

To the Evidence of Effectiveness Committee,

We appreciate your positive feedback. We have added comments to the questions below addressing the areas where the Evidence of Effectiveness Committee has requested more information and clarification.

CoVid 19 created a challenging two years for us and we focused our time and attention on caring for our faculty and students. We also reflected and continued to learn and grow in our understanding of Professional Learning Communities as a result of this feedback and our story and demographics have evolved and changed since the time of our initial application. Our enrollment has had a slight reduction. Our current enrollment is 444 students. Currently, all but 16 of our students qualify for the National School Lunch Program. In other words, 97% of our school population is economically disadvantaged. Of our 444 students, 43% are identified as limited English proficient and 14 percent are identified as Special Education students. This information paints a true picture of our campus demographics.

We decided that the best approach, for now, is to answer your questions below. If we are accepted as a Model PLC, we would like to update our story that was originally submitted to reflect our growth through this process. Thank you for challenging our thinking and helping us dig deeper to grow as professionals. We are better and our teachers are better for students because of our reflections, studying, collective inquiry, and revised practices.

1. It is apparent from your PLC story that teachers were given the “how” to do PLC before they understood their “why”. To help the committee understand the culture of your school, would you please clarify the process you used at Kruse Elementary to create your Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals. These Four Pillars are recognized as the foundation of a Professional Learning Community at Work (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many, and Mattos, 2016). How frequently do you revisit this foundation of your Professional Learning Community?

The Professional Learning Community of Kruse Elementary has grown significantly as seen through grade-level collaborative team growth resulting in increased student achievement. Our mission has always been about students, student academic achievement, and developing the whole child. The feedback from the Evidence of Effectiveness Committee has caused us to do some “soul searching” and caused us to dig deeper into our campus PLC practices and has helped us continue to unite as a Professional Learning Community. As we continue to grow and understand how the PLC process works, it is apparent that in order to keep our focus on what we want for our students, we must have a systematic structure in place. Every year, as we review data, we analyze our role and actions to make adjustments in what the adults do in the building to improve student learning and increase the success of ALL students. After attending PLC @ Work Conferences in the summers of 2021 (Pasadena, TX) and 2022 (Orlando, FL), we made crucial changes to our PLC processes to best ensure student success. We took a step back and analyzed how well we were preparing our students for the next grade level and if we were setting them up for success. While we have had a leadership team for all of these years, we determined that the work of our team transcended beyond the typical campus leadership teamwork, and we began to go deeper into the work of guiding student learning on our campus by establishing a Guiding Coalition including administrators, coaches, team leads from every collaborative team and even a few naysayers. (Adding naysayers was an idea we implemented after attending Mike Mattos’ breakout session on Guiding Principles for Principals in Orlando 2022). This team began its newly charged work by not only examining our vision and mission statements but also identifying and creating an action plan and SMART goals to set our students up for success. The Guiding Coalition did this work by empowering faculty engagement through the creation of two Task Force teams. The first Task Force team examined student data. It determined a plan of action for areas of concern in our data including SMART Goals to increase literacy for our students not reaching grade-level standards in Kindergarten, first, and second grade. The second Task Force is focused on 2nd-4th Emerging Bilingual students successfully maintaining

their first language while transitioning to English as a second language as evidenced by the standards of the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) and state measures. The revision of our PLC processes, Task Force work, and the focus of our fourth-grade collaborative team on ensuring growth by student, by standard, resulted in student growth from 59-89% from the 2021 to 2022 school year.

The Guiding Coalition reviewed our current Mission, Vision, Collective Commitments, and Goals and led the faculty in revisiting all of these foundational aspects of our school in August 2022. All faculty were engaged in the process and interactive activities allowed each faculty member to have a voice in answering the question, "Why do we exist?". Because the Guiding Coalition engaged the naysayers and all stakeholders in the process, what transpired was a new and collaboratively developed Mission, Vision, Collective Commitment, and Goals that all faculty approved and accepted as the driving force for the campus. The Mission, Vision, Collective Collective Commitments, and Goals are provided in a PDF and this document and will be added to the website upon acceptance as a Model PLC Campus. As a result of our newly created M-V-V-G, we have seen two of our most struggling teams change from a fixed to a growth mindset and the teacher teams have critically analyzed data and most importantly their role in impacting student learning to ensure high levels of learning for ALL students. The teams have taken ownership of their roles, assigned responsibilities, and set ambitious and achievable goals for themselves and their students. The conversations taking place on our grade-level collaborative teams have evolved from focusing on teaching to focusing on learning and how we are setting up our students for success by integrating and answering the four critical questions through each unit we teach. We are stepping away from how well we taught the essential standards and running towards how well our students learned them and creating day-to-day formative assessments to best inform our teaching. In addition, we examine data and group students based on results from Common Formative Assessments to provide additional time and support for students who need that time as well as extend learning for students who mastered the material.

