

U.S. Department of Education
2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

[X] Public or [] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [X] Title I [] Charter [] Magnet [] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Rebecca (Becky) Shepard Page

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Imogene Giesinger Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 2323 White Oak Blvd

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Conroe State TX Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 77304-3560

County Montgomery County State School Code Number* 170902119

Telephone 936-709-2600 Fax 936-709-2699

Web site/URL http://giesinger.conroeisd.net/ E-mail rpague@conroeisd.net

Twitter Handle _____ Facebook Page _____ Google+ _____

YouTube/URL _____ Blog _____ Other Social Media Link _____

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date _____

(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent*Dr. Don Stockton, NA E-mail: dostockton@conroeisd.net
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Conroe Independent School District Tel. 936-709-7751

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date _____

(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mr. Ray Sanders, NA
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date _____

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 38 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
 - 7 Middle/Junior high schools
 - 6 High schools
 - 0 K-12 schools
- 51 TOTAL

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
 - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
 - Suburban
 - Small city or town in a rural area
 - Rural
3. 5 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	12	17	29
K	58	66	124
1	58	52	110
2	65	56	121
3	65	64	129
4	58	46	104
5	0	0	0
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
Total Students	316	301	617

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
 - 3 % Asian
 - 9 % Black or African American
 - 19 % Hispanic or Latino
 - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - 64 % White
 - 5 % Two or more races
 - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 33%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

Steps For Determining Mobility Rate	Answer
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	89
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	101
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	190
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	580
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.328
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	33

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 4 %
23 Total number ELL
 Number of non-English languages represented: 7
 Specify non-English languages: Spanish, Pilipino, Chinese, Gujarati, Nepali, Polish, Vietnamese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 37 %
 Total number students who qualify: 236

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9. Students receiving special education services: 8 %
50 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 7 Autism | 0 Orthopedic Impairment |
| 0 Deafness | 3 Other Health Impaired |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness | 4 Specific Learning Disability |
| 4 Emotional Disturbance | 26 Speech or Language Impairment |
| 0 Hearing Impairment | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 4 Mental Retardation | 2 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 0 Multiple Disabilities | 0 Developmentally Delayed |

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff
Administrators	2
Classroom teachers	31
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	7
Paraprofessionals	5
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	1

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 20:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

Required Information	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	95%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

Post-Secondary Status	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.

Yes_ No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

PART III – SUMMARY

Giesinger’s mission is to provide a positive, caring and challenging environment of excellence in which each child can feel success and achieve at his or her maximum potential. The mission is accomplished by teachers, parents, students, friends and the community working together. The school is named after Imogene Giesinger, a former teacher, campus and district administrator. She is respected for her love of children, hard work and high expectations for all. These characteristics are at the foundation of the beliefs at Giesinger. Giesinger’s motto is “All Means All.” The Giesinger school community embodies this motto daily.

A long standing tradition at Giesinger Elementary is Ms. Giesinger Day which is celebrated annually. The students sing songs, and Ms. Giesinger reads books to the students. Students share their favorite books with Ms. Giesinger. The love and importance of reading is communicated throughout the school from the school’s namesake, administration, and staff.

Since 1990, the year Giesinger opened its doors, Conroe has grown from 28,000 to 61,533 residents. The 2012 US Census Bureau identified Conroe as the tenth fastest growing “municipality of over 50,000” in the nation. Conroe, no longer a sleepy little rural town in the piney woods of East Texas, was recently designated by the Census Bureau as part of “a large urbanized area” in the Houston region. Giesinger has been a reflection of these changes during the last 24 years. Giesinger is now a Title I suburban school representing mostly White, Hispanic, and African American students coming from diverse households including economically disadvantaged to affluent families from neighborhoods, apartments and rural areas. The continual enrollment of students, staffing changes for a growing campus, and changes in administration have been challenging. However, the opportunities outweigh these challenges. Giesinger embraces the evolution of the Conroe community as well as the opportunities and challenges this change brings.

A cornerstone of Giesinger’s success is dedicated teachers using data-driven, differentiated instruction, and planning time. In Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), teachers analyze data from common and formative assessments. With this information, teachers are able to focus on students that need interventions. Teachers lead the data analysis and develop an instructional plan. The administration, including the principal and assistant principal, support the instructional plan to make it happen. Data analysis drives instructional planning in the classroom. Student groups are fluid in the classroom and throughout the grade levels. Data also helps teachers recognize their strengths and weaknesses as they share methods to further develop the art of teaching. Administrators meet with all 3rd and 4th grade students to review the students' results, celebrate progress, and set goals. Students graph their progress. This focus on student progress has demonstrated significant academic gains and ownership of the process.

Parent and community support are crucial to Giesinger’s success. All students know that the adults at Giesinger want them to be successful. Giesinger’s Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) provides assistance in the library and classrooms. Dads participate in the WATCH D.O.G.S. (Dads of Great Students) program which provides dads with the opportunity to be actively involved. Each dad is provided orientation prior to participating. Giesinger has observed that involving dads in the culture of the campus has encouraged students to create positive relationships with positive male role models as well as providing parents with another opportunity to positively impact student success at Giesinger.

Giesinger also encourages parent involvement by actively engaging parents in family academic nights where Giesinger staff share strategies to parents to help their children learn at high levels. Materials are provided free for the parents to take home so that they can reinforce foundational learning concepts. Monthly and weekly newsletters, online access to student information, and teacher web pages keep parents informed. Giesinger’s community provides the school with an immense amount of support. Local restaurants provide student incentives. West Conroe Baptist Church, a neighborhood church, provides Giesinger students with a mentoring program, tutoring, backpacks, and school supplies.

Another partnership is with Sam Houston State University. The university established a reading block class at Giesinger where pre-service teachers attend their class and work side-by-side with Giesinger teachers in classrooms. As the university students learn instructional strategies, Giesinger students benefit from their help and participation in classrooms.

