Midland Independent School District

Midland High School

2024-2025 Campus Improvement Plan



Mission Statement

Mission: At Midland Senior High School, all students have equitable access to quality education so ALL are empowered to reach academic goals.

Vision

Vision: All (all means all) students will be ready to succeed following graduation; college, career or military.

Value Statement

Commitments (values):

I will be a positive, contributing member of my collaborative team and our full staff.

I will teach the essential learnings of our agreed-upon curriculum.

I will monitor each student's learning on an ongoing basis through classroom and team developed formative assessments and give practical feedback.

I will use evidence of student learning to inform and improve my practice and to better meet the needs of individual students.

I will seek out the most promising practices to support student learning.

I will keep parents informed of the progress of their children.

I will utilize the discipline matrix and maintain a safe environment in my classroom

Table of Contents

| Comprehensive Needs Assessment | 5 |
|--|----|
| Demographics | 5 |
| Student Learning | 7 |
| School Processes & Programs | 11 |
| Perceptions | 13 |
| Priority Problem Statements | 15 |
| Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation | 17 |
| Goals | 19 |
| Goal 1: Board Goal :3 The percentage of English I -English II students who MEET OR EXCEED their Reading Language Arts STAAR Annual Growth will increase from 55% to 71% by 2028. | 19 |
| Goal 2: Board Goal : 4 The percentage of Algebra 1 students who MEET or EXCEED their Math STAAR Annual Growth will increase from 61% to 71% by 2028. | 22 |
| Goal 3: Board Goal: 5 The percentage of the graduating class MEETING one or more CCMR indicators will increase from 54% to 83% by 2028. | 25 |
| Goal 4: Through the Student Experience we will foster safe and innovative learning spaces where students engage in rigorous and relevant experiences, preparing them for meaningful opportunities post graduation. | 37 |
| Goal 5: Through Growing & Developing Staff we will build retention and recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards high-impact staff, improving student outcomes. | 45 |
| Goal 6: Through Engaging & Acting we will engage the entire Midland community through clear and actionable communication that cultivates trust and partnership. | 48 |

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

| Demographics Summary |
|----------------------------------|
| Demographics summary: |
| Current enrollment: 2709 |
| student demographics in detail: |
| 7% African American |
| 70% Hispanic |
| 22% white |
| 44% economically disadvantaged |
| 13% ELL |
| 68% at risk |
| 18% mobility rate |
| 4% GT |
| 7% special education |
| Teacher demographics in detail: |
| 9% African American |
| 28% Hispanic |
| 61% white |
| 43% have 11+ years of experience |

Demographics Strengths

Midland High serves a diverse student group We serve a high amount of at risk students who experience success at MHS We are growing We have a diverse mix of teachers our administrative team has experience above the state average

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1 Root Cause: sheltered instruction strategies are not being taught by teachers

Problem Statement 2: Our exceeds expectations percentages are not correlating with our GT population Root Cause: a lack of rigor is missing in the classrooms to challenge our top students

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Biology:

Approaches - up 7% (74%-81%) Meets - up 2% (24%-26%) SPED (16% to 12%) Masters - remained the same (2%) *STATE: Approaches 91%; Meets 57% 2024 demographics (approaches): 81% overall 80% Hispanic 74% black 93% white 80% EcoDis 71% EB 80% at risk

English II EOC (Approaches or Higher) Breakdown:

Overall - 58% Hispanic - 53% Black/African American - 63% White - 76% Asian - 69% Eco Dis - 51% Not Eco Dis - 67% EB/EL - 31%

Eng. II 2023 - 37% Meets 2024 - 40% Meets SPED - 12% to 10% (Does not follow trend)

*Eng II 2024 - 4% Masters (First Time Testers) Eng I First Time 10 % Approaches Eng I Re Test 9% Approaches Eng I Hispanic 9% Approaches

Math: (Algebra 1) 2022 - Approaches (9%) Meets (2%) 2023 - Approaches (36%) Meets (2%) 2024- Approaches (36%) Meets (2%)

STATE (2024) 79% Approaches; 45% Meets 2024 demographics (approaches): 36% overall 34% Hispanic 23% black

53% white 37% EcoDis 45% EB 33% at risk

US History:

2022 - 81% Approaches 2023 - 91% Approaches 2024 - 92% Approaches

2022 - 60% Meets 2023 - 58% Meets *2024 - 52% Meets

2022 - 29% Masters 2023 - 23% Masters 2024 - 21% Masters

STATE: (2024) 95% Approaches; 69% Meets SPED - 20% to 21% Meets 2024 demographics (approaches): 92% overall 90% Hispanic 96% black 99% white 89% EcoDis 79% EB

CCMR-91% predicted for class of 24 Attendance rate: 90% graduation rate (class of 22)-88%

Student Learning Strengths

- 1. CCMR exceeded growth goal
- 2. US History is approaching the state approaches average
- 3. Biology, while still below state average, is up 7%
- 4. Graduation rate is above state average

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Students are not performing in English 2 **Root Cause:** While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): AP scores are well below state and national average Root Cause: Lack of rigor in AP and EAS classes

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1 Root Cause: sheltered instruction strategies are not being taught by teachers

Problem Statement 5: Our exceeds expectations percentages are not correlating with our GT population Root Cause: a lack of rigor is missing in the classrooms to challenge our top students

Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized): lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Credit recovery is in place

Flex scheduling and Bulldog Academy to help meet student needs and socio-emotional needs

PLC teams are formed with English, Biology and Math having common PLC times

Putting instructional coaching as a priority with administration team

CCMR campus plan remains in place w/ weekly meetings between principal and CCMR coordinator

Family liaison to help assist with attendance

Restructuring instructional specialist to provide coaching for high needs teachers

Teacher job postings made as soon as vacancy occurs

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Restructure of instructional specialist

Making PLCs a high priority with administrative team

Staff resources hub created for teachers

Will be implementing Harvard Rounds to strengthen Tier 1 instruction

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): PLCs are not maintaining fidelity of the PLC process. It has become more of a "trading worksheets" meeting when teams do meet Root Cause: PLC processes are not truly understood by teachers

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areas Root Cause: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staff

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Addition of new staff without certifications during the school year that miss out on parts of the mentor program Root Cause: We started a new campus mentor program last year but did not have systems to get those hired within the school year caught up

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Students are not performing in English 2 **Root Cause:** While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader.

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): AP scores are well below state and national average Root Cause: Lack of rigor in AP and EAS classes

Problem Statement 6: Students do not treat each other with respect, according to parents, staff and students Root Cause: Although students report feeling there is an adult they can go to, they do not feel they can trust their classmates

Problem Statement 7: Teachers do not successfully show students how lessons relate to life outside of school as perceived by students Root Cause: There is a lack of real life lessons and projects in classes

Problem Statement 8 (Prioritized): Students, parents and staff report the school is not clean and well maintained Root Cause: Restrooms are often dirty but this is caused by students. Students do not value nor respect the building

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

We provide numerous opportunities for students to be involved

Students feel connected at school

There are deep rooted traditions and family ties to MHS

Stakeholders feel welcome at MHS

Teachers care about students

Perceptions Strengths

Parent/guardian:

This school informs families about school - sponsored activities, such as tutoring, after - school programs, and student performances. There is a teacher, counselor, or other staff member to whom a student can go for help with a school problem. School offers a variety of courses and co-curricular/extracurricular activities.

This school is welcoming to families.

Staff:

There is a teacher, counselor, or other staff member to whom a student can go for help with a school problem.

This school is welcoming to families.

There is a teacher, counselor, or other staff member to whom a student can go for help with a personal problem.

Teachers/School staff genuinely care about students.

This school informs families about school - sponsored activities, such as tutoring, after - school programs, and student performances.

Students:

I have at least one friend at this school.

Midland High School Generated by Plan4Learning.com School offers a variety of courses and co-curricular/extracurricular activities.

There is a teacher, counselor, or other staff member to whom a student can go for help with a school problem.

Teachers set high expectations for all students.

I can easily talk with my teachers and other staff with information and questions.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: Students do not treat each other with respect, according to parents, staff and students Root Cause: Although students report feeling there is an adult they can go to, they do not feel they can trust their classmates

Problem Statement 2: Teachers do not successfully show students how lessons relate to life outside of school as perceived by students Root Cause: There is a lack of real life lessons and projects in classes

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Students, parents and staff report the school is not clean and well maintained Root Cause: Restrooms are often dirty but this is caused by students. Students do not value nor respect the building

