ready in Reading & Math (as identified by MAP BOY or subsequent State assessments)

**Performance Objective 1:** Utilize data from the Circle and MAP assessment to provide individualized instruction and intervention for Pre-K and Kinder students to meet EOY Circle standards and MAP RIT Goals aligned with Campus Performance Objects.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** MAP  
Pre-K CIRCLE Assessment

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> The campus will improve alignment to state standards in core instruction. The campus will promote At-home learning activities tailored to students by the Circle and MAP Assessments and provide families with materials to support at-home learning. The campus will provide teachers planning time to construct TEKS aligned lesson plans with student activities, daily formative assessments for diverse learners.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> MAP Circle DFAs Campus Assessments</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Principal AP Instructional Coach Teachers</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	Review content area			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue         </div> </div>				

**Goal 3: ENSURE PROFICIENCY**

2b: Increase the percent of Grade 3 students on grade level in Reading & Math STAAR

**Performance Objective 1:** Increase the percentage of 3rd-grade students achieving grade-level expectations on STAAR from 28% to 40% in reading and from 21% to 40% in math.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR

MAP

DFA

CBAAs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> The campus will improve alignment to state standards in core instruction. The campus will provide time for families, students, and teachers to review MAP Data for their students and lead students in setting goals and presenting it to their families.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> Data Binders MAP STAAR Simulation DFA</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Teachers IC Counselor Admin</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.6, 4.2</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June



Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 2:</b> The campus will provide teachers planning time to deconstruct TEKS, align lesson plans, develop aligned student activities, daily formative assessments for diverse learners, and analyze student data to drive instruction.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> DFA MAP CBAs</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Teachers IC Counselor Admin</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 3:</b> The school will host content specific events that promote reading and math support at home. Instructional materials will be provided to families that may be implemented at home to support achievement of students in reading and math.</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

**KPI/Metric/Measure:** Parent Survey

MAP

DFAs

CBAs

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers

IC

Counselor

Librarian

FACE Specialist

**Title I:**

2.4, 2.6, 4.2

- **TEA Priorities:**

Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

- **ESF Levers:**

Lever 3: Positive School Culture

- **Targeted Support Strategy**



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue





**Goal 4: ENSURE PROFICIENCY**

2c: Increase the percent of all students on grade level (all grades/all subjects at the Meets grade level standard)

**Performance Objective 1:** Increase the percentage of student performance at Meets from 31% to 40% in reading, 21% to 35% in Math, and 11% to 25% in Science on STAAR.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** STAAR  
 MAP  
 DFAs  
 CBAs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> Provide teachers professional development on real-time feedback, assessment building, and Tier 1 instruction planning and implementation for content areas.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> STAAR                      MAP</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Teachers                      IC                      Admin</p> <p><b>Title I:</b>                      2.4, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b>                      Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b>                      Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 2:</b> Ensure teachers and students are utilizing high quality assessment tools such as NWEA MAP in all tested content areas.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> MAP STAAR</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Teachers IC Admin</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.5, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <span> No Progress</span> <span> Accomplished</span> <span> Continue/Modify</span> <span> Discontinue</span> </div>				

**Goal 4: ENSURE PROFICIENCY**





2c: Increase the percent of all students on grade level (all grades/all subjects at the Meets grade level standard)

**Performance Objective 2:** Increase the percentage of student performance at Tier 1 from 42% to 60% in Kinder reading, from 28% to 50% in 1st grade reading, and from 44% to 60% in 2nd grade reading and from 81% to 90% in kinder math, from 37% to 50% in 1st grade math, and from 39% to 50% in 2nd grade math on MAP in grades K-2.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** MAP

DFAs

CBAs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> Provide professional development in the areas of reading on the Science of Teaching Reading to support student proficiency in reading and comprehension.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> MAP Growth and Fluency, DFA, TELPAS</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Admin, Instructional Coach, Teachers</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 2:</b> Provide professional development, planning time, Math Workshop and Guided Math training to teachers.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> MAP Growth, DFAs, CBAs</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> Admin, IC, Teachers</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>- <b>Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability</b></p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <span> No Progress</span> <span> Accomplished</span> <span> Continue/Modify</span> <span> Discontinue</span> </div>				

**Goal 5: ENSURE PROFICIENCY**

2d: Increase % on-time, 4-year Graduation and decrease Dropout Rates

**Goal 6: CULTIVATE HIGH-PERFORMING STUDENTS**

3a: Increase the percent of Grade 8 students earning HS credit

**Goal 7: CULTIVATE HIGH-PERFORMING STUDENTS**

3b: Increase the percent of HS students earning college credit (AP, IB, DC, etc.)



