Pflugerville Independent School District Kelly Lane Middle School 2023-2024 Board Approved



Board Approval Date: October 19, 2023

Mission Statement

We will provide purposefully designed learning activities that:

Challenge all students to excel,
Engage all students in service learning opportunities to emphasize the strength of the school community over individual gain,
Value problem-solving and critical thinking over basic comprehension.

Vision

Kelly Lane Middle School will produce life-long learners who have the capacity to be critical thinkers, are ready to accept challenges, and have the resilience to overcome adversity.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	9
School Processes & Programs	12
Perceptions	16
Priority Problem Statements	19
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	21
Goals	23
Goal 1: PfISD will recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals.	23
Goal 2: PfISD will build a foundation of reading and math.	24
Goal 3: PfISD will connect high school to career and college.	25
Goal 4: PfISD will improve low performing schools.	25
Addendums	27

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Kelly Lane has 953 students for the start of the 2023-24 school year according to Skyward. KLMS had 986 students at the end of the 2022-23 school year. The student diversity has not changed significantly from the 2015-16 to the 2022-23 school year, although there have been fluctuations. According to Skyward calculations, the race/ethnicity percentages of KLMS students is below. This data reports Hispanic/Latino as an ethnicity and not a race, therefore the percentages will not add to 100%. Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander is not reported because the population is too small to protect student identities. Of these students, 398 (or 40%) of the students identify with more than one race/ethnicity (including Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander).

	Student Demographics - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: OnDataSuite)										
	2019 -2020	2020 -2021	2021 -2022	2022- 2023	2023 -2024						
To tal E nr oll m en	1136	1100	1040	986	954						
Af ric an A m eri caı	12.5%	12.4%	11.3%	9.7%	9.2%						
Hi sp an ic	33.1%	34.9%	36.1%	35.8%	34.6%						
W hite	41.1%	39.6%	39.4%	39.1%	39.5%						

	Student Demographics - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: OnDataSuite)										
A m eri ca n In di an	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%						
As ian	5.7%	6.6%	8.1%	10.0%	10.6%						
P ac ifi c Isl an de	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%						
T w o or M or e R ac es	7.0%	5.9%	4.7%	4.9%	5.7%						

The breakdown of students enrolled in special programs is listed in the chart below. There are fewer than 20 students classified as homeless (all students have shelter) and fewer than 20 students classified as immigrant students. Of the 986 students at the of 2022-23, 23% are classified as economically disadvantaged.

Student Special Program Identification - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: OnDataSuite & TAPR)										
	2019- 2020	2020-2 021	2021-2 022	2022-20 23	2023-2024					

Student Special Program Identification - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: OnDataSuite & TAPR)										
Economically Disadvantaged	20.1%	19.7%	20.0%	21.0%	18.4%					
Emergent Bilingual	4.3%	5.6%	7.6%	10.1%	12.6%					
At-Risk	28.1%	28.1%	37.8%	36.3%	36.5%					
Special Education	8.3%	8.4%	9.3%	9.5%	10.6%					
Gifted & Talented	9.7%	9.3%	10.96%	12.1%	13.9%					
Dyslexia	5.7%	6.6%	6.7%	8.3%	8.6%					
Section 504	14.5%	14.3%	13.5%	15.6%	15.1%					
Immigrant	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%					
Homeless	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%					
Migrant	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
Campus Mobility Rate	6.3%	6.3%	7.1%	not yet reported	not yet reported					

In evaluating the demographics of the teaching faculty, there is not proportionate representation with the student demographics when comparing the OnDataSuite fall snapshot to the Skyward demographics calculated above. The enrollment for students, according to Skyward, for the 2022-23 school year is repeated below for convenience. The OnDataSuite reports Hispanic/Latino as a race, therefore the statistics are not exact comparisons.

Teacher Demographics - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: TAPR)											
	2017-20 18	2018-2 019	2019-2 020	2020-20 21	2021-2 022						
Teachers	68.3	61.7	66.0	65.7	61.2						
African American	7.3%	6.5%	12.9%	10.8%	6.5%						
Hispanic	18.1%	20.1%	15.2%	17.3%	13.3%						
White	70.1%	73.4%	67.4%	65.8%	76.9%						
American Indian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%						
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%						
Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	3.0%	1.6%						
Two or More Races	4.4%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%						

The impact of the budget deficit has resulted in a reduction in the number of teachers and staff at KLMS. For the 2021-22 school year, KLMS cut 5 teachers and 1 aide from the faculty/staff. An additional 7 teachers and 1 aide were cut for the 2022-23 school year. Changes to programming for the 2022-23 school year will result in 2 less teaching faculty members for 2023-24. This will result in a reduction of 14 teaching faculty members over the last 3 years with a drop in enrollment of approximately 100 students. One position is funded through ESSER funds and is expected to be not funded for the 2024-25 school year.

