Keller Independent School District Friendship Elementary School 2023-2024 Improvement Plan



Mission Statement

Friendship Elementary will create a partnership with parents and community that will empower all students to achieve high standards of individual academic growth and excellence of character through diverse educational opportunities.

Vision

"Friendship ROCKS!"

Keller ISD and Friendship Elementary, an exceptional district and campus in which to learn, work and live.

Motto: Intentionally Exceptional!

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	6
School Processes & Programs	7
Perceptions	8
Priority Problem Statements	9
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	10
Goals	12
Goal 1: Increase Student Achievement	12
Goal 2: Increase student, parent, and community engagement	17
State Compensatory	21
Budget for Friendship Elementary School	21
Personnel for Friendship Elementary School	21
Campus Funding Summary	22

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Our campus is a Title I campus comprised of approximately 543 Pre K-4th grade students. The enrollment for Friendship Elementary, as indicated on the 2022-2023 PEIMS snapshot report, was 543 students, slightly more from the previous academic school year. Our student ethnic distribution is African American 26.1%, Hispanic 23.0%, White 33.5%, Asian 8.6% and 2 or more Races 8.8%. In considering student participation in programs, at-risk 25.2%, 11.6% Section 504, 17.1% Emerging bilingual, 23.5% Special Education and 3.7% Gifted and Talented. Student mobility is defined as a student who has been in membership at the school for less than 83% of the school year (i.e., has missed six or more weeks at a particular school). The student mobility rate for Friendship Elementary is _____% (2020 TAPR). Students come from the community of Fort Worth and across the district for services such as Pre-Kindergarten or Special Education.

Teacher Ethnic Distribution is as follows (2021-2022 TAPR):

African American	2.4%
Hispanic	14.6%
White	82.9%
American Indian	0%
Asian	0%
Pacific Islander	0%
2 or More Races	0%

Student to Teacher ratio is 13.0 to 1. This ratio shows we meet the standard for performance and is below both district and state percentages.

Friendship Elementary Staff Demographics (2021-2022 TAPR) - Teachers by Years of Experience:

Beginning Teachers	2.4%
1-5 Years	32.7%
6-10 Years	29%
11-20 Years	32.9%
Over 20 years	3.0%

Campus programs include: Pre-Kindergarten (GenEd and ECSE 2), STACC, STARS, ESL, Gifted and Talented, Dyslexia, and Resource.

Demographics Strengths

- Our student population is diverse.
- We provide on-site programs with specially certified teachers to meet the needs of our students: Pre-Kindergarten, Special Education
- 8 professional staff members hold a Master's degree
- 20 staff members have ESL certifications
- Shared decision making through PLCs
- 37% our professional staff have 11-20 years of experience
- Average years of experience of teachers 9.3 years
- Average years of experience of teachers with district 6.4 years

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): There has been an increase in students enrolled in programs which require specialized support to address varying academic, behavior, and emotional needs **Root Cause:** Students were under-identified and have greater needs than in years past.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Grades K-4 continuted to implement LLI for reading intervention during the fall and spring semester. Students, K-4, worked on Istation for Math and Reading support this year. Teachers were able to pull reports to pinpoint instructional needs and facilitate small groups and tutoring based on needs. We have utilized MAP Growth Testing for Reading and Math.

MAP Student Growth Summary Report Fall 2022-Spring 2023 (Math and Reading K-4)

Median Student Growth Percentile

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	55%	68*
First Grade	26.5%	41%
Second Grade	71%	58%
Third Grade	70%	85%
Fourth Grade	55%	71%

Student Learning Strengths

We met our CIP goals for 2021-2022 of 53% of students will met or exceed their EOY growth projections for math and 67% for reading campus-wide.

Kinder, 2nd, and 3rd grades exceeded campus growth projection goals in reading.