Giesinger has celebrated many academic milestones beginning with being recognized as a Texas Title I Part A Distinguished School in 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. Based on past assessment recognitions, Giesinger was noted as “exemplary” for three years 2009, 2010, and 2011. In 2013, Giesinger met assessment expectations and earned three designations in the new Texas accountability ratings: Academic Achievement in Reading/ELA, Academic Achievement in Mathematics, and Student Progress. When compared with forty other schools with similar demographics throughout the state of Texas, Giesinger tied for fourth in Student Progress. These academic milestones have validated Giesinger’s belief that “All Means All.”

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. Assessment Results:

a) As Texas transitions from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS) which was used 2009-2011 to the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), the rigor of the assessment has increased. STAAR requires students to solve multi-step problems and to use critical thinking skills. This is a significant change from questions requiring recall, as was the case with TAKS. Foundational concepts for each grade level are defined as readiness standards. These standards are assessed in a variety of ways within each STAAR assessment. Instructional approaches which encompass not only teaching the concepts but how to apply that knowledge in a variety of applications is critical to student success on STAAR.

During the years of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS), TAKS data was reported as Met Standard and Commended Performance. Met Standard was passing and Commended Performance was a score of 90% or greater. To provide time for schools and districts to adapt to the higher standards, Texas is phasing in standards for STAAR Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance. These standards increase until the target of requiring students to answer an average of 75% of items correctly to pass the test. The standards for STAAR Level III: Advanced Academic Performance are in place. Students must score greater than 85% to achieve Level III: Advanced Academic Performance. While the state has only required campuses to demonstrate mastery at the lower phase-in standards for 2012 and 2013, Giesinger's expectation has been that all students will achieve at the highest level of academic performance. This expectation is evidenced in Giesinger's ongoing curriculum, instruction, assessment analyses and changes to instructional approaches as Giesinger transitions to STAAR.

b) Testing data over the last five years shows that Giesinger has narrowed the achievement gap with all student groups. Student groups are reported as well as student groups that do not have enough students to generate a report.

In 2009, Giesinger received an exemplary rating and commended performances in Reading and Math. In 2010 and 2011, Giesinger was exemplary and received commended performances in reading, writing and math. Giesinger also received a comparable improvement in Reading/ELA and Math. Texas did not award ratings in 2012 because of the implementation of a new testing system. Giesinger's 2013 Accountability Rating Index 1 shows all students (3rd and 4th grade) scoring 94 percent on all tests. On Index 3, which gives the scores of our economically disadvantaged and Hispanic student groups, the score was also 94 percent. This shows no achievement gap in our student groups. Giesinger also received Academic Achievement in the top 25% for student progress compared with forty schools with similar demographics.

Through data analysis over the past five years, Giesinger used the TAKS and STAAR tests to examine each student group. We identified students who needed remediation in order to meet learning objectives. Teachers use small group differentiated instruction, offer tutorials before, during and after school, and hold one-on-one student conferences to motivate and provide individualized instruction. Teachers in all grade levels become mentors to struggling students to form relationships during the year.

Teachers disaggregate data from common assessments within grade levels to determine strengths and weaknesses. Based on common assessment results, teachers reteach concepts and skills not mastered with 90% accuracy. Data is used to drive teachers' instruction. Teachers emphasize Tier I best practices of differentiated instruction by using TEKS analysis, Gardner's Multiple Intelligences, brain-based learning, cooperative learning, Marzano's instructional strategies and Bloom's Taxonomy.

Giesinger identifies the areas of instruction that need improvement using the percent of students that pass each objective. That information guides staff development in identified areas. Teachers study the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) by analyzing the verbs and concepts in order to have a clear understanding of the depth and rigor of each objective. Lesson plans and common assessments are developed with the end in mind, meaning instruction is scaffolded to reach higher levels of thinking.

In Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), teachers monitor student achievement and look at data by objective and by item analysis to identify learning gaps that need remediation. The principal and administrators also look at teachers' strengths and weaknesses to see if there is a systemic and/or individual conceptual issue. Teachers also look at their own data to determine their strengths and weaknesses. Teachers and staff share with each other to strengthen their instructional strategies so that all the teachers and students will be successful.

2. Using Assessment Results:

Teachers and administrators use assessment results systematically and deliberately in order to improve student and school performance. To gain information about students at the beginning of the year, teachers review assessment data from the following sources: cumulative folders, response to intervention documentation, literacy folders, and accelerate math instruction (math intervention) documentation. Teachers can discover powerful information about a child's educational journey and help students set academic goals.

Multiple intelligence surveys are also administered at the beginning of the year to reveal learning styles. By incorporating instructional strategies into lesson plans and anchor activities, students are more engaged in learning and the teachers are able to meet the diverse needs of their classroom.

Formative assessments such as teacher observations, exit slips and thumbs up/down are implemented daily by teachers as they check for understanding during a lesson. By adjusting the pacing of the lesson for the class or scaffolding for struggling students, teachers continually monitor student learning for success.

Common and formative assessments (district benchmarks), teacher created tests and state assessments, allow teachers to measure growth of individual students and whole group learning. Once these results have been scanned into CISD's data analysis system, teachers and administrators then analyze the results on an individual student, a teacher, or an entire grade-level. Based upon the data, teachers reflect on the quality of their teaching, share results with students for goal setting, and form differentiated flexible groups both within a class and across the grade-level.

Current student data is analyzed during weekly grade-level Professional Learning Communities, PLC meetings. When disaggregating data, teachers reflect on the following critical questions: 1) What skill do we want our students to learn? 2) How will we know if each student has learned the skill? 3) How will we respond when some students don't learn the skill? 4) How will we extend and enrich if they already know the skill? Teachers who have demonstrated high performance share instructional strategies and resources with the team. At the end of the meeting, teachers summarize their grade level's needs and areas that need support from administrators. This information is shared with the principal to ensure that teacher needs are addressed.

District instructional coaches are included as Giesinger's support team to give guidance on improving instruction and student learning. Instructional coaches model lessons in classrooms, and then teachers implement the instructional strategies in their delivery. Attending grade level meetings to discuss benchmark data, celebrating successes, and helping set goals for improvement are also instructional supports provided by instructional coaches.