Teachers by Years of Experience - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: TAPR)										
2017-2 2018-2 2019-2 2020-20 2021-2022 018 019 020 21										
Beginning Teachers	2.9%	3.1%	8.1%	4.8%	8.5%					
1-5 Years Experience										
6-10 Years Experience	25.4%	27.9%	23.3%	20.4%	24.6%					

Teachers by Years of Experience - Kelly Lane Middle School (Source: TAPR)									
11-20 Years 22.1% 29.6% 32.3% 35.0% 32.8% Experience									
Over 20 Years Experience	15.4%	13.5%	12.5%	10.2%	7.0%				

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Based on staffing allocation, there will not be any instructional coaches or a dedicated Emergent Bilingual teacher. **Root Cause:** PfISD budget constraints required reduction in staffing.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Kelly Lane was rated a "B" campus, with an overall score of 89, for the 2021-22 school year based on the performance from the spring of 2022. KLMS did not receive any distinctions; in 10 of the 16 distinction indicators KLMS was ranked in the bottom two quartiles of their comparison group.

The 2023 STAAR performance levels were not set and therefore are not reported as official results. The results below are rough estimates by applying the 2022 performance standards to the 2023 raw scores. This information is not disaggregated by student groups. The STAAR EOC scores are reported as official results. The TEA prediction of the "likely passing" percent for reading was higher than when the 2022 approaches percent was applied to the 2023 raw scores.

Overview of 2023 STAAR Results at the projected Percent at the Approaches performance level

Subject	All Students	African- American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	2+ races	Econ Disadv	Special Ed
All Subjects										
Reading6-8	77									
Math 6-8	81									
Algebra	100									
Science	77									
Social Studies	78									

[&]quot;--" results are masked due to the number of students in this group.

TO BE UPDATED WITH 2023 RESULTS

According to the 2022 STAAR Results, there are larger achievement gaps between 1) the reading and math scores of Black/ African-American students when compared to White students; and 2) the math and reading scores of students identified as Emerging Bilingual or receiving special education services. There was a disproportionate representation of students at the Masters Level.

The 2022 Closing the Gaps (Domain 3) of the TEA report indicates that KLMS met all targets in reading for achievement and growth and all targets for the student success initiative. However, we missed the growth targets for math in the following groups: all, Hispanic, white, Asian, students identified as economically disadvantaged, and non-continuously enrolled students. Additionally, we missed the math achievement target for the Asian student group and the English Language Proficiency target for students who are emerging bilingual. Based on the chart below, the greatest area of concern are the targets for students who are classified as Two or More Races, receiving special education, and are identified as economically disadvantaged.

% of Gap for Missed Closing the Gaps Targets

Achievement Target denoted with (A) Growth Target denoted with (G)

	All	Hispanic	White	Two or More Races	Emerging Bilingual	Special Ed	Non-continuously enrolled
Reading							
Math							
Student Success							
ELPS							

Kelly Lane also uses Renaissance Learning STAR 360 as a universal screener for reading and math. All students take the STAR 360 assessment three times per year (beginning, middle, and end). Students are classified for intervention based on their percentile rank (PR) score. Students with a PR score less than 10 require progress monitoring at a rate of once every two weeks, students with a PR score between 10 and 25 require progress monitoring at a rate of once every three weeks, and students with a PR score between 26 and 40 require progress monitoring at a rate of once every four weeks.

STAR 360 Reading

According to Renaissance, 941 students completed one or more reading assessments as part of STAR 360. Overall, 59.4% of students scored at or above the minimum district benchmark proficiency level (.6% under the district goal of 60%). In addition, 62.6% of students are estimated to score at or above the proficiency benchmark for the STAAR Reading test. The student growth measure was 60.7%, above the goal of 55%.

STAR 360 End of the Year (EOY) Reading results for 6th grade: According to the STAR 360 data, 60% of the students were at or above the district benchmark. A review of the PR scores shows 9% of students had a PR of less than 10, 15% had a PR between 11 and 25, and 15% of students had a PR between 26 and 40, for a total of 118 6th grade students needing additional progress monitoring. The EOY scores projected an overall pass rate on the STAAR test of 84% with 24% at approaches level, 20% at meets standard, and 40% at the masters level.

STAR 360 End of the Year (EOY) Reading results for 7th grade: According to the STAR 360 data, 72% of the students were at or above the district benchmark. A review of the PR scores shows 9% of students had a PR of less than 10, 13% had a PR between 11 and 25, and 16% of students had a PR between 26 and 40, for a total of 123 7th grade students needing additional progress monitoring. The EOY scores projected an overall pass rate on the STAAR test of 86% with 25% at approaches level, 33% at meets standard, and 28% at the masters level

STAR 360 End of the Year (EOY) Reading results for 8th grade: According to the STAR 360 data, 56% of the students were at or above the district benchmark. A review of the PR scores shows 11% of students had a PR of less than 10, 13% had a PR between 11 and 25, and 20% of students had a PR between 26 and 40, for a total of 141 8th grade students needing additional progress monitoring. The EOY scores projected an overall pass rate on the STAAR test of 88% with 22% at approaches level, 32% at meets standard, and 35% at the masters level.

