Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4
Demographics 4
Student Learning 4
School Processes & Programs 6
Perceptions 8
Priority Problem Statements 9
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation 11
Goals 12
Goal 1: Students will achieve their full potential through a system that is responsive to the academic, social, and emotional needs of the student. 13
Goal 2: The system will utilize efficient and effective operations to support and improve the learning organization. 22
Goal 3: All students and staff will learn and work in a safe and responsive environment. 24
RDA Strategies 26
Targeted Support Strategies 27
Additional Targeted Support Strategies 28
State Compensatory 29
Budget for Alliene Mullendore Elementary 30
Personnel for Alliene Mullendore Elementary 30
Title I 30
1.1: Comprehensive Needs Assessment 31
2.1: Campus Improvement Plan developed with appropriate stakeholders 31
2.2: Regular monitoring and revision 32
2.3: Available to parents and community in an understandable format and language 32
2.4: Opportunities for all children to meet State standards 32

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Our ELL population and students in our demographic subgroups, did not make the progress expected in the areas of meets and masters grade level expectation in Math, according to STAAR results. **Root Cause:** Staff needs to track and monitor student progress, make adjustments and be informed of students who fall in multiple sub-populations.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Our ELL students in grades 1-5 did not show growth according to the TELPAS assessment. **Root Cause:** Staff need to ensure with fidelity

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Many students that are on a Tier 2 or Tier 3 academically have not grown. They have stayed stagnate in their Tier despite intervention and support. **Root Cause:** Students are not able to move academically because they are struggling socially and emotionally and not able to be in the right brain state for the learning to take place.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Perceptions Strengths

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): According to the Mullendore Parent survey that was sent at the end of the school year, 42) our families fe t they neeied more

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Our ELL population and students in our demographic subgroups, did not make the progress expected in the areas of meets and masters grade level expectation in Math, according to STAAR results.

Root Cause 1: Staff needs to track and monitor student progress, make adjustments and be informed of students who fall in multiple sub-populations.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: When looking at comparison data from the Math STAAR test, students in grades 3 showed minimal growth in the area of approaches, and declined in the area of Meets from the previous year.

Root Cause 2: Rigor and relevance across grade level planning was not tightly aligned. Teachers in grades 3-5 will meet once a week in grade-level PLC to review data and practice. Teachers in grade 2 will reflect on standards not mastered in grade 3 to see how to best support students on the standard. Vertical teams will meet monthly in an effort to tightly align rigor and relevance across grade levels.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Our ELL students in grades 1-5 did not show growth according to the TELPAS assessment.

Root Cause 3: Staff need to ensure with fidelity instruction is being delivered to students so that background knowledge is built, prior knowledge is activated, learning experiences are created that make content comprehensible, and vocabulary development is a focus.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: When looking at Mclass data, analysis of our beginning of the year mClass K-2 data for Nonsense Word Fluency shows that 41% (21) of kindergarten students, 50% (26) of 1st grade students, and 70% (36) of 2nd grade students did not meet benchmark. Students with a deficit in phonic decoding will not acquire sufficient vocabulary through text. This will negatively impact their reading comprehension.

Root Cause 4: Tiered 2 targeted instruction was done inconsistently. Teachers in grades K-2will meet once a week in grade-level PLCS to review data and practice done in blending and segmenting practices that support explicit and systematic decoding instruction. Tier 2 targeted instruction will be done daily for students who do not meet benchmark in nonsense

relocated to different areas in the metroplex but are moving to be closer to employment opportunities or have moved out of state.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 7: Our STAAR reading scores decreased from the previous year.

Root Cause 7: The focus of the PLC was not tightly aligned.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 8: According to the Mullendore Parent survey that was sent at the end of the school year, 42% of our families felt they needed more communication regarding student expectations.

Root Cause 8: Teachers have been asked to communicate with parents weekly regarding lessons, assignments, and projects that are upcoming in an effort to keep families informed.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 9: Many students that are on a Tier 2 or Tier 3 academically have not grown. They have stayed stagnate in their Tier despite intervention and support.

