Groesbeck Independent School District

District Improvement Plan

2018-2019

Accountability Rating: C

Public Presentation Date: October 15, 2018

Mission Statement

The Mission of Groesbeck ISD is to ensure that every student achieves maximum potential.

Vision

The Vision of Groesbeck ISD it to be an EDUCATIONAL BEACON that exceeds the state's highest standards in all areas of education.

Motto

Every Kid a Winner!

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Groesbeck ISD is a rural 3A district in central Texas. The community consists of the town of Groesbeck and the surrounding area including ranch and farm land. Groesbeck ISD is one of the oldest school districts in Texas and is located near historic Ft. Parker. Groesbeck is home to a coal-based power plant, various small mining enterprises and manufacturing industries. The total assessed property value in the school district has decreased by 48% in the last 8 years.

Currently the district serves 1685 students in grade pre-kindergarten - 12. The number of students has decreased in the past year. During the 2017-18 school year, the student population declined by just over 4%. The student number at the beginning of the 2018-19 school year represents an additional 4% decrease. Groesbeck ISD does accept transfer students who meet attendance and discipline standards. Students are housed in four campuses: H.O. Whitehurst Elementary (PK - 3), Enge-Washington Intermediate School (4-6), Groesbeck Middle School (7-8), and Groesbeck High School (9-12). Groesbeck ISD also serves students who are incarcerated at the Limestone County Juvenile Detention Center. The student population is approximately 56% white; 26% Hispanic; 12% African American; 4% two or more races; and the remaining 2% American Indian, Asian, or Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. The majority of the students (70%) qualify for free or reduced meals. English learners comprise about 5% of the population, and about 11% of the students qualify for special education services. Specific information about performance for students as a whole and specific sub-populations is included in the Academic Achievement section of this report. In an effort to save paper, those results will not be duplicated in this section.

Groesbeck ISD employees 266 individuals of which 123 are teachers and 8 are campus based administrators. Teachers and administrators do meet state certification requirements. The 2017-18 Equity Plan indicated no disparity for teachers with less experience with slightly over 50% of the teachers having 10 or more years of experience. Each campus is also served by at least one licensed school counselor. The district is governed by an elected 7-member Board of Trustees.

Demographics Strengths

Students in all groups exhibited growth as measured by STAAR.

The student graduation rate is 99.1%.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: Average percentage of students who score at the meets grade level is less than 20%. **Root Cause**: Instruction did not meet the level of rigor defined in TEKS.

Student Academic Achievement

Student Academic Achievement Summary

We have chosen to focus at the District level on STAAR scores and College Career and Military Ready measures for Academic Achievement. Campuses will report more specific data beyond STAAR scores. The District does recognize that students are much more than a score on a single high-stakes test or a measure of items defined by the state as indicating college, career, or military readiness. However, the accountability rating for Groesbeck ISD is based upon STAAR scores, the College, Career, and Military Ready measure; and graduation rate.

The Groesbeck ISD overall accountability rating is 76(C) which is met standard.

Student Achievement rating is a 75(C) with STAAR Performance a 65, College Career and Military Readiness a 74, and Graduation Rate a 95.

School Progress is a 79(C) with Academic Growth a 79 and Relative Performance a 74.

Closing the Gaps is a 70(C).

STAAR Performance is measured as the percentage of students who score approaches grade level, meets grade level, and masters grade level. The following chart shows the percentage all students for each test and each sub-population at each of the score levels.

ELAR	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	Two or More	Eco Dis	EL (current)	EL (current and monitored)	Spec. Ed. (Current)	Spec. Ed (Former)	Continuously Enrolled	Non-Continuously Enrolled
Approaches	66	48	60	73	61	59	40	58	25	55	67	62
Meets	36	21	25	44	37	28	0	15	19	27	37	33
Masters	13	4	6	18	15	9	0	3	9	12	12	15
Math												
Approaches	70	52	68	75	79	64	55	70	34	80	70	69
Meets	33	14	27	39	42	26	28	30	14	40	33	33
Masters	13	2	10	17	9	9	3	12	8	17	13	12
Writing												
Approaches	51	36	44	55	77	43	7	33	20	63	50	55
Meets	28	18	42	30	38	21	0	14	17	0	26	32
Masters	6	4	2	8	15	4	0	0	15	0	6	7

Science												
Approaches	69	45	61	78	71	59	33	61	27	67	70	65
Meets	37	13	27	47	36	27	8	17	12	33	37	36
Masters	13	0	8	19	0	6	8	4	4	33	12	14
Social Studies												
Approaches	51	38	36	62	40	41	0	15	19	60	50	53
Meets	20	8	6	31	20	12	0	0	13	0	21	18
Masters	9	0	2	13	20	5	0	0	6	0	9	7

Groesbeck ISD has a 4-year graduation rate of 99.1%. The lowest sub-population graduation rate is 90.9% for African American students; all other sub-populations have a graduation rate of 100%.