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1Root Cause 1: sheltered instruction strategies are not being taught by teachersProblem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areasRoot Cause 2: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areasProblem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Students are not performing in Algebra 1Root Cause 3: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking.Problem Statement 3 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in English 2Root Cause 4: While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader.Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: AP scores are well below state and national averageRoot Cause 5: Lack of rigor in AP and EAS classesProblem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: PLCs are not maintaining fidelity of the PLC process. It has become more of a "trading worksheets" meeting when teams do meetRoot Cause 6: PLC processes are not truly understood by teachersProblem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 7: Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areasRoot Cause 7: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staffProblem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 8: Addition of new staff without certifications during the school year that miss out on parts of the mentor programRoot Cause 8: We started a new campus mentor program last year but did not have systems to get those hired within the school year caught up

Problem Statement 8 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 9: Students, parents and staff report the school is not clean and well maintainedRoot Cause 9: Restrooms are often dirty but this is caused by students. Students do not value nor respect the buildingProblem Statement 9 Areas: School Processes & Programs - Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

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

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Effective Schools Framework data
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
- Federal Report Card and accountability data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Postsecondary college, career or military-ready graduates including enlisting in U. S. armed services, earning an industry based certification, earning an associate degree, graduating with completed IEP and workforce readiness
- Advanced Placement (AP) and/or International Baccalaureate (IB) assessment data
- SAT and/or ACT assessment data
- PSAT
- Observation Survey results

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility data

- · At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Emergent Bilingual (EB) /non-EB data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, gender etc.
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant achievements by race, ethnicity, gender, etc.
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- Gifted and talented data
- Dyslexia data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data
- Dual-credit and/or college prep course completion data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

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

Employee Data

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

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices

Goals

Goal 1: Board Goal :3

The percentage of English I -English II students who MEET OR EXCEED their Reading Language Arts STAAR Annual Growth will increase from 55% to 71% by 2028.

Performance Objective 1: GPM 3.6: The percentage of English I students who meet or exceed their Reading annual growth goals on the NWEA MAP assessment will increase from 52% to 57% by 2025.

GPM 3.7: The percentage of English II students who meet or exceed their Reading annual growth goals on the NWEA MAP assessment will increase from 53% to 58% by 2025.

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP

| Strategy 1 Details | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Professional Learning Communities: Midland High School leadership team will work along side teachers to | Formative | | | Summative |
| facilitate well-planned PLCs to streamline the curriculum across all content areas. The focus of PLCs this year will be common assessments, alignment to MISD scope and sequence, and adjusting instruction based on results. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased awareness and mastery of TEKS; increased use of data to drive instruction through formative instruction; increase in small group instruction; increase in research-based instructional delivery practices; increased scores in all student pops | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 4, 6 - School Processes & Programs 1, 4 | | | | |

| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | iews | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|----------------------|
| Strategy 2: The campus will monitor and document students' progress by expecting students and teachers to track data on a | | Formative | | Summative or June |
| weekly basis. Student success will be measured by weekly formative assessments, unit exams, curriculum-based assessments (from district), and benchmarks (from district). We will continue to utilize our Title funds to pay for STAAR camps, after school, and Saturday tutoring. | Nov | Feb | Apr | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved student scores on NWEA MAP; improved student growth measures on NWEA MAP | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team including department chairs | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 4, 6 - School Processes & Programs 2, 4 | | | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | | Rev | iews | |
| Strategy 3: Midland High School will continue to provide targeted support to students in all ELAR courses with a focus on | Formative | | | Summative |
| sheltered instruction practices to increase EB students' EI and EII MAP scores ELA 2. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in EB students' MAP scores; increase in teachers' use of sheltered instruction practices | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; instructional specialist | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math | | | | |
| | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | 1 | 1 |
| - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Strategy 4 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 4: Midland High School will administer common bell ringers that address E1 and EII content during 5th period 3X | | Formative | | Summative |
| per week with a quick video tutorial on strategies to solve the problem. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in MAP student growth across all student groups | | | • | + |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | | | | |
| Title I: 2.4, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 4, 6 - School Processes & Programs 4 | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | • |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1 Root Cause: sheltered instruction strategies are not being taught by teachers |
| Problem Statement 3: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1 : Students are not performing in English 2 Root Cause : While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader. |
| Problem Statement 4: EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1 Root Cause: sheltered instruction strategies are not being taught by teachers |
| Problem Statement 6: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: PLCs are not maintaining fidelity of the PLC process. It has become more of a "trading worksheets" meeting when teams do meet Root Cause: PLC processes are not truly understood by teachers |
| Problem Statement 2: Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areas Root Cause: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staff |
| Problem Statement 4 : Students are not performing in English 2 Root Cause : While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader. |
| Midland High School Campus #165901003 |

Goal 2: Board Goal : 4

The percentage of Algebra 1 students who MEET or EXCEED their Math STAAR Annual Growth will increase from 61% to 71% by 2028.