STAR 360 Math

According to Renaissance, 955 students completed one or more math assessments as part of STAR 360. Overall, 72.1% of students scored at or above the minimum district benchmark proficiency level (12% above the district goal of 60%). In addition,45.1% of students are estimated to score at or above the proficiency benchmark for the STAAR Math test. The student growth measure was 59.6%, above the goal of 55%.

STAR 360 End of the Year (EOY) Math results for 6th grade: According to the STAR 360 data, 70% of the students were at or above the district benchmark. A review of the PR scores shows 8% of students had a PR of less than 10, 9% had a PR between 11 and 25, and 13% of students had a PR between 26 and 40, for a total of 90 6th grade students needing additional progress monitoring. The EOY scores projected an overall pass rate on the STAAR test of 78% with 25% at approaches level, 24% at meets standard, and 29% at the masters level.

STAR 360 End of the Year (EOY) Math results for 7th grade: According to the STAR 360 data, 62% of the students were at or above the district benchmark. A review of the PR scores shows 7% of students had a PR of less than 10, 8% had a PR between 11 and 25, and 11% of students had a PR between 26 and 40, for a total of 84 7th grade students needing additional progress monitoring. The EOY scores projected an overall pass rate on the STAAR test of 76% but the data holds no predictive value because all 7th grade students took the 7th grade STAR 360 assessment but not all 7th grade students would take the 7th grade STAAR test.

STAR 360 End of the Year (EOY) Math results for 8th grade: According to the STAR 360 data, 56% of the students were at or above the district benchmark. A review of the PR scores shows 7% of students had a PR of less than 10, 9% had a PR between 11 and 25, and 11% of students had a PR between 26 and 40, for a total of 91 8th grade students needing additional progress monitoring. The EOY scores projected an overall pass rate on the STAAR test of 77% but the data holds no predictive value because all 8th grade students took the 8th grade STAR 360 assessment but not all 8th grade students would take the 8th grade STAAR test.

The intervention systems in place for the 2022-23 school year focused on meeting the HB4545 requirements. Students received intervention through a GAME or CARE class (math/reading respectively) or through small groups during Catapult time.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): According to STAR 360 EOY results, there are 382 reading students and 265 math students that require additional progress monitoring. **Root Cause:** Despite the presence of intervention systems, there are still students struggling to demonstrate progress.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): According to 2023 STAAR Reading results, 68% of 6th graders scored at the Meets and 29% scored at the Master level with achievement gaps for students identified as receiving services in Special Education, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and/or Limited English Proficient. Root Cause: The instruction and/or interventions do not adequately support language acquisition or cultural competence.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): According to 2023 STAAR Math results, 71% of 7th graders scored at the Approaches level and 5% scored at the Master level with achievement gaps for students identified as receiving services in Special Education, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and/or Limited English Proficient. **Root Cause:** The instruction and/or interventions do not adequately support language acquisition or cultural competence.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): According to 2023 STAAR Science and Social Studies results, 69% of 8th graders scored at the Meets level for Science and and 59% scored at the Meets level for Social Studies with achievement gaps for students identified as receiving services in Special Education, Economically Disadvantaged, and/or Limited English Proficient. **Root Cause:** The instruction and/or interventions do not adequately support language acquisition or cultural competence.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Kelly Lane uses a variety of structures to provide support and collaboration to teachers: PLC during the day (STAAR tested subjects only), department meetings, professional development, and mega-team meetings. The format for August 2022 professional development included personalized plans for all teachers/staff. Each main topic was split into three-five groups based on experience and application of the topic in the classroom; teachers were therefore more likely/able to collaborate with peers at their level and receive appropriate support.

Teachers were asked to provide input on the preferred topics for professional development. The main categories of request were: content-specific/ instructional strategies, SEL/ student behavior, technology, personal development, and logistics/management. More specifics are offered below in the table.

Content/ Instructional Strategies	SEL/Student Behavior	Technology	Personal Development	Logistics/ Management
Topic Specific	Document & manage behavior	• Excel	Work/Life Balance	Meeting time
Enrichment	Brain development	Eduphoria	Team Building	Compliance
Lesson Planning	Motivation	• Canvas	Consensus Building	
• Strategies		Skyward	National Board Certification	
		• IXL	Peer Observation	
		Online Textbooks		

We discontinued Power Walks after the fall semester to focus on T-TESS walkthroughs and TIA calibration. An analysis of T-TESS using Eduphoria Strive reports, shows relative strengths in Domain 3. The top strengths (determined by percent of teachers scoring distinguished or accomplished) in each domain are:

Domain 1 Planning/Dimension 1 Standards & Alignment, followed by Knowledge of Students

Domain 2 Instruction/Dimension 2 Content Knowledge & Expertise followed by Monitor & Adjust.