Root Cause 9: Students are not able to move academically because they are struggling socially and emotionally and not able to be in the right brain state for the learning to take place.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 10: STAAR scores in grades 3-5 were lower than expected. Students did not excell to the level of Mastery that was anticipated during the school year.

Root Cause 10: Teacher and student absences played a factor in this. When subs were not available, support staff was pulled to cover classes, or classes were combined which dampered instruction and student learning.

Problem Statement 10 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 11: Staff feedback from survey and campus walks indicated areas of the building that were unsafe and caused a concern for potential injury.

Root Cause 11: The building we were housed in was old and there was lots of shifting in the ground and areas around the building due to foundational concerns and drainage issues.

Problem Statement 11 Areas: Perceptions

Goals

Evaluation Data Sources: Fountas & Pinnell reading levels

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews
Strategy 1: Implement district literacy plan. **Actions:** a) Ensure all reading teachers attend district training. b) Utilize instructional coaches to help mentor and train teachers with use of district-provided strategies. c) Provide coverage so that teachers will be able to visit Model Classrooms. d) Implement comprehensive RtI plan and Progress Monitoring e) Reading workshop model utilizing district curriculum materials f) implement F & P curriculum with fidelity **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal and Assistant Principal **Title I:** 2.5, 2.6 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy** - **Additional Targeted Support Strategy** - **Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:**	

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
Strategy 2: Implement personalized learning for students. **Actions:** a) Scheduled WIN time for intervention and extension c) Implement guided reading strategies d) Implement flexible small groups based on data e) Utilize performance data from M-class and Renaissance programs to target instruction to student need f) Utilize resources to provide personnel, technology, and instructional materials in order to close achievement gaps in core content areas **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal, Math and reading interventionist **Title I:** 2.4 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math - **ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3, 5 **Funding Sources:** Intervention Personnel - 199 - General Funds: SCE - $49,814, Intervention Personnel - 211 - Title I - $71,468				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
Strategy 3: Implement district Social and Emotional Learning using Character Strong. **Actions:** a) Ensure all teachers participate in weekly lessons and activities with students. b) Utilize campus counselor to assist and collaborate with teachers to ensure instruction is effective. c) Encourage and recognize students each nine weeks who model and demonstrate character values and traits shared during daily morning announcements and weekly lessons. d) Utilize SCE funded Crisis Counselors to provide support to students in areas of social-emotional learning **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal and Counselor **Title I:** 2.5 - **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2 **Funding Sources:** Crisis Counselor - 199 - General Funds: SCE				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Problem Statement 3: When looking at Mclass data, analysis of our beginning of the year mClass K-2 data for Nonsense Word Fluency shows that 41% (21) of kindergarten students, 50% (26) of 1st grade students, and 70% (36) of 2nd grade students did not meet benchmark. Students with a deficit in phonic decoding will not acquire sufficient vocabulary through text. This will negatively impact their reading comprehension. **Root Cause**: Tiered 2 targeted instruction was done inconsistently. Teachers in grades K-2will meet once a week in grade-level PLCS to review data and practice done in blending and segmenting practices that support explicit and systematic decoding instruction. Tier 2 targeted instruction will be done daily for students who do not meet benchmark in nonsense word fluency.

Problem Statement 5: In the 22-23 school year, 47% (25 students) of first grade students and 62% (32 students) of second grade students did not meet benchmark on BAS beginning of the year comprehension. Students with a deficit in reading comprehension will not make adequate reading progress, which will contribute to gaps in learning as they