Assessment data is shared with parents through Title I academic nights held at Giesinger in the fall and spring semesters. Data is also shared by the principal during PTO board meetings which are held monthly. State assessment results are shared with parents and the community through public meetings and available on the campus/district website. Conroe ISD offers a plethora of ways to improve student learning and school performance. Giesinger Elementary utilizes all of these tools to add value to all students.

3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

Giesinger teachers present content staff development to other educators within CISD often. For example, each year trained Giesinger teachers have been asked to present core content for district-wide staff development which is attended by all Conroe ISD teachers. Giesinger cadre representatives meet with other campus representatives and the CISD curriculum specialists to discuss curriculum, scope and sequence, and teaching strategies. After these meetings, each cadre member brings the information back to share with Giesinger faculty. Teachers also share instructional strategies through grade level and vertical team meetings. For instance, Giesinger's reading specialist presented the components of guided reading lessons to the faculty and then was asked to share this information with another campus. The math cadre representatives presented vertical alignment and grade level expectations. Giesinger's social studies and science cadres presented interactive notebooks and the value this instructional strategy can add to a student's understanding of skills. A Giesinger interventionist was videotaped modeling guided reading techniques. This video was used in a district online course for teachers who are learning how to address the needs of at-risk readers.

At Giesinger, teacher strengths are used as resources for others. Teachers have presented how technology can be used to enhance instruction, record and monitor student progress, and assess skills that need remediation or that have been mastered. This information is easily accessible and instructional decisions can be made in a timely manner. One obstacle encountered by Giesinger regarding technology has been funding needed to stay current with technology tools. Giesinger has partnered with restaurants and PTO through auctions, carnival activities, and a 5K fun run to provide updated interactive hardware and software to be used in the classrooms.

One unique staff development opportunity offered at Giesinger is training for pre-service SHSU students. This opportunity provides embedded training for students who are training to be teachers. Giesinger opens the campus to provide opportunities for university students to learn from expert teachers in their classrooms.

Each fall, the superintendent and central administrators meet with each principal and a core team of teachers at every campus to discuss the focus areas of the school, activities designed to target areas of need, and the tools which will be utilized to evaluate progress. In the fall of 2012, Giesinger was a host site for other school principals and staff to attend. This recognition was an opportunity to highlight the targeted school improvement techniques utilized at Giesinger Elementary.

4. Engaging Families and Community:

Parent and community involvement are important aspects of student success. Giesinger Elementary has a comprehensive approach that engages families and the community through volunteering, communication, and parent education.

As part of our plan for school improvement, Giesinger collaborates with parents and the community to maximize learning for all students. In particular, Giesinger has refined and developed many campus based initiatives to help narrow the performance gap in reading. Since 2008, Giesinger has had a strong partnership with the West Conroe Baptist Church, a local church in the neighborhood. Members have committed to tutoring and reading to struggling third graders. For the past three years, Giesinger dads have volunteered to serve as positive male role models for students through The WATCH D.O.G.S. (Dads of Great Students) program. This program requires the dad to attend a training and orientation to determine roles and responsibilities. Giesinger has observed an increase in parent participation and student motivation due to actively involving dads in the instructional culture of the school.

To further develop a culture of reading, the PTO recruited local high school football and cheerleaders as guest readers. Dr. Seuss Day, a new campus reading initiative, increased parent participation by providing opportunities for parents to read to students. Giesinger added Buddy Reading Programs this year including student peer mentors, older students reading to younger students, and university pre-service students.

Giesinger is committed to developing strong readers. The demonstrated reading progress of all students has validated this commitment.

Communication strengthens the relationship between the school and parents. Giesinger communicates information through emails, weekly and monthly newsletters, grade level newsletters, teacher websites, parent-teacher conferences and SAE's (Students Achieving Excellence.) Giesinger has generated approximately 300 SAE's per marking period. This recognition is emailed to parents to recognize student's outstanding efforts academically or socially. Giesinger's varied forms of communication establish a sense of community and keep parents informed.

Parent education is valued at Giesinger. Parents attend academic nights twice a year to develop an understanding of the rigor of CISD curriculum. Parents learn practical and engaging activities and receive free reading and math materials that will help them work with their children at home. Through a partnership with SHSU, free child care is also offered. The SHSU students conduct learning activities with the students while their parents attend the parent involvement activities. Giesinger demonstrates the importance of the parent as a partner in each child's success.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. Curriculum:

Giesinger Elementary's curriculum is based on state standards, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), stipulating what students should know and be able to do for each subject of the required curriculum. CISD has created scope and sequences based on the TEKS. Giesinger connects the TEKS, assessment, and learning to address the needs of each student. Technology is integrated throughout the curriculum for students to access information, create new learning, and practice new skills.

CISD READS is the balanced literacy model which identifies instructional practices that are most effective for accelerating literacy development identified in the scope and sequence for reading, writing, listening and speaking. These components in reading are addressed through reading aloud and thinking together, shared and strategic reading, guided reading, independent reading and word study. Writing is addressed through writer's workshop, implementing these components of modeled writing: shared writing, interactive writing, guided writing and independent writing. Giesinger students celebrate literacy as they share their favorite books on the daily announcements, as books are highlighted in the classroom and library, and also when community "celebrity" readers come to read books to the students. Students also benefit from parent and student volunteers reading to and with them.

CISD's mathematics curriculum and scope and sequence identify foundational learning in number operation, and quantitative reasoning; patterns; relationships, and algebraic thinking; geometry and spatial reasoning; measurement; probability and statistics and use algorithms for addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division as generalizations connected to concrete experiences. The curriculum is implemented through CISD Solves, a balanced math model. Number sense, accuracy, and automaticity with operations are developed during math review/mental math. Patterns and relationships of numbers are developed in math fluency. Reasoning, algebraic thinking, and problem solving are promoted through effective questioning and "math talk." Problem-solving maps model and develop critical thinking skills and processes, and poster method showcases different ways to solve problems.