Domain 3 Learning Environment/Dimension 1 Classroom environment/Routines/Procedures followed by Classroom Culture.

Domain 4 Professional Practices & Responsibilities/Dimension 1 Professional Demeanor & Ethics followed by School Community Involvement

There are 24 teachers eligible for the Teacher Incentive Allotment based on teaching assignment. To remain eligible, a teacher must be rated "proficient" or better in all eight dimensions of Domains 2 and 3 of T-TESS. If they are scored "proficient" or higher on their summative evaluation in all 8 dimensions, their ratings are averaged and they must have an average score of 3.7 or better. The student growth percentiles on the student's STAR 360 EOY results will determine final eligibility for TIA designation. A comparison of TIA eligible teachers to non-eligible teachers and their averages for domains 2 and 3 is below. There is consistency in the scoring, which supports the TIA validation system.

	Recognized	Exemplary	Masters
TIA eligible	17%	38%	25%
Not TIA eligible	17%	33%	28%

When averaging each dimension in domains 2 and 3, there is a relative weakness in 2.1 Achieving Expectations, 2.3 Communication, and 2.4 Differentiation. When averaging all dimensions/domains for all teachers, our rank from strongest to weakest is demonstrated in the table below. Some key attributes of each domain have been included.

Dimension	Average	Rank
3.1 Classroom Environment, Routines & Procedures (procedures, routines, management of safety/equipment, organization)	4.28	1
3.3 Classroom Culture (relevant, meaningful learning, respectful (individual and group), collaboration and rapport)	4.28	1
3.2 Managing Student Behavior (behavior systems & standards)	4.21	3
2.2 Content Knowledge & Expertise (tied to other disciplines, anticipate misunderstandings, HOTS, sequencing instruction)	4.05	4
2.5 Monitor & Adjust (adjustment to maintain engagement, check for understanding, questioning and feedback)	4.02	5
1.3 Knowledge of Students (prior knowledge, diverse learning, SEL, unique learning styles, meeting student needs)	3.96	6
1.1 Standards & Alignment (aligned goals, lesson structure, design, pacing, technology)	3.95	7
4.1 Professional Demeanor & Ethics (code of ethics, student advocacy)	3.88	8
2.4 Differentiation (pre-planned individualized lessons, monitor performance & participation, differentiated content/methods)	3.86	9
2.3 Communication (two-way communication, questions & wait time, anticipate misunderstandings, technology & visual tools)	3.82	10
1.4 Activities (questioning, groups, activities, resources, problem-solving, and student goal setting)	3.81	11
4.4 School Community Involvement (communication with families, outreach with stakeholders, mission/vision aligned)	3.79	12
2.1 Achieving Expectations (high/challenging expectations, mastery of objective, self-correction of student mistakes)	3.72	13
4.2 Goal Setting (short-long term goals of teacher, self-assessment)	3.68	14
1.2 Data & Assessment (progress monitoring, feedback, and data informs instruction)	3.63	15
4.3 Professional Development (team collaboration, PLCs, personal improvement plans, application of professional development)	3.42	16

For the 2022-23 school year, elective options in the master schedule were reduced and continue to be reduced for the 2023-24 school year. The following classes will not be offered: Technology Applications 7/8, AVID, *Fundamentals of Computer Science, Kickstart, and Literacy Workshop. Courses marked with an asterisk are high school credit courses. Courses expected to be added back into the master schedule are Health / Professional Communications and PFLEX.

The Emerging Bilingual (EB) program has been restructured for all middle schools for the 2023-24 school year. As a result, there will not be an on-campus LPAC facilitator or EB teacher. We are expecting to have itinerant support. The new structure includes the International Academy for newcomers (defined as students with two years or less of education in the United States). Kelly Lane will have less than 10 students participate; the other (approximately) 75 students on campus will be served through the general education teachers and the itinerant support. These numbers are reported as approximations to conceal the identity of students participating/not participating in the Academy.

The Kickstart Kids program has also been eliminated at Kelly Lane for the 2023-24 school year. The 6th and 7th grade students will either take pre-athletics/athletics, PE, or dance for their physical education credit and 8th grade students can take athletics, PE, dance, or another elective. This change impacted 130 student schedules.