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Use intervention strategies designed to meet student needs.	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
Actions: a) Meet during scheduled PLC and RTI collaboratives to discuss student progress, academic growth, and instructional celebrations and concerns. b) Implement and monitor strategies discussed at RtI collaborative discussions. c) Integrate a GAP class (Gaining Academic Performance) during specials rotations that allows flexibility for students to regularly use remediation and extension programs. d) Monitor the progress and growth of students that are identified as economically disadvantaged and those who fall in more than one sup-group. Provide additional support for those students that are struggling and extensions for those that are making gains and growth. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI team **Title I:** 2.5, 2.6 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - **Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 **Funding Sources:** Intervention Personnel - 199 - General Funds: SCE, Instructional Resources - 211 - Title I - $3,650				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Utilize tutors to help serve Tier 3 students.	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
Actions: a) Hire certified teachers to serve as tutors. b) Have tutors work closely with reading and math interventionist to group students and to provided targeted instruction based on student need. c) Create a WIN time schedule where students can be supported during times that new information is not being delivered. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal and Assistant Principal **Title I:** 2.5 **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3, 4 **Funding Sources:** Tutorials - 211 - Title I - $2,000, Intervention Personnel - 199 - General Funds: SCE, ESSER Tutors - ESSER - $17,157				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews
Strategy 4: Utilize continuous improvement strategies to ensure instructional strategies are meeting student needs.	

Problem Statement 1: Our ELL population and students in our demographic subgroups, did not make the progress expected in the areas of meets and masters grade level expectation in Math, according to STAAR results. **Root Cause**: Staff needs to track and monitor student progress, make adjustments and be informed of students who fall in multiple sub-populations.

Problem Statement 2:

Evaluation Data Sources:

Problem Statement 2:

Evaluation Data Sources: Quarterly reports of workers' compensation claims

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	Implement district literacy plan.

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	Implement district literacy plan.

State Compensatory

Budget for Alliene Mullendore Elementary

$0.00

1

Title I

1.1: Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment was completed in May 2022 based on spring survey feedback, STAAR achievement, TELPAS and universal screener results, attendance and behavior data compiled in April and May of 2022.

2.1: Campus Improvement Plan developed with appropriate stakeholders

The Campus Improvement Plan was developed through the input and involvement of the following:

Teachers:

Melissa Piesche

Elizabeth Huggins

Cherri Kehoe

Amanda Rivera

Natalia Chancellor

Parents:

Mandee Wisnewski

Heidi Pagel

Community Members:

Shawn Wood

Helen Clark

Administrators:

Merritt Dobecka

Sara Muetzenberg

Other Campus and district staff:

Channing Haye

2.2: Regular monitoring and revision

The Campus Improvement Plan is revised and evaluated in November, January, March, and June.

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

The Campus Improvement Plan is made available to parents and the public through the campus website in English

professional development for teachers to improve their effectiveness.

2.5: Increased learning time and well-rounded education

Student learning will be supported through research-based instructional strategies such as:

- Whole Child Initiative
- Conscious Discipline
- Workshop Model
- Sheltered Instruction
- Leveled Literacy Intervention
- Social Skills Training

Increased learning time is provided through pullout intervention programs and targeted tutorials.

2.6: Address needs of all students, particularly at-risk

Student enrollment, attendance, and success will be supported through targeted support programs that address the specific needs of our at-risk student population, as well as schoolwide incentive programs, individual and class recognition, two-way communication between the school and home, and parent and family engagement activities.

3.1: Annually evaluate the schoolwide plan

The Campus Needs Assessment (CNA) is completed each spring through a multi-stakeholder collaborative process using multiple sources of data to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and practices.

The CNA addresses:

1. Demographics
2. Perceptions
3. Student Learning
4. Processes and Programs

The findings of the CNA are used to inform the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP). Both the CNA and CIP are presented to the Site Based Committee for review and feedback at the end of the school year.

4.1: Develop and distribute Parent and Family Engagement Policy

The Parent and Family Engagement Plan was developed through the input and involvement of the following:

Teachers:

Melissa Piesche

Elizabeth Huggins

Cherri Kehoe

Amanda Rivera

Natalia Chancellor

Parents:

Mandee Wisnewski

Heidi Pagel

Community Members:

Shawn Wood

Title I Personnel

Name	Position	Program	FTE
Ashley Joy	Educational Assistant	Title I	1.0
Cherri Kehoe	Math Interventionist	Title I	0.5

Campus Funding Summary