Kinder, 3rd, and 4th grades exceeded campus growth projection goals in math.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Students are not making expected growth in reading when compared to math. **Root Cause:** Students have learning gaps in foundational reading skills. Teachers do not consistently use strategy or guided reading groups to meet student needs and help them learn to generalize skills.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Our campus consists of Pre Kindergarten-4th for the 2023-2023 school year. Each grade level follows the district curriculum and scope and sequence. Early literacy curriculum uses Letterland (Pre-Kinder) and Reading Horizons (K-3) as a phonics resource and Heggerty as a phonemic awareness resource in grades K-2. All grade level teams intentionally plan with end goals in mind and meet for collaborative planning at least quarterly. Our staff is comfortable using technology for instructional and intervention purposes. PreK, Kinder and 1st grades utilized Seesaw as an online platform while 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades utilize Google Classroom. Additionally, programs such as iStation, MAP, Raz Kids, Brainpop and other KISD supported programs are used for instructional purposes with students. Technology is used for communication with parents and colleagues, lesson planning, and access to district resources and digital learning. Additionally, we are a 1:1 campus with all students having access to an iPad for instruction. Staff has quick access to data to evaluate the students' performance. Campus implementation of Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS) will be implemented using PBIS Rewards as a resource in 2022-2023.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- Implementation of district curriculum following scope and sequence
- Reading, Writing and Math Workshop models are the frameworks of learning.
- Teacher and student support is available
- · Master Schedule minimizes instructional interruptions with pullouts and keeps teams together
- Data meetings allow for teachers to identify students in academic and behavioral need and work on plans to close gaps
- Campus faculty and staff share a passion and dedication to providing relevant and engaging learning opportunities for students.
- Technology needs are addressed at the campus level

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): There is inconsistent implementation of the PBIS system across the campus. **Root Cause:** Not all staff have had sufficient training on PBIS and additional training is needed to support students with Tier 2 and Tier 3 behaviors.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Students continue to lag behind academically despite interventions and tutoring efforts. **Root Cause:** Formative and summative assessment data is not analyzed regularly to drive Tier I instructional decisions.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Data is gathered from areas of parent and staff climate, and from discipline records, volunteer logs, and Title 1 parent surveys and needs in the overall climate and family/community involvement at Friendship Elementary. We started collecting data in regards to parent perceptions of school events. Morning meetings are used with students to develop healthier peer relations and increase social emotional intelligence. Parents have identified an area of support needed as academic support, specifically in regards to teacher communication regarding what their students are learning and how parents can help from home. Friendship Elementary has a need for continued PTA leadership and increased PTA participation as well as staff participation expectations at family engagement events. We continue to struggle with consistent involvement in our academic-content related events. Our CEIC and academic events are sparsely attended. We utilized the results from our parent surveys to increase participation in our academic events.

Perceptions Strengths

- Students, parents, and staff "agree" or "strongly agree" that our campus is safe place and that we promote and work toward academic success for all students.
- Community partnerships with Horace Mann and Doxology Church.
- School Environment (Surveys show that 100% of staff feel like they belong on campus)
- Cultural Night in the Spring is the favorite event between both staff and families

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Parent involvement in academic-related school activities remains lower than PTA and culture-related school activities. **Root Cause:** Limited communication to parent regarding focus, agendas and importance of attending academic-related school activities and the direct impact on their child's academic achievement/growth.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Teachers and staff do not feel as though students behave in a way that instruction can happen in the classroom. **Root Cause:** Students lack self regulation and social skills. Classroom management and student discipline are not consistent across the campus.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: There has been an increase in students enrolled in programs which require specialized support to address varying academic, behavior, and emotional needs

Root Cause 1: Students were under-identified and have greater needs than in years past.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Teachers and staff do not feel as though students behave in a way that instruction can happen in the classroom.

Root Cause 2: Students lack self regulation and social skills. Classroom management and student discipline are not consistent across the campus.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Parent involvement in academic-related school activities remains lower than PTA and culture-related school activities.

Root Cause 3: Limited communication to parent regarding focus, agendas and importance of attending academic-related school activities and the direct impact on their child's academic achievement/growth.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 4: Students continue to lag behind academically despite interventions and tutoring efforts.

Root Cause 4: Formative and summative assessment data is not analyzed regularly to drive Tier I instructional decisions.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: There is inconsistent implementation of the PBIS system across the campus.

Root Cause 5: Not all staff have had sufficient training on PBIS and additional training is needed to support students with Tier 2 and Tier 3 behaviors.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Students are not making expected growth in reading when compared to math.