The CISD science curriculum and scope and sequence include planning and safely implementing classroom and outdoor investigations using scientific processes, including inquiry methods, analyzing information, making informed decisions, and using tools to collect and record information, while addressing the major concepts and vocabulary in the context of physical, earth, and life sciences. CISD Investigates is the district science model that incorporates TEKS-aligned science lessons using the 5-E lesson model (engage, explore, explain, elaborate and evaluate). Teachers develop common assessments with TEKS aligned questions that assess at a high level of cognitive complexity. Science vocabulary is addressed through the Science Word of the Week (included in morning announcements), science word walls, and the use of Marzano's Six Step Process. Students utilize a science interactive notebook to develop scientific thinking. Students and teachers also participate in the district Sci-Tech Fair, guiding visitors through the experiments.

CISD's social studies curriculum builds a foundation in history, geography, economics, government, citizenship, culture, science, technology and society, and social studies skills. Students learn about the lives of heroes; and fourth grade focuses on Texas history. CISD Remembers is the social studies model, integrating social studies and language arts through literacy strategies for pre-reading, during reading and after reading. Comprehension Toolkit strategies are utilized in reading for meaning and understanding, and interactive student notebooks encourage writing and processing information.

The elementary physical education and health program follows the elementary TEKS and focuses on exercises that strengthen the body and group games that incorporate skill development. Safety is discussed and practiced daily along with healthy choices.

The fine arts program includes art and music education. The art curriculum develops students' perception, creative expression, cultural and historical heritage, and response/evaluation. Students use various mediums

to create original works of art while studying art techniques, vocabulary, artists and appreciation for individuality. The art program showcases student artwork at the annual Western Art Show.

The music curriculum develops music literacy and a lifelong appreciation for music. Kodaly and Orff models are used, with students performing on keyboard instruments and rhythm instruments as well as voice. Activities include attending the Houston Symphony Orchestra and participating in the fourth grade honor choir and in the annual performance of "The Nutcracker." In addition, Giesinger showcases an artist and composer of the week, including samples of their works, during daily announcements.

2. Reading/English:

Giesinger Elementary implements CISD READS, a balanced literacy model that addresses reading, writing, listening, and speaking through differentiated instruction. The TEKS-based scope and sequence provides the foundation for a comprehensive literacy instruction based on the Gradual Release of Responsibility Theory with a focus on higher-level critical thinking. This model addresses the following research based components: reading aloud and thinking together, shared and strategic reading, guided reading, independent reading, and word study. The components include direct instruction and modeling for conceptual understanding, guided instruction and independent practice that ensures a strong foundational understanding of reading. These instructional components, often referred to as best practices, are highlighted because they provide learning at high levels for all students.

Through observation and assessments, teachers monitor the reading development of students as they acquire skills and develop as readers. Assessment data is routinely analyzed to drive instruction. Based on the data, teachers develop purposeful lessons and interventions that meet the needs of students by differentiating the learning environment through tiered assignments, flexible grouping, and anchor activities. Teachers incorporate research based activities and techniques such as multiple intelligences, brain-based learning, cooperative learning, questioning strategies; comprehension techniques, vocabulary development, and word work into the appropriate instructional component to meet the needs of the students.

At-risk students receive Accelerated Reading Instruction (ARI). ARI is a daily intervention in which students receive leveled texts at their instructional reading level. Some at-risk students receive daily additional small-group instruction or intensive one-on-one tutoring. Peer tutoring is utilized daily before school for first graders and kindergarteners who are at-risk. Sam Houston University pre-service teachers address fluency issues with third graders in a one-on-one tutoring session two times a week. Classroom teachers tutor before, during, and after school. Teachers meet with students on or above level two to three times per week in guided reading groups and utilize book clubs during independent reading.

Professional development is crucial to the success of CISD's reading model. CISD regularly provides workshops that deepen teachers' understanding of the reading process. Grade level representatives attend all district sponsored workshops. Staff members then share the information either in grade level or faculty meetings. District coaches provide campus based staff development addressing teacher and campus needs. The Title I teacher serves as a peer coach and provides feedback to help teachers implement and refine techniques. Professional development is valued at Giesinger because it benefits both the staff and students.

3. Mathematics:

Giesinger Elementary implements CISD Solves, our balanced mathematical structure that addresses computational and procedural skills, conceptual understanding, and problem solving. The components of the structure include assessment, differentiating instruction/intervention, math review/mental math, math fluency, problem solving, and direct instruction for conceptual understanding. These components provide the structure for which the TEKS-based scope and sequence are delivered and are essential for our school's success.

Formative and summative assessments provide feedback on student progress and drive instructional decisions. Teachers utilize assessment data to determine how to differentiate instruction and utilize

interventions to accelerate learning and close learning gaps. Based on data, the teacher develops tiered assignments, flexible grouping, and anchor activities to ensure student success for our diverse student populations ranging from our at-risk (RtI, special education) to our advanced math students. Data also identifies the targeted concepts, skills, or problem solving strategies to be taught during guided math small group instruction as well as direct instruction.

Math review is a short, written daily practice and review of previously taught concepts and skills, with the goal of attaining automaticity and accuracy. Teachers provide immediate feedback, and students reflect on their progress, heightening awareness of common mistakes and correcting misconceptions. A short quiz is given weekly, and results determine the problems for the following week. Mental math promotes number sense and enhances math fact development as students solve orally presented problems, check answers and explain their thinking.

Fact fluency allows students to recognize that all math facts are conceptually related. Giesinger's goal is to give students the tools to find facts that they do not know based on what they do know, through the understanding of patterns and application of mental math. A forward approach is taken to improve fact fluency by developing strong number sense in ALL students.

Math talk and effective questioning are two methods used to develop independent problem solvers. Problem solving is incorporated daily through lessons, anchor activities, and cooperative groups and is supported through activities such as poster method and problem-solving maps. These strategies build rigor and develop problem-solving capacity to use skills taught at the application level.

Math instruction starts at the conceptual level, moving to pictorial, and finally to abstract. This ensures a strong foundational understanding and can be delivered through direct instruction or guided math. CISD Solves provides an approach to student centered mathematics that ensures effective and successful problem solving at a rigorous level.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

a) Giesinger Elementary's music curriculum follows the state standards (TEKS) while incorporating standards from math, science, social studies and language arts through the use of movement and songs. Brain-based instruction using multiple intelligences creates a transfer of knowledge and concepts from the music classroom to all disciplines making music instrumental in support of the TEKS from all grade levels and subjects.