Groesbeck had 112 students in the graduation cohort; 50 of those students or 45% met the designation of College, Career, and Military Ready.

School progress is measured by STAAR growth; Groesbeck ISD earned 973 of the possible 1415 growth points available for both ELAR and math.

Closing the Gaps is measured by the number of sub-population groups that meet standard in Academic Achievement, Growth Status, Graduation Rate, English Language Proficiency, Student Success, and School Quality. The chart below gives the number of measures evaluated and the number that met standard.

	Academic Achievement	Growth Status	Graduation Rate Status	English Language Proficiency Status	Student Success Status	School Quality Status
Total Met	1	12	3	1	0	1
Total Evaluated	22	22	3	1	11	5

Student Academic Achievement Strengths

The student Graduation Rate is 99.1%.

Students in all groups exhibited growth as measured by STAAR progress.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Academic Achievement Needs

Problem Statement 1: Special education students do not meet standard on the STAAR assessment. **Root Cause**: Students do not possess the knowledge and skills necessary to meet grade level expectations.

District Processes & Programs

District Processes & Programs Summary

Groesbeck ISD has undergone a leadership change within the last school year including the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, High School Principal, and High School Assistant Principal. The Middle School Principal has taken on new roles and an Assistant Principal was added to the Middle School. The new leadership has undertaken a staffing, PEIMS, special education, and transcript/GPA audit. Recommendations were given in each area, and changes are underway.

Personnel: District positions were evaluated and those that were not necessary were not filled. Beyond that, Groesbeck High School has positions that were not filled due to lack of applicants: Spanish and English teachers. Federal funds were used to Instructional Intervention teachers were added at H.O.Whitehurst Elementary, Enge-Washington Intermediate, and Groesbeck Middle School.

Information Management/PEIMS: A program of training is in place for Information Management personnel. Structures are being built for verification and management of student information. A new system has been implemented for requisitions and purchase orders.

Professional Practices: Ruth Meggs has worked with Enge-Washington and H.O.Whitehurst for the past two years and has taught teachers and administrators how to measure achievement and use data to identify areas of need for individual students. Mrs. Meggs will continue to work with the principals and teachers and the use of student data will be expanded to the Middle School and High School.

Professional Development is planned in consultation with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Campus Administrators, and Teachers. A coordinated schedule of staff development was offered prior to the 2018-19 school year culminating in two weeks of 'on-contract' time staff development in August. Offerings included Purposeful Planning Days for each Grade/Department, Google Classroom, Lead4ward Comprehension Strategies, Lead4ward Review 360 Math, Guided Reading, School Safety Awareness, True Colors, TEKS Resource System Updates, PASS Training, Eduphoria training, and Technology training. Staff were also encouraged to participate in Region 12 offerings such as Gifted and Talented Updates and Pre-kindergarten training. Throughout the school year, staff will continue to participate in Region 12 professional development opportunities; specific conferences are planned such as Lead4ward think! conference which instructional specialists will attend, the Daily 5 training which a delegation of primary teachers will attend, CAST (science) and CAMT (math) annual conference which a selection of subject area teachers will attend, and TEPSA/TASSP which campus administrators will attend. Additionally, grade level teams will meet regularly and district administrators will lead professional development throughout the year. All professional development is designed to support the program of instruction provided to students.

Programs and Opportunities for Students: District administrators have given curriculum non-negotiables for the 2018-19 school year. Teachers must use TEKS Resource System and specifically the Year-at-a-Glance, Instructional Focus Document, and Performance Assessments. Campus administrators monitor the teachers use of TEKS Resource System through lesson plans and classroom observations. Support for the use of TEKS Resource System is provided to teachers through the TExGuide, an online library of support materials organized to support TEKS Resource System. Primary grade teachers have undertaken two major changes for instruction: 1)all classes are self-contained, and 2)the Daily 5 model of instruction is being used for English/Language Arts and Reading. Additional support for early intervention and individual/small group instruction has been put in place this year with the addition of instructional interventionists at H.O. Whitehurst, Enge-Washington, and Groesbeck Middle School. A formal RtI process is in place that includes student assessment and evaluation paired with individual, targeted intervention as indicated. Students in grades 6-12 are issued a chromebook for the school year. Students take this chromebook to and from school and have this device to use in the classroom and at home. Through the Technology Lending Grant, internet hotspots have been added to targeted school buses to allow students who ride long routes to and from school to work on homework while in transit and to allow students who are traveling for school sponsored activities or field trips to work on school work. Students in grade K-5 are not personally issued a chromebook; these students do have access to devices in the classroom.