Performance Objective 1: GPM 4.6: The percentage of Algebra I students who meet or exceed their Math annual growth goals on the NWEA MAP assessment will increase from 60% to 62% by 2025

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Strategy 1: Professional Learning Communities: Midland High School leadership team will work along side teachers to | Formative | | | 5 Formativ | | | | | |
| facilitate well-planned PLCs to streamline the curriculum across all content areas. The focus of PLCs this year will be common assessments, alignment to MISD scope and sequence, and adjusting instruction based on results. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | | | | | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased awareness and mastery of TEKS; increased use of data to drive instruction through formative instruction; increase in small group instruction; increase in research-based instructional delivery practices; increased scores in all student pops Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team Title I: 2.4, 2.6 TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 2, 6 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | | | | | | | | |

| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | iews | |
|--|-----|------------|------|-----------|
| Strategy 2: The campus will monitor and document students' progress by expecting students and teachers to track data on a | | Formative | | |
| weekly basis. Student success will be measured by weekly formative assessments, unit exams, curriculum-based assessments (from district), and benchmarks (from district). We will continue to utilize our Title funds to pay for STAAR camps, after school, and Saturday tutoring. | Nov | ov Feb Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved student scores on NWEA MAP; improved student growth measures on NWEA MAP | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team including department chairs | | | | |
| Title I: 2.4, 2.6 TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 2, 6 | | | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | | Rev | iews | • |
| Strategy 3: Midland High School will continue to provide targeted support to students in all Algebra I with a focus on | | Formative | | Summative |
| sheltered instruction practices to increase EB students' Alg 1 MAP scores Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in students' MAP scores as well as STAAR scores; increase in teachers' use of sheltered instruction practices | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; instructional specialist | | | | |
| Title I: 2.4, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |

| Strategy 4 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 4: Midland High School will administer common bell ringers that address AI content during 5th period 2X per | | Formative | | Summative |
| week with a quick video tutorial on strategies to solve the problem. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in students' scores on AI MAP testing and EOC tests | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 2, 6 | | | | |
| No Progress ON Accomplished Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 3: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas |
| Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 2: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. |
| Problem Statement 6: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: PLCs are not maintaining fidelity of the PLC process. It has become more of a "trading worksheets" meeting when teams do meet Root Cause: PLC processes are not truly understood by teachers |
| Problem Statement 2: Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areas Root Cause: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staff |

The percentage of the graduating class MEETING one or more CCMR indicators will increase from 54% to 83% by 2028.

Performance Objective 1: GPM 5.1: First time Algebra I EOC testers scoring at the meets grade level or above will increase from 42% to 46% by 2025.

| Strategy 1 Details | | Rev | iews | | |
|---|-----|-----------|----------|-----------|--|
| Strategy 1: MHS will employ a math instructional specialist who will work with small groups to increase math student's | | Formative | | Summative | |
| understanding of misconceptions and misunderstandings | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in A1 EOC scores | | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; math specialist | | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 2: Strategic Staffing | | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy | | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 2, 6 | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: Midland High School will continue to provide targeted support to students in all Algebra I with a focus on | | | | | |
| sheltered instruction practices to increase EB students' Alg 1 MAP scores | N | | A | Summative | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in students' MAP scores as well as STAAR scores; increase in teachers' use of sheltered instruction practices | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; instructional specialist | | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy | | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| Strategy 3: The campus will monitor and document students' progress by expecting students and teachers to track data on a | | Formative | | Summative |
| weekly basis. Student success will be measured by weekly formative assessments, unit exams, curriculum-based assessments (from district), and benchmarks (from district). We will continue to utilize our Title funds to pay for STAAR | Nov Feb | Apr | June | |
| camps, after school, and Saturday tutoring. | | | | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved student scores on NWEA MAP; improved student growth measures on NWEA MAP | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.4, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 2, 6 - School Processes & Programs 2 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Demographics | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Problem Statement 3: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. | | | | | |
| Student Learning | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 2: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 6: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas | | | | | |
| School Processes & Programs | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 2: Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areas Root Cause: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staff | | | | | |

The percentage of the graduating class MEETING one or more CCMR indicators will increase from 54% to 83% by 2028.