Root Cause 6: Students have learning gaps in foundational reading skills. Teachers do not consistently use strategy or guided reading groups to meet student needs and help them learn to generalize skills.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Student Learning

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- Campus goals
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)

Accountability Data

Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- Local benchmark or common assessments data
- Running Records results
- Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) reading assessment data for Grades PK-2
- Texas approved Prekindergarten and Kindergarten assessment data
- Other PreK 2nd grade assessment data
- State-developed online interim assessments
- Grades that measure student performance based on the TEKS

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
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- · Gifted and talented data
- Dvslexia data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Discipline records
- Student surveys and/or other feedback
- School safety data

Employee Data

• Professional learning communities (PLC) data

- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- T-TESS data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent engagement rate

Support Systems and Other Data

- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices

Goals

Goal 1: Increase Student Achievement

Performance Objective 1: By June 2024, the percent of 3rd grade students hitting the "meets standard" rating in reading will be at 60% as measured by the STAAR assessments.

Action Step 1 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 1: Quarterly teachers will meet with instructional coaches to develop a reading instructional plan for the grade level to identify		Progress	
priority TEKS, common assessment dates, and artifacts that will demonstrate student growth and proficiency to campus administration. Measures: Grade level RLA instructional plans, student growth and achievement data	Dec	Apr	July
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, instructional coaches, classroom teachers			
Title I: 2.4, 2.5, 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 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			
Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 2			
Funding Sources: - 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg - \$88,127			

Action Step 2 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 2: Teachers will collect and analyze student data (including MAP, reading level assessments, ISIP and summative assessments)		Progress	
to monitor student growth and achievement in reading.	Dec	Apr	July
Measures: Student growth and achievement			
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, instructional coaches, classroom teachers			
Title I:			
2.4, 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			
Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 2			
Funding Sources: - 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg - \$4,000			
Action Step 3 Details	Pro	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 3: Provide targeted intervention support for students performing below level in reading using small group instruction,		Progress	
Intervention Support Teachers (IST), and campus instructional staff.	Dec	Apr	July
Measures: Student growth and achievement			
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, instructional coaches, classroom teachers, ISTs			
Title I:			
2.4, 2.5, 2.6			
- TEA Priorities:			
Build a foundation of reading and math			
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1			
·			

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: There has been an increase in students enrolled in programs which require specialized support to address varying academic, behavior, and emotional needs **Root Cause**: Students were under-identified and have greater needs than in years past.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Students are not making expected growth in reading when compared to math. **Root Cause**: Students have learning gaps in foundational reading skills. Teachers do not consistently use strategy or guided reading groups to meet student needs and help them learn to generalize skills.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Students continue to lag behind academically despite interventions and tutoring efforts. **Root Cause**: Formative and summative assessment data is not analyzed regularly to drive Tier I instructional decisions.

Goal 1: Increase Student Achievement

Performance Objective 2: By June 2024, the percent of 3rd grade students hitting the "meets standard" rating in math will be at 60% as measured by the STAAR assessments.

Action Step 1 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ews
Action Step 1: Quarterly teachers will meet with instructional coaches to develop a math instructional plan for the grade level to identify	Progress		
priority TEKS, common assessment dates, and artifacts that will demonstrate student growth and proficiency to campus administration.	Dec	Apr	July
Measures: Grade level math instructional plans, student growth and achievement data		P-	July
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, instructional coaches, classroom teachers			
Title I:			
2.4, 2.5, 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 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			
Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 2			
Action Step 2 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ews
Action Step 2: Teachers will collect and analyze student data (including MAP, reading level assessments, ISIP and summative assessments)		Progress	
to monitor student growth and achievement in math.	Dec	Apr	July
Measures: Student growth and achievement	Dec	Apı	July
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, instructional coaches, classroom teachers			
Title I:			
2.4, 2.6			
- TEA Priorities:			
Build a foundation of reading and math			
- ESF Levers:			
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			
Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 2			
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify X Discontinu	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: There has been an increase in students enrolled in programs which require specialized support to address varying academic, behavior, and emotional needs **Root Cause**: Students were under-identified and have greater needs than in years past.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Students are not making expected growth in reading when compared to math. **Root Cause**: Students have learning gaps in foundational reading skills. Teachers do not consistently use strategy or guided reading groups to meet student needs and help them learn to generalize skills.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Students continue to lag behind academically despite interventions and tutoring efforts. **Root Cause**: Formative and summative assessment data is not analyzed regularly to drive Tier I instructional decisions.