District Processes & Programs Strengths

Defined curriculum available in TEKS Resource System. Specific support provided through TExGuide.

Primary classrooms now are self-contained and are implementing the Daily 5 framework for ELAR instruction.

Professional development targeted to meet instructional needs.

Problem Statements Identifying District Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1: The average percentage of students scoring at the masters grade level is below 20%. **Root Cause**: Instruction does not consistently meet the level of rigor defined in TEKS.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

The district attendance rate for the 2017-18 school year was 94.6%. This low attendance rate coupled with the decline in enrollment have directly impacted the district budget. Specific actions are planned to raise awareness about the importance of school attendance and to increase the student attendance rate.

The DAEP school day was shorter than the traditional campus and could have been viewed as a benefit for committing an offense that places a student in DAEP.

No campus met the designation of persistently dangerous.

Perceptions Strengths

All campuses met the definition of a safe campus.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: Student attendance rate of 94.6% was below state average. **Root Cause**: Students and families do not understand the importance of daily school attendance.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Current and/or prior year(s) campus and/or district improvement plans
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Domain 1 - Student Achievement
- Performance Index Framework Data: Index 1 - Student Achievement
- Domain 2 - Student Progress
- Performance Index Framework Data: Index 2 - Student Progress
- Domain 3 - Closing the Gaps
- Performance Index Framework Data: Index 3 - Closing Performance Gaps
- Performance Index Framework Data: Index 4 - Postsecondary Readiness
- Critical Success Factor(s) data
- Accountability Distinction Designations
- PBMAS data

Student Data: Assessments

- 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
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) results
- Texas Success Initiative (TSI) data for postsecondary/college-ready graduates data
- Student Success Initiative (SSI) data for Grades 5 and 8

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each group
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) data, including academic achievement, program growth, race, ethnicity, gender, etc.

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Completion rates and/or graduation rates data
- Attendance data

Employee Data

- State certified and high quality staff data

Goals

Goal 1: All students exceeding state and federal performance standards

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of Special Education students scoring at the approaches grade level will increase by 10%.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: STAAR Score Reports
Eduphoria Reports
PBMAS Report

Summative Evaluation 1:

TEA Priorities: 2. Build a foundation of reading and math.

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews		
				Dec	Feb	May
PBMAS **Critical Success Factors** CSF 1 CSF 4 1) Special education inclusion teachers and general education teachers will work cooperatively to provide grade level instruction with accommodations to students who qualify for special education services.	2.4, 2.6	Principals, Director of Special Programs	Special education students will increase the percentage who score approaches grade level.			
	Problem Statements: Student Academic Achievement 1					
PBMAS **Critical Success Factors** CSF 1 CSF 2 2) Teachers will utilize TEKS Resource System components consistently including the Year-at-a-Glance, the Instructional Focus Document, and the Performance Assessments.	2.5	Principals, Assistant Principals	The percentage of special education students scoring at the approaches grade level will increase by 10%.			
	Problem Statements: Student Academic Achievement 1 Funding Sources: General Fund - 20000.00					
= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue						

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Academic Achievement

Problem Statement 1: Special education students do not meet standard on the STAAR assessment. **Root Cause 1**: Students do not possess the knowledge and skills necessary to meet grade level expectations.

Goal 1: All students exceeding state and federal performance standards

Performance Objective 2: The percentage of all students and each sub-population of students who score meets grade level will be greater than 20%

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: STAAR score reports
Eduphoria reports

Summative Evaluation 2:

TEA Priorities: 2. Build a foundation of reading and math.

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews		
				Dec	Feb	May
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 4 1) Primary grade level teachers will implement the Daily 5 structure for teaching English/Language Arts and Reading.	2.5	Elementary Principal and Assistant Principal	The percentage of students who score meets grade level will be greater than 20%.			
	Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1					
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 2) Teachers will utilize TEKS Resource System components consistently including the Year-at-a-Glance, the Instructional Focus Document, and the Performance Assessments.	2.4	Principals and Assistant Principals	The percentage of students who score meets grade level will be greater than 20%.			
	Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1					
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 CSF 3 CSF 4 3) Teachers will continue to use the district selected writing process and will receive updated training as appropriate.	2.4, 2.5, 2.6	Assistant Superintendent, Principals	The percentage of students who score meets grade level will be greater than 20%.			
	Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1					

= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: The average percentage of students scoring at the masters grade level is below 20%. **Root Cause 1**: Instruction does not consistently meet the level of rigor defined in TEKS.