IXL

IXL is a program that offers students the opportunity to practice skills independently or as assigned by a teacher. It is available for all core subjects and all students have an account. The subjects are K-12 so advanced students have the option to practice skills at courses above their enrolled grade. In addition to skills practice, IXL offers practice aligned to the math curriculum, the PSAT & SAT, the ACT, TELPAS, and the TSI. Professional development was not provided to teachers and KLMS was not the "owner" of the account until November. Teachers were not required to have students take the diagnostic test or have students practice IXL questions.

The core subject and intervention teachers have class lists uploaded into IXL. Of the teachers that have accounts, 91% have set up their accounts (the remaining 4 are inclusion teachers who gained access late and do not have rosters added); 77% have signed in and their students have signed into the account (2 of these teachers do not have standard core classes), 65% have used the analytics at least once and their class has answered at least 500 questions, and 37% have explore the analytics/ have an active for at least 3 weeks.

As a school, students answered 965,750 questions and mastered 16,081 skills. Overall school data does show growth in both reading and math.

Student participation data indicates 6th and 7th grade math used IXL most, followed by 7th grade social studies. The least practiced subjects were 7th grade science and 8th grade social studies.

Math - Que	estions					
Grade	# students	# used IXL	% used	Min#	Max #	Average
6	315	315	100%	73	5459	812.9
7	335	334	100%	0	5687	748.2
8	328	167	51%	0	4740	159.9
ELA - Quest	tions	·		·	·	·
Grade	# students	# used IXL	% used	Min#	Max #	Average
6	315	113	36%	0	1360	55.6
7	335	292	87%	0	2805	159.7
8	328	143	44%	0	1860	76.4
Science - Qu	uestions	·	·		·	·
Grade	# students	# used IXL	% used	Min#	Max #	Average
6	315	122	39%	0	1378	66.1
7	335	37	11%	0	744	7.2
8	328	163	50%	0	2086	70.9
Social Studio	es - Questions	•	•		•	·
Grade	# students	# used IXL	% used	Min#	Max #	Average
6	315	175	56%	0	1077	80.3
7	335	335	100%	15	6974	664.3
8	328	36	11%	0	1421	12.5

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Based on staffing allocations, 6th and 7th grade core subjects and all electives teachers have a single 48 minute conference period. **Root Cause:** PfISD budget constraints require additional sections per teacher.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): The IXL implementation plan did not involve teacher training or requirements for minimum engagement. **Root Cause:** The program was launched late and after professional development days.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): According to the Eduphoria Strive T-TESS Domain 1, Dimension 2 analysis (data & assessment), the average score for KLMS was 3.62 and ranked 15th of 16 dimensions. **Root Cause:** Teachers have a lack of knowledge and/or experience with independently running PLC teams and data response.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

The campus had faculty meetings every Wednesday, with different goals (whole faculty, committees, department, and committee). Once a month, each faculty member served on a committee; the options were: Advanced Academics, Diversity, Hospitality, PBIS, or Wellness.

The PBIS committee created a new program for Student Ambassadors; these students served as hosts/guides for evening events, helped decorate the school for dances, and helped design a school store. Based on the School-wide PBIS (SWBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory, KLMS scored 93% on Tier 1 features across three sections: teams, implementation, and evaluation. Tier 1 areas of improvement include 1) a formal system used by 90% of teachers and given to at least 50% of students, and 2) the faculty sees school-wide data regularly and provides input. For the 2023-24 school year, KLMS will focus on Tier 2 implementation. Tier 2 implementation will require establishing a Tier 2 team, written procedures for referring students to Tier 2 support team, and a tracking document to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of our system.

A review of attendance data in Skyward for the 6th six weeks of data report shows the average daily attendance was 95.47%. The prior six week periods were: 95.48, 95.98, 94.27, 94.26, and 96.10 (in order of most recent to the 1st six weeks). There does not appear to be a pattern or consistency for which grade has the lowest ADA within each six weeks.

The discipline data in Skyward indicates that most referrals are for physically aggressive behavior (53), disrespect/rude comments (49), roughhousing (29), inappropriate language/gesture (24), disruptive classroom behavior (24), and insubordination/failure to comply (22). During the 2022-23 school year, 28 incidents were recommended for placement at the DAEP/JJAEP and a due process meeting was conducted; nearly 25% of the recommendations did not result in a placement. The Skyward data shows the 2022-23 placements at the DAEP/JJAEP is equivalent to the 2021-22 school year; however, these years are significantly higher than the previous years.

The most common reason for placement was possession/use of marijuana followed by fighting and threats against the school. Of the recommendations, 57% were mandatory by the Texas Education Code (TEC), 29% were mandatory by TEC or district expectations, and 14% were considered discretionary placements. The categories of drug or alcohol possession/use, assault, or school threats are considered mandatory placements in the TEC. The categories of fighting and distributing intimate visual materials are considered discretionary placements by the TEC; however, these offenses are generally referred to the DAEP in accordance with PfISD behavior and discipline standards. Offenses generally considered discretionary are extreme or persistent defiances or extreme verbal/physical abuse.