Performance Objective 2: GPM 5.2: The percentage of students earning 6 or more credits by the end of their first year in high school will increase from 87% to 89% by 2025.

GPM 5.3: The percentage of students in their second year of high school earning 6 or more credits will increase from 79% to 81% by 2025.

| Strategy 1: Counselors have created an off-grade tracking tool in order to monitor students lacking credits and working off grade level. Tracking tool will be used and monitored weekly Formative Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: students' earning more credits and getting back on track Nov Feb Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of instruction; lead counselor Image: Counselor Image: Counselor Title I: Image: Counselor Image: Counselor Image: Counselor | Apr | Summative June | |
|---|-----------|-------------------|--|
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: students' earning more credits and getting back on track INOV Feb Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of instruction; lead counselor Intervention Intervention Title I: Intervention Intervention Intervention | Apr | June | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of instruction; lead counselor Title I: | | | |
| Title I: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 2.5, 2.6 | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | |
| Improve low-performing schools | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details Reviews | vs | | |
| Strategy 2: MHS will utilize a Bulldog Academy in which students enroll in Coleman Flex Academy for 6 weeks to get Formative | Formative | | |
| caught up on credits. The college and career coach will monitor students' in the flex academy to ensure success Nov Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: students behind in credits are earning credits and getting caught up | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: college and career coach | | | |
| Title I: | | | |
| 2.5, 2.6 | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | |
| Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----|--------------|------|
| Strategy 3: Night school and Saturday school will be offered for students that need additional time and a chance to earn | e and a chance to earn Formative | | Formative Su | |
| predit through our credit recovery system | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: students with lost credit(s) are earning credits needed | | | F | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; night school staff | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.5, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Improve low-performing schools | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy | | | | |
| Strategy 4 Details | | Rev | iews | |
| Strategy 4: Students will be able to recover failed six weeks in core subjects in order to prevent semester failures during | Formative Su | | Summativ | |
| hight school and Saturday school as well as work from home on school-issued device | | | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students who lost credit will be earning credit back | | ГСО | Apr | June |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: counselors; night school staff | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.5, 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Improve low-performing schools | | | | |
| - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy | | | | |
| - Targeleu Support Stralegy - Auditonal Targeleu Support Stralegy | | | | |
| - Targeteu Support Strategy - Additional Targeteu Support Strategy | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify | X Discon | | | |

Performance Objective 3: GPM 5.4: The number of students that complete a program of study and earn an industry based certification will increase from 14.5% (Class of 2022) to 21% (Class of 2025).

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|------|-----------|--|
| Strategy 1: Increase opportunities provided for career investigation through guest speakers, field trips, community | | Summative | | | |
| collaborations, internships and practicums. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased interest in programs of study and IBCs, leading to an increase in completed POS and earned IBCs | | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: counselors; associate principal of instruction; teachers; CCMR coach | | | | | |
| Title I: 2.5, 2.6 | | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Connect high school to career and college | | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | iews | | |
| Strategy 2: MHS counselors will carefully track students' schedules to ensure completion of programs of study, using | | Formative | | Summative | |
| interest surveys, career planning | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased number of students completing a POS | 1.0.1 | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: counselors; associate principal of instruction | | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | | |
| 2.6 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | 1 | |
| - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Connect high school to career and college | | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Reviews | | |
|---|-----------|---------|-----------|------|
| Strategy 3: MHS will offer a new series of parent workshops, entitled Bulldog Academy, that offer meetings monthly to | Formative | | Summative | |
| teach parents about programs of study, IBCs, reading a transcript, and college/career readiness | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in parental knowledge of POS and IBCs, which in turn will lead to more students completing POS and earning IBCs | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: counselors; family and parent liaison; associate principal of instruction | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 4.1, 4.2 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | <u> </u> | |

Performance Objective 4: GPM 5.5: The number of students that meet TSI criteria on BOTH reading and math on SAT, ACT, TSIA2, or College Bridge/Prep course will increase from 25.2% (Class of 2022) to 40% (Class of 2025) by 2026.