Goal 1: All students exceeding state and federal performance standards

Performance Objective 3: At least 75% of the STAAR tests will show student growth or maintenance of masters grade level of achievement.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 3: STAAR score reports
Accountability Reports

Summative Evaluation 3:

TEA Priorities: 4. Improve low-performing schools.

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews		
				Dec	Feb	May
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 1) The RtI program will be evaluated and updated as needed to meet state requirements and the needs of the students.	2.4	Assistant Superintendent, Director of Special Programs, Principals, Instructional Interventionists.	At least 75% of the STAAR tests will show student growth or maintenance of masters grade level of achievement.			
	Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1					
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 2) Instructional Interventionists will be hired to provide targeted instruction to identified students.	2.4	Assistant Superintendent, Principals, Instructional Interventionists	At least 75% of the STAAR tests will show student growth or maintenance of masters grade level of achievement.			
	Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1					
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 7 3) Master schedules will reflect time for targeted interventions and teachers assigned to specific tutorials.	2.5	Campus Administration	At least 75% of the STAAR tests will show student growth or maintenance of masters grade level of achievement.			
	Problem Statements: Demographics 1					
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 CSF 3 CSF 4 CSF 7 4) Data will be kept on each student grades K-exit level EOC to show mastery of skills and/or progress on state assessments in the form of a War Board, War Room or Digital Data Notebook and will be used to target instruction.	2.4	Campus Principals	At least 75% of the STAAR tests will show student growth or maintenance of masters grade level of achievement.			
	Problem Statements: Demographics 1					

Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 4 5) The District will use state compensatory funding and Title I funding to support at-risk students through tutorials, STAAR prep and SUCCESS classes, inclusion aides, and content mastery.	2.4, 2.5	Assistant Superintendent, Director of Special Programs, Principals	At least 75% of the STAAR tests will show student growth or maintenance of masters grade level of achievement.			
= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue						

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Average percentage of students who score at the meets grade level is less than 20%. **Root Cause 1**: Instruction did not meet the level of rigor defined in TEKS.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: The average percentage of students scoring at the masters grade level is below 20%. **Root Cause 1**: Instruction does not consistently meet the level of rigor defined in TEKS.

Goal 2: Supportive parents and community members proactively involved in the education of our students

Performance Objective 1: The District and campuses will provide regular communication to stakeholders.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: District Website
Newsletters
Social Media
Remind

Summative Evaluation 1:

TEA Priorities: 4. Improve low-performing schools.

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews		
				Dec	Feb	May
Critical Success Factors CSF 5 1) Principals and teachers will create and utilize Remind accounts to communicate with parents and students.		Principals	Regular communication will be provided to stakeholders.			
Critical Success Factors CSF 5 2) District and campus staff will use electronic platforms such as websites and social media sites to distribute information to stakeholders.		Superintendent, Administrative Assistant, Principals	Regular communication will be provided to stake holders.			

= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue

Goal 2: Supportive parents and community members proactively involved in the education of our students

Performance Objective 2: Student attendance rate for the district will increase from 94.6% to at least 95.1%.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: Student attendance reports

Summative Evaluation 2:

TEA Priorities: 4. Improve low-performing schools.

<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Strategy Description</th><th rowspan="2">ELEMENTS</th><th rowspan="2">Monitor</th><th rowspan="2">Strategy's Expected Result/Impact</th><th colspan="3">Formative Reviews</th></tr>
<tr><th>Dec</th><th>Feb</th><th>May</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Critical Success Factors
CSF 4 CSF 5

1) Campuses will work with parents and students to create Truancy Prevention Plans.</td><td>2.5</td><td>Principals, Assistant Principals.</td><td>The students attendance rate will be at least 95.1%.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Problem Statements: Perceptions 1</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Critical Success Factors
CSF 4 CSF 5

2) Campuses will enforce state attendance laws in regards to course credit and truancy.</td><td>2.5</td><td>Principals, Assistant Principals</td><td>The student attendance rate will be at least 95.1%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Problem Statements: Perceptions 1</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Critical Success Factors
CSF 4

3) School personnel will increase awareness among students, parents, and community members of the importance of regular school attendance through social media posts, school newsletters, personal communication.</td><td>2.5</td><td>Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Principals, Assistant Principals</td><td>The student attendance rate will be at least 95.1%.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Problem Statements: Perceptions 1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="7">= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue</td></tr>
</table>

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Student attendance rate of 94.6% was below state average. **Root Cause 1**: Students and families do not understand the importance of daily school attendance.