**Goal 8: TARGETED FOCUS ON POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS**  
4a: Increase the % meeting TSI/SAT/ACT college-ready performance

**Goal 9: TARGETED FOCUS ON POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS**

4b: Increase the % of HS students College, Career, & Military Ready (CCMR)

**Goal 10: TARGETED FOCUS ON POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS**





4c: Increase the percent of graduates attending College

**Goal 11:** District Purchases for Campuses Monitored at the District Level - ENSURE PROFICIENCY

2c: Increase the percent of all students on grade level (all grades/all subjects at the Meets grade level standard)

**Performance Objective 1:** By the end of 2022-2023, student grade level readiness will increase by 5%, the 4 year graduation rate will increase to 85.4% and the CCMR rate to 75%.

**Evaluation Data Sources:** CBE Results, MAP results, PSAT results, SAT results, ACT results, retention rates, drop out rates, and graduation rates

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p><b>Strategy 1:</b> Campuses will implement the MAP assessment platform and conduct an assessment at the beginning, middle, and end of the year.</p> <p><b>KPI/Metric/Measure:</b> By the end of 2022-2023, the grade-level ready ratings will increase by 5%</p> <p><b>Staff Responsible for Monitoring:</b> SAISD Testing and Evaluation Staff with assistance from campus counselors</p> <p><b>Title I:</b> 2.4, 2.5, 2.6</p> <p>- <b>TEA Priorities:</b> Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- <b>ESF Levers:</b> Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p><b>Problem Statements:</b> Student Learning 4</p> <p><b>Funding Sources:</b> MAP Assessment Platform - 164 - State Compensatory Education (SCE) - \$4,636</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	Empty review cells			
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress                   Accomplished                   Continue/Modify                   Discontinue         </p>				

**Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:**

<b>Student Learning</b>
<p><b>Problem Statement 4:</b> As a district, 35% of students are at meeting grade-level in reading and 22% in math. 30% of students are meeting grade level expectations in all tested content areas. <b>Root Cause:</b> As a district, we need to improve systems that involve assessments, how we evaluate the results of the assessments, and how we create targeted intervention plans for students with gaps in grade-level readiness.</p>

# Title I

## 1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

### 1.1: Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The CNA was reviewed on 8/23/22 by the following individuals:

Azaela Ortiz, Teacher

Petra Perryman, Teacher

Melissa Torres, Teacher

Christina Carrender, Teacher

Alma Hernandez, Teacher

Nonnie Harris-Cohen, Teacher

Gamaliel Rodriguez, Instructional Coach

Nicole Washington, Assistant Principal

Andrea Pitts, Principal

Bianca Longoria, Data Clerk

Vanessa Trevino, Secretary

Ashley Massey, Parent

## 2. Campus Improvement Plan

### 2.1: Campus Improvement Plan developed with appropriate stakeholders

The CNA was reviewed on 8/23/22 by the following individuals:

Azaela Ortiz, Teacher

Petra Perryman, Teacher

Melissa Torres, Teacher

Christina Carrender, Teacher

Alma Hernandez, Teacher

Nonnie Harris-Cohen, Teacher

Gamaliel Rodriguez, Instructional Coach

Nicole Washington, Assistant Principal

Andrea Pitts, Principal

Bianca Longoria, Data Clerk

Vanessa Trevino, Secretary

Ashley Massey, Parent

## **2.2: Regular monitoring and revision**

8/23/22

11/29/22

1/24/23

4/25/23

6/1/23

## **2.3: Available to parents and community in an understandable format and language**

CIP is available on campus in the Main Office and during parent meetings.

The CIP is available in English and Spanish.

## **3. Annual Evaluation**

## **4. Parent and Family Engagement (PFE)**

## **5. Targeted Assistance Schools Only**

# Campus Funding Summary

164 - State Compensatory Education (SCE)					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	Math, reading and science resources		\$3,000.00
11	1	1	MAP Assessment Platform		\$4,636.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>					<b>\$7,636.00</b>