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|--|--|
| Strategy 1: The CCMR coach and principal will utilize a CCMR tracker which will track students' completion of SAT, | | Summative | | | | |
| ACT, TSIA2 and TXCB and also meet bi-monthly to review data Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in EACH student being tracked so they have a chance to earn TSI criteria in reading and math Staff Responsible for Monitoring: principal Title I: 2.4 TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | views | | | |
| Strategy 2: MHS will employ common bell ringers/Do-Knows directly tied to College Board performance measures during | Formative | | | Summative | | |
| Advisory Classes. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in TSI/ACT/SAT scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team Title I: 2.4, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Rev | views | |
|--|-----------|--------|-------|-----------|
| Strategy 3: All students will be enrolled in TXCB their junior year to begin work immediately in the course as well as all | Formative | | | Summative |
| seniors who have not met TSI criteria in reading and math will be enrolled in TXCB during the school day so they have the opportunity to complete the course | Nov Feb | | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased number of students earning TXCB credit | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: CCMR coach | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 2.6 | | | | |
| - TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | | |
| No Progress ON Accomplished Continue/Modify | X Discon | itinue | 1 | 1 |

Performance Objective 5: GPM 5.6: The number of students that score a 3 or higher on an AP exam will increase from 15.6% (Class of 2022) to 20% (Class of 2027).

| rategy 1: All AP teachers will attend AP Summer Academy to increase their knowledge of AP instruction Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased rigor in the AP classroom Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Associate principal of instruction TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 5 | Nov | Formative Feb | Apr | Summative June |
|--|-----------|------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Associate principal of instruction TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 5 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | views | |
| rategy 2: Increased number of coaching visits between the associate principal and AP teacher after an instructional | Formative | | | Summative |
| alkthrough | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in rigor in AP classrooms | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Associate principal of instruction | | | | |
| TEA Priorities: | | | | |
| Connect high school to career and college | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 5: Effective Instruction | | | | |
| Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 5 | | | | |
| | | | | |

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

| | Student Learning |
|--|---|
| Problem Statement 3 : AP scores are well below state and national average | Root Cause: Lack of rigor in AP and EAS classes |
| | |

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: AP scores are well below state and national average Root Cause: Lack of rigor in AP and EAS classes

Goal 3: Board Goal: 5

The percentage of the graduating class MEETING one or more CCMR indicators will increase from 54% to 83% by 2028.

Performance Objective 6: GPM 5.7: The four-year longitudinal graduation rate will increase from 86.8% (Class of 2022) to 89% (Class of 2025).

High Priority

HB3 Goal

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Students who are behind in credits will be enrolled in credit recovery | | Formative | | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in students earning lost credit Staff Responsible for Monitoring: counselors; associate principal of instruction TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | views | |
| Strategy 2: Counselors will utilize their tracking tool to keep track of those in danger of graduation and meet with these | Formative | | | Summative |
| students monthly to check their progress Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in students graduating who are in danger of Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of instruction Title I: 2.6 TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |

| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------------|--------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: MHS will utilize the collegiate coach to monitor our students who are 5th and 6th years | Formative Sur | | | Summative |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: more students graduating who are 1 and 2 years behind their cohort Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of instruction | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Title I: 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discor | ntinue | | |

Performance Objective 1: Strengthen instructional practices to improve student academic performance across all grades, cultivating a culture of continuous improvement.

Evaluation Data Sources: Accountability Ratings

| | Reviews | | |
|-----------|-----------|-------------------|---|
| | Summative | | |
| Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Rev | views | |
| Formative | | | Summative |
| Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1 | | | |
| 1 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Nov | Formative Nov Feb | Formative Nov Feb Apr Nov Feb Apr Image: state states |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Rev | iews | |
|--|----------|-----------|------|-----------|
| Strategy 3: MHS will begin utilizing sheltered instruction strategies in order to refine Tier 1 instruction and help reach EB | | Formative | | Summative |
| learners and at risk learners | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved instruction; at risk students performing better academically | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: instructional specialist; associate principal of instruction | | | | |
| Title I: 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2 | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 3: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas |
| Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1: Students are not performing in English 2 Root Cause: While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader. |
| Problem Statement 2: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. |
| Problem Statement 6: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: PLCs are not maintaining fidelity of the PLC process. It has become more of a "trading worksheets" meeting when teams do meet Root Cause: PLC processes are not truly understood by teachers |
| Problem Statement 2: Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areas Root Cause: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staff |
| Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in English 2 Root Cause: While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader. |

Performance Objective 2: 100% of PLCs will use student data effectively to inform instructional decisions and personalize learning experiences. PLCs will analyze assessment data, identify student needs and learning gaps, and develop targeted interventions and enrichment activities to support student growth and achievement.