Music offers the opportunity for each child to feel successful and explore their creativity in a risk free environment. Through songs and movement, students often acquire understanding of concepts which are demonstrated in core subject areas. Giesinger's mission is for each student to feel successful, and music is a place for all to succeed through song and movement.

During weekly music time, composers are discussed using time lines, maps, thinking maps, and comparing and contrasting activities. A different composer is also spotlighted during the "Composer of the Day" portion of announcements. Students also learn about different cultures, including African drumming, folk dancing, and instrument playing.

In 1990, the fourth graders presented "The Nutcracker", a children's musical. This has become an ongoing tradition and all students look forward to participating. Community members and ex-students attend the annual performance at Conroe High School.

Students in grades 1-4 participate in grade level musicals by performing their program for the school, parents, and community. Curriculum is incorporated into the programs including science, history, and reading. For example, students performed a program called "Grammar Rocks." This musical reinforced the parts of speech as well as contractions and homophones in a fun interactive way. Students learned rhyming dialogue to help the story unfold as all students were involved in choreography throughout the program.

Giesinger students are taught kinesthetically, orally and, visually how to read and write music primarily through the singing of American folk songs using basic instruments. This carries over to many other aspects of learning. It reinforces tracking from left to right, encourages higher level thinking, and uses rhythms to demonstrate fractions. Analyzing music helps students find rhythmic patterns (ex. AB or ABA). Lyrics from songs teach new words. Students are assessed by teacher observation as well as verbal and written assessment.

Music instruction uses technology such as the interactive whiteboard, electronic devices, internet, and laptops. The teacher differentiates instruction in whole group and/or anchor stations using manipulatives and technology which addresses learning styles and enhances student success.

b) Pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) provides students with enriching learning opportunities at a pivotal time to nurture the development of the whole child. CISD's core curriculum ensures that all essential domains necessary to prepare Pre-K students for learning in kindergarten and beyond are covered through developmentally appropriate classroom experiences. The targeted and specific learning goals within each domain are designed to engage all Pre-K children in hands-on activities as they work to attain these goals. The core curriculum domains include the following: emergent literacy- writing, emergent literacy-reading, mathematics, science, social studies, fine arts, physical development, technology, social and emotional development, and language and communication.

The alignment of the Pre-K academic standards for kindergarten through third grade is one of the most important elements in addressing the readiness gap before it becomes an achievement gap. Pre-K academic standards align to each of the foundational skills as well as all enrichment skills. This vertical alignment allows students to build on learning experiences as they progress throughout the grades. This alignment also provides a structure for the systematic analysis of data as students move from Pre-K into Kindergarten.

Students who attend Pre-K develop both academic and social skills that allow them to interact and learn with others outside of their own families. Pre-K students build and expand their knowledge at a critical time of development allowing them to acquire readiness skills essential for success in the following years. Indicators, such as rubrics and checklists used in literacy and math, as well as systematic observations across the curriculum, are invaluable measurement tools that track the learning goals achieved by each child. Specific and targeted assessment provides information about any gaps that may arise in learning and allows teachers to adjust their instruction to meet the needs of each student. Data indicators utilized in Pre-K lay the foundation for each child's educational journey through school. The assessments and indicators used to screen and monitor progress throughout the year facilitate the transition into the next grade. The ability to track assessments longitudinally from Pre-K provides primary grade teachers insight into each child's academic history.

Students who have attended pre-kindergarten are observed as having a greater understanding of classroom procedures as well as basic reading and math skills such as concepts about print, letters and sounds, rhyming words, word recognition, number identification, number writing and counting. These readiness skills are essential when acquiring and understanding new knowledge.

5. Instructional Methods:

Giesinger provides differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. The staff knows that each child is unique and needs to be provided different ways to learn. Differentiated lessons are facilitated through differentiated content, process, product, and environment, differentiated management strategies, and differentiated assessments.

The content is differentiated by concentrating on the concepts, processes, and skills by increasing or accommodating the complexity of learning. How the topic is presented to students reflects the needs, styles, and preferences of students. The content is the same, but the way students learn and process is different. Giesinger differentiates the product by providing greater challenges, variety, and choice in how students demonstrate what they have learned. The environment in which the students learn also plays an important

role in learning. Giesinger, as a school, has behavior expectations and each classroom has adapted the expectations to promote positive student behavior toward learning.

Classroom differentiated strategies include tiered assignments, flexible grouping, and anchor activities. Tiered assignments are lessons designed according to the student's readiness and/or ability as well as multiple intelligences, Bloom's Taxonomy, product, and process. Intensive small group instruction, whole group instruction, or individual instruction is given during flexible grouping. Flexible grouping is used to group students according to learning needs, strengths, and preferences. The flexible groupings are done while the other students are in anchor stations, TEKS based activities that are done independently. Fluid group membership enables teachers to work on different activities at different levels. They include curriculum related skills that focus on significant learning outcomes, reinforce content and have step by step procedures that allow for student choices. The use of tablets and laptops during anchor stations allow students to facilitate learning by creating different products using technology tools. Students who need additional instructional support beyond the classroom qualify for researched based interventions such as Response to Intervention (RtI) and Title I teacher support which are designed to meet the learning needs Giesinger's diverse population.

Differentiated assessments give teachers information about each student's strengths and needs in relation to skills. This information shapes teacher's planning. Giesinger uses common assessments which are collaboratively created to ensure consistency of student expectations. Summative assessments evaluate the effectiveness of instruction after instruction. Formative assessments are ongoing so teaching and learning can be adjusted. Giesinger adds value to all students through differentiating teaching, learning, and fostering a positive learning environment.

6. Professional Development:

Effective professional development requires careful planning and implementation. Giesinger's administrators and teachers analyze student data to identify instructional gaps and then select from various trainings that will improve the quality of teaching and result in increased student learning and achievement. Giesinger analyzes both students' and teachers' needs to ensure success for all.