Goal 2: Increase student, parent, and community engagement

Performance Objective 1: Establish and maintain systematic communication between students, families, and the school.

Action Step 1 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 1: Facilitate parent-teacher conferences to inform parents of their child's progress and build partnership for their child's success.		Progress	
Measures: Parent Conference Documentation	Dec	Apr	July
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers		1	
Title I:			
4.1			
- TEA Priorities:	I		
Improve low-performing schools	I		
- ESF Levers:	I		
Lever 3: Positive School Culture	1		
Problem Statements: Perceptions 1			
No Progress Continue/Modify X Discontinue	;		

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Parent involvement in academic-related school activities remains lower than PTA and culture-related school activities. **Root Cause**: Limited communication to parent regarding focus, agendas and importance of attending academic-related school activities and the direct impact on their child's academic achievement/growth.

Goal 2: Increase student, parent, and community engagement

Performance Objective 2: By June 2024, the campus will promote parental and community involvement in campus planning and events by promoting a minimum of 3 academic events as measured by Title I documentation and sign-in sheets.

Action Step 1 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ews
on Step 1: Hold parent engagement/involvement events including Literacy Night, Math Night, STEAM Night with Fort Worth Science		Progress	
Museum, Cultural Night, STAAR Parent Night, and Curriculum Nights	Dec	Apr	July
Measures: Attendance/sign-in sheets, Title I EOY survey, student achievement data			,
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, campus committees			
Title I:			
2.4, 4.2			
- TEA Priorities:	ĺ		
Build a foundation of reading and math	ĺ		
- ESF Levers:	1		
Lever 3: Positive School Culture	1		
Funding Sources: - 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg - \$3,000	ĺ		
	1		
No Progress Accomplished — Continue/Modify X Discontinue	e	1	l

Goal 2: Increase student, parent, and community engagement

Performance Objective 3: Establish and promote consistent school-wide positive behavior intervention supports to re-teach and reward desired school behaviors

Action Step 1 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 1: Utilize PBIS Rewards campus-wide to provide a digital platform for rewarding and recognizing student and teacher efforts		Progress	
with positive behaviors	Dec	Apr	July
Measures: PBIS Rewards reports, discipline and classroom data		-	
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration, PBIS Committee			
Title I:			
2.5, 2.6			
- TEA Priorities:			
Improve low-performing schools			
- ESF Levers:			
Lever 3: Positive School Culture			
Funding Sources: - 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg - \$1,850			
Action Step 2 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 2: Provide support to students who demonstrate behaviors that impede the learning of themselves and others using Title I paraprofessional support.	_	Progress	
Measures: FBA Data tracking, Discipline and classroom data	Dec	Apr	July
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration and teachers			
Title I:			
2.5, 2.6			
- TEA Priorities:			
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers:			
Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			
Funding Sources: - 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg - \$52,114			

Action Step 3 Details	Pr	ogress Revie	ws
Action Step 3: Establish PBIS team to create campus-wide routines, procedures, and expectations for common areas and classrooms.		Progress	
Measures: Discipline data, academic growth and achievement data, classroom data.	Dec	Apr	July
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, classroom teachers			-
Title I: 2.4, 2.5 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools			
- ESF Levers: Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction			
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 2			
No Progress Accomplished — Continue/Modify X Discontinue	e		

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: There is inconsistent implementation of the PBIS system across the campus. **Root Cause**: Not all staff have had sufficient training on PBIS and additional training is needed to support students with Tier 2 and Tier 3 behaviors.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Teachers and staff do not feel as though students behave in a way that instruction can happen in the classroom. **Root Cause**: Students lack self regulation and social skills. Classroom management and student discipline are not consistent across the campus.

State Compensatory

Budget for Friendship Elementary School

Total SCE Funds

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 3.75

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Personnel for Friendship Elementary School

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Allison Montague	Intervention Support Teacher	1
Debra Stankewitz	Intervention Support Teacher	1
Laura Cheng	ESL Teacher	0.75
Laura Follett	Intervention Support Teacher	1

Campus Funding Summary

211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg					
Goal	Objective	Action Step	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1			\$88,127.00
1	1	2			\$4,000.00
2	2	1			\$3,000.00
2	3	1			\$1,850.00
2	3	2			\$52,114.00
Sub-Total				\$149,091.00	