Evaluation Data Sources: PLCs will demonstrate the ability to analyze assessment data, identify student needs and learning gaps, and develop targeted interventions and enrichment activities that are tailored to individual student needs. This personalized approach to instruction will support student growth and achievement, leading to improved academic outcomes and increased student engagement and success.

PLC data scorecards will show improvement. Student Achievement.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|-----|------|
| Strategy 1: MHS will contract a PLC consultant to coach effective collaboration including refining tier 1 instruction, | | Summative | | |
| improving Tier 2 instruction and raising instruction for students who have mastered the content Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 instruction Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Title I: 2.4 TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 1, 2, 6 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 4 | | | | |

| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 2: Professional Learning Communities: Midland High School leadership team will work along side teachers to | Formative | | | Summative |
| facilitate well-planned PLCs to streamline the curriculum across all content areas. The focus of PLCs this year will be common assessments, alignment to MISD scope and sequence, and adjusting instruction based on results. | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased awareness and mastery of TEKS; increased use of data to drive instruction through formative instruction; increase in small group instruction; increase in research-based instructional delivery practices; increased scores in all student pops | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | | | | |
| Title I: 2.4, 2.6 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 4, 6 - School Processes & Programs 1, 4 | | | | |
| No Progress Occomplished Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

| Demographics | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Problem Statement 1: EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1 Root Cause: sheltered instruction strategies are not being aught by teachers | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 3: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. | | | | | | |
| Student Learning | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 1: Students are not performing in English 2 Root Cause: While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader. | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 2: Students are not performing in Algebra 1 Root Cause: PLC practices are lacking with no systems in place. Solid Tier 1 instruction is lacking. | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 4: EB students are scoring below the their peers in EOC tested subjects in all areas except Algebra 1 Root Cause: sheltered instruction strategies are not being taught by teachers | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 6: lack of growth across time in our student populations in all content areas Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is lacking across the content areas | | | | | | |

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: PLCs are not maintaining fidelity of the PLC process. It has become more of a "trading worksheets" meeting when teams do meet Root Cause: PLC processes are not truly understood by teachers

Problem Statement 2: Tier 1 instruction is lacking rigor in all content areas Root Cause: The administrative team and department chairs alone are not able to do as much instructional coaching that is needed due to non-certified staff

Problem Statement 4: Students are not performing in English 2 **Root Cause**: While strong PLC practice is in place, there is a sense of resentment in PLC between the team and the MCL leader.

Performance Objective 3: Research, plan and implement new school safety infrastructure, facility updates and transportation operations that maximize instructional time.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Students will experience a safer and more conducive learning environment, with increased opportunities for uninterrupted instruction and academic engagement.

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | |
|---|-------------|---------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: MHS will utilize a digital hall pass to maximize instruction in the classroom and reduce hallway traffic | Formative | | | Summative |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: more students in the classroom; less time spent in the halls Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; teachers TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy 2 Details Strategy 2: MHS will employ a safety team to measure potential threats; perform threat assessments; review safety data; as | s Formative | | | Summative |
| well as participate in round table scenarios to practice protocols Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: safer campus; more familiarity with safety protocols where they become more second nature Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of operations | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|-----|------|
| Strategy 3: Cleaning walk throughs will be performed between the associate principal of operations and the head of custodians to check for areas in need on the campus | | Summative | | |
| | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: a cleaner campus which is tied to higher performance academically | | | | 1 |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of operations | | | | |
| TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 8 - Perceptions 3 | | | | |
| Image: No Progress Image: Accomplished Image: Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

| School Processes & Programs | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Problem Statement 8: Students, parents and staff report the school is not clean and well maintained Root Cause: Restrooms are often dirty but this is caused by students. Students do not value nor respect the building | | | | | | |
| Perceptions | | | | | | |
| Problem Statement 3 : Students, parents and staff report the school is not clean and well maintaine Students do not value nor respect the building | d Root Cause: Restrooms are often dirty but this is caused by students. | | | | | |

Performance Objective 4: 100% of the district's safety policies will be implemented.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Safety drills and Audits.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|--------------|-------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: MHS will perform all safety drills and at the frequency required according to district policy | Formative Su | | | Summative |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: quicker response time in drills | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: associate principal of operations; leadership team | | | | |
| ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning | | | | |
| Image: No Progress Image: Accomplished Image: Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Goal 5: Through Growing & Developing Staff we will build retention and recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards highimpact staff, improving student outcomes.