District hosted workshops are a valued resource because the trainings have been developed based on district data based on integration of both the district's curriculum and model of differentiated instruction. CISD's administrators promptly notify the campuses about upcoming professional development opportunities and encourage representation from each grade level at all core subject staff developments. District coaches and curriculum coordinators are routinely invited to observe teachers implement the new strategies and offer feedback. By offering a variety of workshop topics such as CISD Instructional Model, rigor, tiered assignments, meeting the needs of diverse learners, cross-curricular integration, and guided reading, the district enables all staff to understand both the "why" and "how" of best practices. In addition to district workshops, Giesinger's staff also participates in workshops offered by professional organizations such as Region Service Centers IV and VI, team trainings, and data analysis. Partnerships with other elementary campuses also occur to consolidate funds for on-site training from educational consultants to meet unique campus needs.

Campus initiated staff developments include: mentoring, peer coaching, team meetings, faculty meetings, grade-level meetings and school initiated programs. Giesinger has implemented PLC (Professional Learning Community) at Giesinger over the past two years. With PLC, each grade level meets weekly with administrators to analyze student data and address the needs of the students. The meetings focus on student achievement, collaboration and results. Through the PLC time, Giesinger has been able to establish communication and trust across grade levels. By analyzing the data, Giesinger has been able to address strengths and weaknesses in the curriculum. Individual teacher's strengths are shared collaboratively and implemented in other classrooms to enhance student success. As a result, there has been an increased sense of community and positive interactions among staff. PLC focuses on school improvement and student achievement using the state standards as one of the many measures of success. This collaborative process has increased leadership capacity.

By providing opportunities to increase the learning of teachers, Giesinger Elementary has an “All Means All” approach to professional development. These efforts have resulted in better teaching, improved school leadership, and higher student performance.

7. School Leadership

The leadership philosophy at Giesinger Elementary aligns with the school mission to create an environment of excellence for students, staff and community. Giesinger school administration (principal, assistant principal and counselor) are instructional leaders and mentors who support the mission, standards, and expectations for excellence in the school. Daily and direct involvement with students and staff occur to support student achievement and success. Though the administrative team has specific roles and responsibilities, a collaborative team approach provides consistency within the organization. Team leaders represent each grade, special subjects (art, music, P.E., library) and special education. The team leaders facilitate organizational tasks and act as instructional leaders. The Campus Improvement Committee consists of representatives from each grade level. They make decisions about resources, curriculum and staff development. The committee members also serve as chairpersons for vertical teams that develop presentations in core subject areas in faculty and staff development meetings. Vertical teams discuss curriculum alignment and areas of strengths and weaknesses. Technology and social planning are also part of the vertical team. The organizational structure ensures that the curriculum scope and sequence and best practices are implemented in all classrooms on campus.

Giesinger’s Professional Learning Community (PLC) time brings teachers together to develop lesson plans, discuss instructional strategies, create common assessments, and review objectives to determine students’ instructional needs. Plans of action are designed by teachers for their grade level and classrooms.

The campus motto, “All Means All” ensures that every person at Giesinger has the same expectations for students academically as well as behaviorally. School-wide policies and procedures are implemented by all staff so that expectations are consistent throughout the building.

Giesinger’s on-line school lesson plans allow administrators to monitor teacher’s execution of programs and curriculum with consistency and fidelity. CISD’s instructional models, such as C.I.S.D. READS (language arts), SOLVES (mathematics), INVESTIGATES (science), and REMEMBERS (social studies) focus on student achievement. The lesson plans are easily accessible as walk-throughs and observations are conducted in classrooms.

Giesinger’s organizational structure encourages teachers to be interdependent. As grade level teachers meet and make decisions, teachers are also mindful of the impact the decisions will have on the entire school. When making decisions the staff considers, “What is best for all students?” High academic standards and achievement for students is a Giesinger priority. This philosophy impacts Giesinger’s success through administrators, teachers, and staff working as a cohesive unit to accomplish the campus goals.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math

Test: STAAR Test

All Students Tested/Grade: 3

Edition/Publication Year: 2013

Publisher: NCS Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced	93	90	93	96	92
Level III: Advanced	36	28	46	52	36
Number of students tested	91	93	116	91	118
Percent of total students tested	98	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	2	2	3	2	4
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	2	3	2	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced	82	89	96	94	91
Level III: Advanced	14	23	38	38	33
Number of students tested	28	39	48	34	46
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced			92	100	100
Level III: Advanced			42	14	23
Number of students tested			12	7	13
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced	83	93	96	95	97
Level III: Advanced	28	21	48	35	30
Number of students tested	18	14	27	20	33
5. African- American Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced		77	58	83	94
Level III: Advanced		0	8	50	24
Number of students tested		13	12	6	17

6. Asian Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced	97	92	96	97	93
Level III: Advanced	44	33	52	54	53
Number of students tested	61	61	71	61	57
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level II: Satisfactory + % Advanced					
Level III: Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Texas gave the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in the 2009, 2010, and 2011 school years. In 2012, the state changed the test to the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR). During the years of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS), TAKS data was reported as Met Standard and Commended Performance. Met Standard was passing and Commended Performance was a score of 90% or greater.

The STAAR assesses the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for success in the current grade level and for preparedness in the next grade (subject). The STAAR assessment increased in length and the

overall test difficulty increased by including more rigorous items. The rigor was increased by assessing skills at a greater depth and level of cognitive complexity. This way the tests are better able to measure the growth of higher-achieving students. In reading, greater emphasis was given to critical analysis than to literal understanding. In mathematics, the number of open-ended (griddable) items increased to allow students more opportunity to derive an answer independently. The student performance standards were set so that they require a higher level of student performance than was required on the old TAKS assessments.

To provide time for schools and districts to adapt to the higher standards, Texas is phasing in standards for STAAR Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance. These standards increase until the target of requiring students to answer an average of 75% of items correctly to pass the test. The standards for STAAR Level III: Advanced Academic Performance are in place. Students must score greater than 85% to achieve Level III: Advanced Academic Performance. While the state has only required campuses to demonstrate mastery at the lower phase-in standards for 2012 and 2013, Giesinger's expectation has been that all students will achieve at the highest level of academic performance. This expectation is evidenced in Giesinger's ongoing curriculum, instruction, and assessment analyses and changes to instructional approaches as Giesinger transitions to STAAR.