As we engaged our Guiding Coalition and the faculty in a deep understanding of the Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals of Kruse Elementary this year, we are keeping this at the forefront of our work with our faculty and collaborative teams. We will review our [one-pager](#) as a faculty throughout the year and will revisit our schoolwide M-V-V-G at the beginning of each year as well as mid-year with the Guiding Coalition to determine whether our school is on course to achieve success for all students. We view our foundation as a living, breathing document that is changing as we grow as learners and educators. Our learning community understands that learning is an ongoing process.

**2. Does the district provide quarterly or periodic assessments which require schools to adhere to a schedule? Do the teachers have any autonomy when setting their own schedule for introducing concepts and administering common formative assessments? What is the process for "choosing essential standards" if teachers are required to follow district pacing guides? Please include an example of a data heat map in your resources and explain how they are used. Do the teachers review a common assessment each week or do teachers present individual heat maps?**

While the district does provide a scope and sequence of instruction, which we use as a guide, our teachers work together to make sure the curriculum is viable and relevant to the needs of the students on our campus. Teachers have the autonomy to set their own schedules and create common formative assessments based on essential standards during each unit. Before the beginning of each quarter, teachers review the essential standards recommended for the unit. They rank how and when the standard will be taught to students. They choose the length of time spent on each standard, plan intervention for the standards that were not mastered in prior grading periods, and make extension plans for students who already know the upcoming standard or master the standard immediately. As our professional learning community evolves, our Guiding Coalition has decided to have two vertical

alignment meetings during the year to revisit essential standards and make sure we are targeting learning gaps, addressing SMART Goal progress, and celebrating short-term wins.

Below are examples of heat maps used during data analysis and collaborative discussions. The standards are noted that need to be addressed either in whole group re-teaching or with individual students who missed mastery of the concept.

4.8ABC -> Whole group  
 4.6F -> Dulce, Santiago, Alan G., Stephanie, Alan L., Adan L., Aurora, Daniel, Sarah, Alan M., Nayeli, Kevin, Silvestre, Jayleen, Emily, Jason, Tony, Andrea, Elias

4.8ABC -> Whole group  
 4.6F -> Carlos, Sophia  
 4.7D -> Sophia, Roy  
 4.10B -> Chris, Carlos, Dominic

Student Name	Score	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15
1 CASTRO, SOLANGE ALESSANDRA	100															
2 GARCIA, EMMANUEL HOMERO	66.667															
3 GOMEZ, JUAN RAMON Jr	77.778															
4 GUJARDO, AMMY	83.333															
5 GUTIERREZ, CHRISTOPHER THOMAS	50															
6 LAMAS, EMMANUEL	50															
7 LOPEZ LEVVA, GAEL	88.889															
8 LOPEZ, MATTHEW HEBRELOU	50															
9 LUJAN, ALDO GUSTAVO	88.889															
10 REYES, LILLY ANN RUBY	94.444															
11 RIVAS SANDOVAL, CHRISTOPHER ALEXIS	94.444															
12 RODRIGUEZ PEREZ, ANGELICA MARCELA	77.778															
13 RODRIGUEZ SOLIS, SHAYLA INOGRAM	100															
14 VILLACORTA TORRES, ASHLEY DAYANA	94.444															
15																
16																
17																
18																
19																
20																
21																
22																

Masters - 86-100% Meets - 75-85% Approaches - 56-74% Did not Meet - 0-55%

Questions: 1, 2, 5, 7  
 TEK: 3.4E  
 I can represent multiplication facts using skip counting.

Questions: 4, 8  
 TEK: 3.4F  
 I can recall corresponding division facts to multiplication facts (up to  $10 \times 10$ )

Questions: 3, 8  
 TEK: 3.5C  
 I can describe a multiplication expression as a comparison.