% of DAEP Placements

	Asian	Black /	Hispanic	White	Economically Disadvantaged
		African-American			
All KLMS Demographics	15%	17%	35%	73%	23%
All Placements	13%	22%	49%	61%	57%
TEC Mandatory	14%	7%	57%	79%	64%
TEC & ISD Mandatory	16%	21%	47%	63%	63%
Discretionary*	0%	33%	67%	67%	33%
Not Placed*	25%	25%	25%	50%	25%

^{*}These statistics are slightly misleading due to the small overall number of students in these categories. The information is still reported for the purposes of transparency in the disproportionate placement of minority students in a DAEP.

exhibits/articulates ideations of harm to self or others, all credible and non-credible threats to the school (ex: social media posts or casual comments made with no intention of harm), bullying, and fighting or assaults.

In the spring of 2023 students took the Panorama survey regarding their opinions in the following categories: pedagogical effectiveness, classroom climate, classroom teacher-student relationships, classroom belonging, and classroom engagement. We had an 85.1% response rate, which is equivalent to 2,493 responses of 2,931 surveys. The number of surveys by grade that were completed are 812 for the 6th grade, 832 for the 7th grade, and 849 for the 8th grade. All categories of the survey show a decrease from the surveys in Spring 2022. According to the survey data, 69% of students report positive feelings regarding the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom (pedagogical effectiveness). This is the highest rated category, but it is a 4% decrease from the spring of 2022. The following are the questions in this category and the percent of students responding favorably:

- How much does the teacher know about the topic = 88% (-3% from Spring 2022)
- How interesting does this teacher make what you are learning in class = 62% (-5% from Spring 2022)
- How often does the teacher give you feedback = 66% (-5% from Spring 2022)
- How good is the teacher at making sure students do not get out of control = 69% (-5% from Spring 2022)
- How clearly does the teacher present the information you need to learn = 73% (-5% from Spring 2022)
- How well can this teacher tell whether or not you understand = 58% (-6% from Spring 2022)
- Overall, how much have you learned from this teacher = 76% (-4% from Spring 2022)

When considering behavior and teacher/student relationships, below are some related questions in other categories.

- 82% report the teacher is respectful toward them
- 47% feel connected to the teacher
- 52% report the other students demonstrate respect toward them
- 40% report that they matter to others in the class
- 60% indicate the behavior of other students hurts their learning
- 77% indicate the rules of the classroom are fair

According to the Spring 2023 Panorama parent survey, only 152 parents participated in the survey. While this is a low participation rate, this is significantly higher than the participation rate in Spring 2022. Of those respondents, 93% reported they primarily speak English with their student(s). The engagement scores for School Safety and School Climate increased and Barriers to Engagement decreased when compared to the Spring 2022 data. Family Engagement increased 3%.

Despite the Barriers to Engagement score dropping, there was a significant increase in the positive responses for the school being welcoming to parents (15% increase). There was a significant increase in the School Climate score - an 11% jump to 60% favorable responses. The largest gain is that 60% of respondents reported the administrators at the school create an environment that helps children learn (a 17% increase). There was also an 8% increase in respondents' belief that the school values the diversity of children's backgrounds. There was a slight increase for favorable responses in School Safety, with the largest change being that 44% of parents rarely/almost never worry about violence at school. However, 79% of respondents reported that their child mostly feels safe at school. About half of the respondents indicated that they think their student will be bullied online by someone else at the school.

Some of the changes that were made this year are: school messages are sent in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese; we increased the number of flags displayed; and the diversity committee increased heritage and recognition month celebrations from previous years.

Based on the Spring 2023 staff Upbeat survey data, the average engagement score was 72%, which is 4.9% higher than the Spring 2022 KLMS engagement score. There is low participation from staff on interest and satisfaction surveys. The Upbeat survey was completed by 68% of the staff (a 3% increase from Spring 2022). There were positive gains in all areas except: Pflugerville custom questions and recruitment/hiring/onboarding; these had a 1.3% and 1% drop respectively. Notable areas of increase are: parent/teacher communication, professional development, autonomy, school safety & order, work/life balance, inclusion, and cultural competence. All of these areas had a 10% or higher gain from Spring 2022. Three of these categories were previous drops in the surveys. It should be noted that the drop in the Pflugerville custom questions is largely impacted by the 100% of the respondents indicating they did not interact with anyone from accountability/assessment or the communications department and 90% of respondents indicating they did not interact with anyone from the finance department.