For students receiving special education services, "STAAR Modified" and "STAAR Alternate" versions were developed. The modified and alternate assessments are aligned to the TEKS as well as to the reporting categories for STAAR. The TAKS test also provided modified and alternate versions but not at the rigor of the STAAR test.

In Texas, two test options were available for special education students that qualified for alternative state assessments. The Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee decides the test the student takes based on the student's IEP and the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAPF). The STAAR modified participation requirements are as follows: multiple years behind grade level or course expectations, the IEP reflects how the student's course content is simplified or scaffolded to facilitate student learning, and the student receives specialized instruction and techniques over a period of time to transfer knowledge and skills to other contexts. The numbers of our special education students that were assessed with the "modified" test followed the state's requirements for participation. On the 2013 STAAR test, there was not a report on six of the ten student groups due to being less than 10% of the school total enrollment. The groups are Special Education, English Language Learner, African-American, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. For the 2012 STAAR test, the following student groups had no report because enrollment was less than 10% of the school total enrollment: English Language Learner, Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. The TAKS test was given in 2011, 2010, and 2009. The student groups that were not reported because of being less than 10% of the school total enrollment were Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and two or More Races Identified Students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Math
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: NCS Pearson

Test: STAAR Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	96	90	98	98	94
% Advanced	26	26	55	58	40
Number of students tested	95	109	96	98	109
Percent of total students tested	100	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	4	4	1	3	3
% of students tested with alternative assessment	4	4	1	3	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	97	79	94	97	91
% Advanced	25	15	38	49	33
Number of students tested	32	39	32	35	46
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced			100	100	100
% Advanced			30	82	23
Number of students tested			10	8	13
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	89	80	100	96	97
% Advanced	22	25	41	63	30
Number of students tested	18	20	22	24	33
5. African- American Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced		67	86	92	94
% Advanced		0	14	42	24
Number of students tested		9	7	12	17
6. Asian Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					

Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	98	94	98	100	93
% Advanced	24	25	62	56	53
Number of students tested	59	72	61	57	57
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Texas gave the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in the 2009, 2010, and 2011 school years. In 2012, the state changed the test to the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR). During the years of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS), TAKS data was reported as Met Standard and Commended Performance. Met Standard was passing and Commended Performance was a score of 90% or greater.

The STAAR assesses the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for success in the current grade level and for preparedness in the next grade (subject). The STAAR assessment increased in length and the overall test difficulty increased by including more rigorous items. The rigor was increased by assessing skills at a greater depth and level of cognitive complexity. This way the tests are better able to measure the

growth of higher-achieving students. In reading, greater emphasis was given to critical analysis than to literal understanding. In mathematics, the number of open-ended (griddable) items increased to allow students more opportunity to derive an answer independently. The student performance standards were set so that they require a higher level of student performance than was required on the old TAKS assessments.

To provide time for schools and districts to adapt to the higher standards, Texas is phasing in standards for STAAR Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance. These standards increase until the target of requiring students to answer an average of 75% of items correctly to pass the test. The standards for STAAR Level III: Advanced Academic Performance are in place. Students must score greater than 85% to achieve Level III: Advanced Academic Performance. While the state has only required campuses to demonstrate mastery at the lower phase-in standards for 2012 and 2013, Giesinger's expectation has been that all students will achieve at the highest level of academic performance. This expectation is evidenced in Giesinger's ongoing curriculum, instruction, and assessment analyses and changes to instructional approaches as Giesinger transitions to STAAR.

For students receiving special education services, "STAAR Modified" and "STAAR Alternate" versions were developed. The modified and alternate assessments are aligned to the TEKS as well as to the reporting categories for STAAR. The TAKS test also provided modified and alternate versions but not at the rigor of the STAAR test.

In Texas, two test options were available for special education students that qualified for alternative state assessments. The Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee decides the test the student takes based on the student's IEP and the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAPF). The STAAR modified participation requirements are as follows: multiple years behind grade level or course expectations, the IEP reflects how the student's course content is simplified or scaffolded to facilitate student learning, and the student receives specialized instruction and techniques over a period of time to transfer knowledge and skills to other contexts. The numbers of our special education students that were assessed with the "modified" test followed the state's requirements for participation.

On the 2013 STAAR test, there was not a report on six of the ten student groups due to being less than 10% of the school total enrollment. The groups are Special Education, English Language Learner, African-American, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. For the 2012 STAAR test, the following student groups had no report because enrollment was less than 10% of the school total enrollment: English Language Learner, Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. The TAKS test was given in 2011, 2010, and 2009. The student groups that were not reported because of being less than 10% of the school total enrollment were Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and two or More Races Identified Students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 3
Publisher: NCS Pearson

Test: STAAR Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	96	88	97	97	97
% Advanced	36	29	57	58	54
Number of students tested	91	94	118	91	128
Percent of total students tested	98	99	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	2	1	3	2	4
% of students tested with alternative assessment	2	1	3	2	3
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	89	85	96	97	93
% Advanced	14	20	38	41	44
Number of students tested	28	40	48	34	60
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced			100	86	88
% Advanced			43	0	14
Number of students tested			14	7	17
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	94	100	96	95	92
% Advanced	28	43	67	40	14
Number of students tested	18	14	27	20	38
5. African- American Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced		85	92	100	100
% Advanced		0	42	33	40
Number of students tested		13	12	6	20
6. Asian Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					

Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	97	85	99	97	99
% Advanced	43	32	58	66	62
Number of students tested	61	62	71	61	67
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Texas gave the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in the 2009, 2010, and 2011 school years. In 2012, the state changed the test to the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR). During the years of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS), TAKS data was reported as Met Standard and Commended Performance. Met Standard was passing and Commended Performance was a score of 90% or greater.