Questions: 9  
 TEK: 4.0  
 I can represent multiplication facts by using arrays.

Plan for reteaching: Pull small group to reteach Place Value AND do a question a day over Place Value during whole group.

The heat maps below use colors to indicate mastery (green), students that need a little attention with time in a small group (yellow), and students that need Tier 2 support (red). We have moved away from a weekly common summative assessment, and have built-in time for formative assessments that teachers frequently discuss during multiple meeting times during the week. The weekly summative assessment is now chunked into daily formative assessments that guide just-in-time small group intervention and are discussed during teacher team time.

REVIEW #4, 5 whole group

Proper, Expert, 5000

#1 -> Compare/Order Decimals	#2 -> Decimal/Frac. Bars	#3 -> Decimal/Frac. Bars # Lines	#4 -> Add/Sub Decimals	#5 -> Decimals/Concept Line	#6 -> $\times 10, \div 100$	#7 -> $\div 2, 3$ & (eC)	#8 -> Division (eC)	#9 -> Multi-Step Problems	#10 -> Concept Line Test
80	90	80	80	70	70	77	70	80	80
100	100	100	80	70	93	80	70	80	80
100	100	90	70	70	60	48	70	80	80
100	100	90	80	80	70	100	90	100	100
100	100	90	90	90	87	80	80	80	80
80	100	70	80	80	80	87	90	90	80
100	90	80	80	70	93	100	80	80	80
80	90	80	70	70	90	80	80	80	80
80	70	70	80	70	80	80	80	80	80
55	70	80	70	70	100	80	80	80	80
100	80	80	70	70	70	53	100	80	80
80	100	80	80	80	70	81%	79%	78%	80%

3. The only year where we noted a drop in scores was the 2017-2018 2<sup>nd</sup> grade reading scores which dropped from 50.98% score in 2016-2017 and 42.22% drop in 2017-2018. Improvement was noted again with a score of 58.62% in 2018-2019. Please include State scores of students Meeting or Exceeding Proficiency on the data presented.

In Texas, there are no state scores for 2<sup>nd</sup> grade; however, we have updated MAP data for the past two years which was new for the 2020-2021 school year. We will be tracking MAP data in the coming school year.

<b>School Student Achievement Data</b>						
<b>State Accountability: Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)</b>						
<b>Mean RIT</b>						
<b>GRADE 2</b>						
	<b>Fall 2020</b>	<b>Winter 2021</b>	<b>Spring 2021</b>	<b>Fall 2021</b>	<b>Winter 2022</b>	<b>Spring 2022</b>
<b>SUBJECT</b>						
<b>Campus Reading</b>	169.5	175.5	176.7	164.6	177	182.3
<b>District Reading</b>	171	176	179	168	176.7	181.4
<b>Campus Mathematics</b>	177.5	172.9	177.8	168.5	177.9	184.2
<b>District Mathematics</b>	173.5	177.8	176.7	169.7	178.5	183.9

4. In order to respond favorably to your application, we request some additional evidence of the progress made by students beyond your school’s mid-year 2019-2020 data specific to essential standards (or other relevant data points). That evidence might include: Progress made on benchmarks given throughout the school year. Progress made on common formative assessments developed and delivered by teams. Progress made towards mastery of school-wide SMART goals focused on essential standards.

During the time at which we originally submitted the Model PLC Application and received this feedback, we experienced CoVid and put this response aside in order to regroup to provide a new level of support for unfinished learning due to CoVid. To answer the question above, we are attaching new Data Templates with the most recent assessment data for our campus which includes evidence of student progress beyond our school’s mid-year 2019-2020 data.

[Kruse - School Student Achievement Data](#)

After accountability in 2019, our campus had an overall rating of a “C” campus. In 2022, our campus had an overall rating of a “B” campus. Kruse Elementary saw a 30% increase in academic growth and progress that we attribute to the work of our Guiding Coalition, collaborative teams, and a focus on student learning. The links below lead to our TEA Accountability Ratings Overall Summary Reports.

[2019 Accountability Rating Summary](#)

Due to CoVid, there is no Accountability Rating Summary for 2020, and Texas schools were not rated in the 2020-2021 school year because a state of disaster was declared. Each school maintained the rating earned on the 2019 Accountability Rating Summary.