Goal 3: Highly competent faculty and staff maintaining a quality education in a diverse and changing environment

Performance Objective 1: The district will provide staff opportunities to attend quality professional development to support identified needs and goals.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: Financial records showing professional development invoices
Sign-in sheets

Summative Evaluation 1:

TEA Priorities: 1. Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals.

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews Dec	Feb	May
Critical Success Factors CSF 7 1) The District will send groups of teachers and administrators to the following professional conferences. Daily 5 Conference Lead4ward think! CAST CAMT ACET TASSP TEPSA other as identified	2.6	Assistant Superintendent, Principals	Teachers and administrators will attend quality professional development.			
	Problem Statements: Demographics 1 Funding Sources: Title II - 12000.00					
Critical Success Factors CSF 7 2) The District will participate in Region 12 cooperative offerings.	2.6	Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent	Staff will attend quality professional development.			
	Problem Statements: Demographics 1 Funding Sources: Title II - 27500.00					
Critical Success Factors CSF 7 3) Engage the following individuals or groups to come to Groesbeck ISD to provide support and training to individuals and staff. Ruth Meggs writing process trainers other as identified		Assistant Superintendent, Principals, Directors	Staff will attend quality professional development.			

= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Average percentage of students who score at the meets grade level is less than 20%. **Root Cause 1**: Instruction did not meet the level of rigor defined in TEKS.

Goal 3: Highly competent faculty and staff maintaining a quality education in a diverse and changing environment

Performance Objective 2: District and Campus Administrators will conduct walkthroughs and provide feedback to the teachers.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 2: Documentation of Walkthroughs
Documentation of Meetings with Teachers to Provide Feedback

Summative Evaluation 2:

TEA Priorities: 1. Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals.

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews		
				Dec	Feb	May
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 CSF 3 CSF 7 1) Principals and Assistant Principals will conduct at least 5 classroom walkthroughs each week.		Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent	Campus administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.			
Critical Success Factors CSF 1 CSF 2 CSF 3 CSF 7 2) District and campus administrators will meet monthly to participate in group walkthroughs.		Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent	District and campus administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs.			

= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue

Goal 4: Modern and well-maintained facilities meeting the current and projected educational needs of all students

Performance Objective 1: The District will maintain a safe and orderly environment and updated and clean facilities.

Evaluation Data Source(s) 1: District Emergency Operations Plan
Safety Drill Reports
Safety and security upgrades (hardening of facilities)

Summative Evaluation 1:

Strategy Description	ELEMENTS	Monitor	Strategy's Expected Result/Impact	Formative Reviews		
				Dec	Feb	May
Critical Success Factors CSF 6 1) The district will evaluate and update the Emergency Operations Plan.		Superintendent, District Safety Coordinator	The District will have a current Emergency Operations Plan.			
Critical Success Factors CSF 6 2) Each campus will complete regular safety drills.		District Safety Coordinator, Principals, Assistant Principals	Each campus will conduct regular safety drills.			
Critical Success Factors CSF 6 3) Entrances at district facilities will be numbered in accordance with law enforcement protocols and Knox Boxes will be places at each campus to allow local law enforcement and fire building access.		Superintendent, District Safety Coordinator	Entrances will be number and Knox Boxes will be in place.			

= Accomplished = Considerable = Some Progress = No Progress = Discontinue

District Improvement & Planning Committee

Committee Role	Name	Position
Administrator	James Cowley	Superintendent
Administrator	Diana Freeman	Assistant Superintendent
Classroom Teacher	Brook Dodd	Teacher
Classroom Teacher	Kelley Samford	Instructional Specialist
Classroom Teacher	Rebecca Reeves	Instructional Interventionist
Classroom Teacher	Lesa Stone	Teacher
Classroom Teacher	Adriana Miles	Teacher
Classroom Teacher	Kristen Curry	Teacher
Classroom Teacher	Sheri Killingsworth	Teacher
Classroom Teacher	Hollye Reynolds	Teacher
District-level Professional	Melody Sadler	Director of Special Programs
Community Representative	Mike Wilson	Community Representative
Community Representative	Shirley Richardson	Community Representative
Parent	Annette Clay	Parent
Business Representative	James Clay	Business Representative
Parent	Tiffany Burleson	Parent
Parent	Clint Burleson	Parent
Business Representative	Kimberly Meyer	Business Representative

District Funding Summary

General Fund					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	2	TEKS Resource System, TExGuide		$20,000.00
				Sub-Total	$20,000.00
Title II					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
3	1	1			$12,000.00
3	1	2			$27,500.00
				Sub-Total	$39,500.00
				Grand Total	$59,500.00