The STAAR assesses the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for success in the current grade level and for preparedness in the next grade (subject). The STAAR assessment increased in length and the overall test difficulty increased by including more rigorous items. The rigor was increased by assessing skills at a greater depth and level of cognitive complexity. This way the tests are better able to measure the

growth of higher-achieving students. In reading, greater emphasis was given to critical analysis than to literal understanding. In mathematics, the number of open-ended (griddable) items increased to allow students more opportunity to derive an answer independently. The student performance standards were set so that they require a higher level of student performance than was required on the old TAKS assessments.

To provide time for schools and districts to adapt to the higher standards, Texas is phasing in standards for STAAR Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance. These standards increase until the target of requiring students to answer an average of 75% of items correctly to pass the test. The standards for STAAR Level III: Advanced Academic Performance are in place. Students must score greater than 85% to achieve Level III: Advanced Academic Performance. While the state has only required campuses to demonstrate mastery at the lower phase-in standards for 2012 and 2013, Giesinger's expectation has been that all students will achieve at the highest level of academic performance. This expectation is evidenced in Giesinger's ongoing curriculum, instruction, and assessment analyses and changes to instructional approaches as Giesinger transitions to STAAR.

For students receiving special education services, "STAAR Modified" and "STAAR Alternate" versions were developed. The modified and alternate assessments are aligned to the TEKS as well as to the reporting categories for STAAR. The TAKS test also provided modified and alternate versions but not at the rigor of the STAAR test.

In Texas, two test options were available for special education students that qualified for alternative state assessments. The Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee decides the test the student takes based on the student's IEP and the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAPF). The STAAR modified participation requirements are as follows: multiple years behind grade level or course expectations, the IEP reflects how the student's course content is simplified or scaffolded to facilitate student learning, and the student receives specialized instruction and techniques over a period of time to transfer knowledge and skills to other contexts. The numbers of our special education students that were assessed with the "modified" test followed the state's requirements for participation.

On the 2013 STAAR test, there was not a report on six of the ten student groups due to being less than 10% of the school total enrollment. The groups are Special Education, English Language Learner, African-American, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. For the 2012 STAAR test, the following student groups had no report because enrollment was less than 10% of the school total enrollment: English Language Learner, Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. The TAKS test was given in 2011, 2010, and 2009. The student groups that were not reported because of being less than 10% of the school total enrollment were Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and two or More Races Identified Students.

STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading/ELA
All Students Tested/Grade: 4
Publisher: NCS Pearson

Test: STAAR Test
Edition/Publication Year: 2013

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
SCHOOL SCORES*					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	88	95	98	96	93
% Advanced	36	33	52	47	28
Number of students tested	96	110	96	94	103
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	3	4	1	4	4
% of students tested with alternative assessment	3	4	1	4	4
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	88	85	97	94	90
% Advanced	18	18	44	28	17
Number of students tested	33	40	32	32	42
2. Students receiving Special Education					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. English Language Learner Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced			100	100	100
% Advanced			30	13	0
Number of students tested			10	8	9
4. Hispanic or Latino Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	89	90	100	100	97
% Advanced	22	30	55	41	21
Number of students tested	18	20	22	22	29
5. African- American Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced		89	100	93	88
% Advanced		33	14	33	18
Number of students tested		9	7	12	17
6. Asian Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					

Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
9. White Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced	87	96	97	96	93
% Advanced	38	33	61	52	36
Number of students tested	60	73	61	56	55
10. Two or More Races identified Students					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
11. Other 1: Other 1					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
12. Other 2: Other 2					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					
13. Other 3: Other 3					
% Level II Satisfactory + % Advanced					
% Advanced					
Number of students tested					

NOTES: Texas gave the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) in the 2009, 2010, and 2011 school years. In 2012, the state changed the test to the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR). During the years of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAKS), TAKS data was reported as Met Standard and Commended Performance. Met Standard was passing and Commended Performance was a score of 90% or greater.

The STAAR assesses the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for success in the current grade level and for preparedness in the next grade (subject). The STAAR assessment increased in length and the overall test difficulty increased by including more rigorous items. The rigor was increased by assessing skills at a greater depth and level of cognitive complexity. This way the tests are better able to measure the

growth of higher-achieving students. In reading, greater emphasis was given to critical analysis than to literal understanding. In mathematics, the number of open-ended (griddable) items increased to allow students more opportunity to derive an answer independently. The student performance standards were set so that they require a higher level of student performance than was required on the old TAKS assessments.

To provide time for schools and districts to adapt to the higher standards, Texas is phasing in standards for STAAR Level II: Satisfactory Academic Performance. These standards increase until the target of requiring students to answer an average of 75% of items correctly to pass the test. The standards for STAAR Level III: Advanced Academic Performance are in place. Students must score greater than 85% to achieve Level III: Advanced Academic Performance. While the state has only required campuses to demonstrate mastery at the lower phase-in standards for 2012 and 2013, Giesinger's expectation has been that all students will achieve at the highest level of academic performance. This expectation is evidenced in Giesinger's ongoing curriculum, instruction, and assessment analyses and changes to instructional approaches as Giesinger transitions to STAAR.

For students receiving special education services, "STAAR Modified" and "STAAR Alternate" versions were developed. The modified and alternate assessments are aligned to the TEKS as well as to the reporting categories for STAAR. The TAKS test also provided modified and alternate versions but not at the rigor of the STAAR test.

In Texas, two test options were available for special education students that qualified for alternative state assessments. The Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee decides the test the student takes based on the student's IEP and the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAPF). The STAAR modified participation requirements are as follows: multiple years behind grade level or course expectations, the IEP reflects how the student's course content is simplified or scaffolded to facilitate student learning, and the student receives specialized instruction and techniques over a period of time to transfer knowledge and skills to other contexts. The numbers of our special education students that were assessed with the "modified" test followed the state's requirements for participation.

On the 2013 STAAR test, there was not a report on six of the ten student groups due to being less than 10% of the school total enrollment. The groups are Special Education, English Language Learner, African-American, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. For the 2012 STAAR test, the following student groups had no report because enrollment was less than 10% of the school total enrollment: English Language Learner, Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Two or More Races Identified Students. The TAKS test was given in 2011, 2010, and 2009. The student groups that were not reported because of being less than 10% of the school total enrollment were Special Education, Asian, American Indian, Native Hawaiian, and two or More Races Identified Students.