When compared to the fall 2022 survey there was negligible gains in the overall engagement score (same staff, same school year). Areas of notable increase are autonomy (+2.4), work/life balance (+12.3), self-efficacy (+3.2), teacher voice and leadership (+7.8), and cultural competence (+6.5). Areas of decrease are professional development (-1.6), school safety and order (-5.4), appreciation (-2.2), and resources (-4.4).

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): According to Panorama and Teacher surveys, both parents and teacher report not feeling connected and/or having positive interactions with each other. **Root Cause:** There are not enough opportunities for parents and teachers to have positive interactions to build relationships.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): According to Skyward, the top reasons for referrals were physically aggressive behavior, disrespectful/rude comments, and inappropriate language or gesture. **Root Cause:** There are deficiencies in student's coping strategies and interpersonal skills since returning from COVID.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): According to the Panorama survey results, only 47% of students report feeling connected to their teacher. **Root Cause:** Survey data may not be complete because of the way that surveys are administered.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): According to the Panorama survey, less than 50% of students report strengths in more than half of the SEL components. **Root Cause:** There are deficiencies in student's coping strategies and interpersonal skills since returning from COVID.

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): According to the School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory, we did not receive full points in 1.9 and 1.10. **Root Cause:** The PBIS system is not monitored by a committee more than school-wide use and feedback.

Problem Statement 6: According to a comparison of staff Upbeat fall-to-spring survey results, teachers were less satisfied with professional development, safety & order, appreciation, and resources. **Root Cause:** The level/intensity of these systems may not have been sustained throughout the year.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: According to the Eduphoria Strive T-TESS Domain 1, Dimension 2 analysis (data & assessment), the average score for KLMS was 3.62 and ranked 15th of 16 dimensions.

Root Cause 1: Teachers have a lack of knowledge and/or experience with independently running PLC teams and data response.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: According to the Panorama survey, less than 50% of students report strengths in more than half of the SEL components.

Root Cause 2: There are deficiencies in student's coping strategies and interpersonal skills since returning from COVID.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Based on staffing allocation, there will not be any instructional coaches or a dedicated Emergent Bilingual teacher.

Root Cause 3: PfISD budget constraints required reduction in staffing.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 4: According to Panorama and Teacher surveys, both parents and teacher report not feeling connected and/or having positive interactions with each other.

Root Cause 4: There are not enough opportunities for parents and teachers to have positive interactions to build relationships.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 5: According to Skyward, the top reasons for referrals were physically aggressive behavior, disrespectful/rude comments, and inappropriate language or gesture.

Root Cause 5: There are deficiencies in student's coping strategies and interpersonal skills since returning from COVID.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 6: According to the Panorama survey results, only 47% of students report feeling connected to their teacher.

Root Cause 6: Survey data may not be complete because of the way that surveys are administered.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 7: Based on staffing allocations, 6th and 7th grade core subjects and all electives teachers have a single 48 minute conference period.

Root Cause 7: PfISD budget constraints require additional sections per teacher.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 8: According to the School-Wide PBIS (SWPBIS) Tiered Fidelity Inventory, we did not receive full points in 1.9 and 1.10.

Root Cause 8: The PBIS system is not monitored by a committee more than school-wide use and feedback.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 9: The IXL implementation plan did not involve teacher training or requirements for minimum engagement.

Root Cause 9: The program was launched late and after professional development days.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 10: According to STAR 360 EOY results, there are 382 reading students and 265 math students that require additional progress monitoring.

Root Cause 10: Despite the presence of intervention systems, there are still students struggling to demonstrate progress.

Problem Statement 10 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 11: According to 2023 STAAR Science and Social Studies results, 69% of 8th graders scored at the Meets level for Science and and 59% scored at the Meets level for Social Studies with achievement gaps for students identified as receiving services in Special Education, Economically Disadvantaged, and/or Limited English Proficient.

Root Cause 11: The instruction and/or interventions do not adequately support language acquisition or cultural competence.

Problem Statement 11 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 12: According to 2023 STAAR Math results, 71% of 7th graders scored at the Approaches level and 5% scored at the Master level with achievement gaps for students identified as receiving services in Special Education, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and/or Limited English Proficient.

Root Cause 12: The instruction and/or interventions do not adequately support language acquisition or cultural competence.

Problem Statement 12 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 13: According to 2023 STAAR Reading results, 68% of 6th graders scored at the Meets and 29% scored at the Master level with achievement gaps for students identified as receiving services in Special Education, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and/or Limited English Proficient.

Root Cause 13: The instruction and/or interventions do not adequately support language acquisition or cultural competence.