Performance Objective 1: Recruit & onboard highly-qualified staff that effectively serve all students and the broader community.

Evaluation Data Sources: Vacancy reports, District Accountability.

Goal 5: Through Growing & Developing Staff we will build retention and recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards high-impact staff, improving student outcomes.

Performance Objective 2: Develop and implement talent pipelines and professional learning for all staff with systems of support that cultivate continuous learning, staff recognition and incentives, enhance job satisfaction, promote staff retention, and foster a culture of growth, well-being, work-life balance and career progression.

Evaluation Data Sources: Pipeline data, and retention reports.

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----|-----------|------|-----------|--|
| Strategy 1: MHS will utilize the MOGS squad (mentoring others to grow and succeed) in which all new teachers 92 years | | Summative | | | |
| ss expereince) are matched with a mentor and receive monthly training in order to feel supported and to grow in their tice | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: retaining new teachers; improved classroom management and instructional practices in new staff; feeling of enjoyment on the campus | | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: assistant principal; principal | | | | | |
| TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 2: Strategic Staffing | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Rev | iews | | |
| Strategy 2: All Associate teachers will be paired with a supervising teacher in order for them to feel supported and | | Formative | | Summative | |
| mentored in their classroom instruction and day to day operations | Nov | Feb | Apr | June | |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: retaining associate teachers in the MHS pipeline to become certified teachers Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team | | | | | |
| TEA Priorities: | | | | | |
| Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: | | | | | |
| Lever 2: Strategic Staffing | | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: MHS will celebrate teachers through the "all stars" program, as well as have monthly meals served to staff by | | Formative | | Summative |
| outside organizations Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved job satisfaction; enjoyment; improved school climate | | Feb | Apr | June |
| | | | - | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: principal; student activities coordinator | | | | |
| TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | |
| | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |

Goal 6: Through Engaging & Acting we will engage the entire Midland community through clear and actionable communication that cultivates trust and partnership.

Performance Objective 1: Promote proactive and transparent data sharing and improve communication practices, ensuring clear follow-up and promoting a culture of openness and accountability.

Evaluation Data Sources: Committing to timely responses and transparent reporting of feedback outcomes holds the district accountable for addressing stakeholder concerns and implementing suggested improvements. This accountability reinforces trust in the district's leadership and ensures that actions are taken to address identified needs.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: MHS will offer a new series of parent workshops, entitled Bulldog Academy, that offer meetings monthly to teach parents about programs of study, IBCs, reading a transcript, and college/career readiness | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in parental knowledge of POS and IBCs, which in turn will lead to more students completing POS and earning IBCs | | | | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: counselors; family and parent liaison; associate principal of instruction | | | | |
| Title I: 4.1, 4.2 TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: Continue weekly communication with students and parents through newsletter, phone call, text reminders, and call outs so that they stay informed | Formative Summ | | | Summative |
| | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: students and parents are more informed; therefore, more engaged | | | _ | |
| Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team; principal | | | | |
| Title I: | | | | |
| 4.1 | | | | |
| - ESF Levers: | | | | |
| Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | 1 |

Goal 6: Through Engaging & Acting we will engage the entire Midland community through clear and actionable communication that cultivates trust and partnership.

Performance Objective 2: Amplify the narrative and impact of communication regarding performance and expectations, empowering stakeholders to effectively understand, engage with, and contribute to the shared story of success.

Evaluation Data Sources: DEIC Meeting, K-12 Insight Survey, ESSA Survey, ESSER Survey

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: MHS will maintain an active Facebook page to keep parents informed about performance and expectations as | Formative | | | Summative |
| well as share student and campus successes | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved engagment with stakeholders Staff Responsible for Monitoring: student activities coordinator; leadership team | | | | |
| ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: MHS will maintain an active Facebook page to keep parents informed about performance and expectations as | Formative | | | Summative |
| well as share student and campus successes | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improved engagment with stakeholders Staff Responsible for Monitoring: student activities coordinator; leadership team ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | | | | |
| Strategy 3 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 3: MHS will administer and collect data using the k12 insights survey of staff, parents and students and use the data to help guide decision making on the campus Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: stakeholders feel more empowered and included at MHS Staff Responsible for Monitoring: leadership team ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Nov | Feb | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| No Progress Accomplished -> Continue/Modify | X Discon | tinue | | |