Problem Statement 13 Areas: Student Learning

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- HB3 CCMR goals
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- RDA data
- Local Accountability Systems (LAS) data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR released test questions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant information
- Student failure and/or retention rates
- · Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Local benchmark or common assessments data
- Observation Survey results
- State-developed online interim assessments

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
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Emergent Bilingual (EB) /non-EB data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, gender etc.
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant achievements by race, ethnicity,

- gender, etc.
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- Gifted and talented data
- Dyslexia data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data
- STEM and/or STEAM data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Completion rates and/or graduation rates data
- Annual dropout rate data
- Attendance data
- Discipline records
- Violence and/or violence prevention records
- Tobacco, alcohol, and other drug-use data
- Student surveys and/or other feedback
- Class size averages by grade and subject
- School safety data
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio
- State certified and high quality staff data
- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Professional development needs assessment data
- Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact
- Equity data
- T-TESS data

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Capacity and resources data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices
- Action research results

Goals

Revised/Approved: September 25, 2023

Goal 1: PfISD will recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals.

Performance Objective 1: Implement a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) plan that results in an increase of 5% in the categories of Diversity (2023 @ 71%) and Cultural Competence (2023 @ 68%), as measured by the Upbeat survey by Spring 2024.

Evaluation Data Sources: Spring 2024 Upbeat survey results compared to Spring 2023.

Next Year's Recommendation: Fall 2023 Upbeat data (compared to Spring 2023): Diversity @ 78 (+7); Cultural Competence @ 79 (+11).

Goal 1: PfISD will recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals.

Performance Objective 2: Implement tier 2 PBIS written protocols and tracking documents, so that we score a minimum of "4" on the Tier 2 SWPBIS "teams" framework by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student surveys, Calendar, campus communication, 2023-24 PBIS action plan document

Goal 1: PfISD will recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals.

Performance Objective 3: Teachers will demonstrate greater proficiency within Domain 1 & 2 of T-TESS, specifically in Domains 1.2 and 2.1 for progressing monitoring and mastery of objective during instruction.

Evaluation Data Sources: The average score for 1.2 and 2.1 will increase - 1.2 is 3.63 average and 2.1 is a 3.72 average.

Goal 1: PfISD will recruit, support, and retain teachers and principals.

Performance Objective 4: Conduct professional development for teachers so that the Upbeat survey shows a 5% or greater gain in the professional development category (2023 @ 67%).

Evaluation Data Sources: Artifacts or organization, sign in pages

Goal 2: PfISD will build a foundation of reading and math.

Performance Objective 1: Implement an intervention system that provides required tutoring for HB1416 students so that 100% of students requiring intervention will participate in supplemental accelerated instruction.

Evaluation Data Sources: Schedules, intervention records, grade change reports, EOY Star360 results

Goal 2: PfISD will build a foundation of reading and math.

Performance Objective 2: Student performance in math at the Meets and Masters levels will increase from the 2023 performance to the following levels:

6th grade: 61% Meets and 30% for Masters;

7th grade: 42% Meets and increase to 8% for Masters;

8th grade: 67% Meets and 33% Masters.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 2024 STAAR Data

Goal 2: PfISD will build a foundation of reading and math.

Performance Objective 3: Student performance in reading at the Meets and Masters levels will increase from the 2023 performance to the following levels:

6th grade: 70% Meets and 31% for Masters; 7th grade: 80% Meets and 46% Masters; 8th grade: 78% Meets and 50% Masters.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 2024 STAAR Data

Goal 2: PfISD will build a foundation of reading and math.

Performance Objective 4: At least 70% of students receiving special education services, or are identified as Emergent Bilingual, will demonstrate Expected or Exceeded Growth standards in 2024 STAAR reading results.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 2024 STAAR reading results

Goal 3: PfISD will connect high school to career and college.

Performance Objective 1: During 2023-24, 100% of Kelly Lane 6th and 7th grade students will participate in daily physical activity in a physical education class or through school-wide activities; at least 80% of 8th grade students will participate in daily physical activity in a physical education class or through school-wide activities.

Evaluation Data Sources: FitnessGram data; student enrollment

Goal 3: PfISD will connect high school to career and college.

Performance Objective 2: Kelly Lane will provide students with academic planning lessons/activities so that 75% of students declare a pathway other than multi-disciplinary for the 2023-2024 high school 4-year plan.

Evaluation Data Sources: Registration data, agendas, artifacts of events.

Goal 4: PfISD will improve low performing schools.

Performance Objective 1: Kelly Lane Middle will achieve a 96% attendance rate for the 2023-24 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: 2023-24 PEIMS attendance reports.

Goal 4: PfISD will improve low performing schools.

Performance Objective 2: Kelly Lane will implement an SEL curriculum so that all students participate in character education.

Evaluation Data Sources: Catapult (advisory) lesson plans

Goal 4: PfISD will improve low performing schools.

Performance Objective 3: Kelly Lane will implement Restorative Practices so that campus-specific survey data indicates indicates the majority of students have good relationships with teachers and peers and feel safe during school.

Evaluation Data Sources: KLMS developed surveys

Addendums