

Garland Independent School District Giddens-Steadham Elementary School 2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan



Board Approval Date: October 28, 2025

Mission Statement

Joyce Giddens-Steadham Elementary School nurtures the growth and development of every student by offering engaging instruction and supportive relationships. Every student will be empowered to become responsible citizens, reach their academic goals, and grow their social skills throughout their educational careers and in life.

Vision

Reaching and teaching every student, every day.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	10
School Processes & Programs	16
Perceptions	21
Priority Problem Statements	27
Goals	29
Goal 1: -Increase the percentage of ALL third-grade students achieving 'Meets Grade Level' on 3rd-grade Reading Language Arts STAAR exams to 61% by 2030 (2025-2026 target: 50%).	29
Goal 2: Increase the percentage of ALL 3rd grade and 4th grade students achieving 'Meets Grade Level' on Math STAAR exams to 58% by 2030 (2025-2026 target: 47%). ...	31
Goal 3: Increase the percentage of students achieving Early, Mid, Late Grade-Level performance on 1st grade READING i-Ready diagnostic from 20% at BOY 2025 to 67% at EOY 2026.	33
Goal 4: Increase the percentage of students achieving Early, Mid, Late Grade-Level performance on 1st grade MATH i-Ready diagnostic from 3% at BOY 2025 to 41% at EOY 2026.	34
Goal 5: Eliminate all D-rated and F-rated campuses by 2030 (2025-2026 target: 18% of campuses).	35
Goal 6: Eliminate scores of zero points in 3rd-5th grades extended constructive responses (ECRs) in STAAR 2025-2026.	38
Goal 7: Increase the percentage in Student Attendance from 93.77% in the 2024-25 school year to 95% in the 2025-2026 school year.	40
Goal 8: By May 2026, at least 75% of parents/guardians will participate in at least one school-sponsored engagement activity (such as Title I meetings/trainings, family literacy/math nights, parent-teacher conferences, or volunteer opportunities), as measured by sign-in sheets and parent surveys.	41
Goal 9: Increase the percentage of Emergent Bilingual students who achieve Meets Grade Level on STAAR Math from 46% in 2025 to 60% in 2026.	42
Title I Personnel	43
Campus Funding Summary	44

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

DEMOGRAPHICS:

Description of School

How do we describe our school? What is our story?

Steadham Elementary is both an open enrollment school and neighborhood school that is located at 6200 Danridge Rd. in Rowlett, Texas. We serve 491 students, ages Pre-K 3 years old through 5th grade. Steadham was named in honor of Joyce Giddens-Steadham who taught 15 years in Garland ISD. She taught at Kimberlin and Back Elementary Schools. She was honored as "Teacher of the Year" by her co-workers at Back in both 1989-90 and in 1993-94. A crowning honor came to her when then first lady, Barbara Bush, presented her with the "Thousand Points of Light" award for teaching a student to read against all odds.

Do our special programs align with the needs and desires of our students, parents and community?

Our special programs align with the needs and desires of our students, parents, and community. Steadham offers Gifted & Talented, Bilingual/ESL, Special Education, ABC, PPCD, Dyslexia, Speech, and Free & Reduced Breakfast and Lunch for 100% of students.

School Environment Data

How do we describe our school? What is our story?

What are student behavior trends including discipline referrals, suspensions, and expulsions? How are discipline issues affecting students and learning?

Discipline Data Overview

Discipline Referrals: 211 (2024–2025), compared to 118 (2023–2024)

Suspensions:

In-School: 46 (2024–2025), up from 14 (2023–2024)

Out-of-School: 12 (2024–2025), up from 6 (2023–2024)

Expulsions: 0

Disciplinary issues have a direct impact on student learning, primarily due to the disruptive behaviors that interfere with instruction. The most common response to referrals continues to be parent conferencing, accounting for 69.4% this year compared to 63.6% last year. Student conferences also remained high, with 54.1% this year versus 63.6% last year.

When students are sent to the office for behavior issues, they lose valuable instructional time and opportunities for peer interaction—both essential for academic and social growth. This disruption contributes to widening learning gaps and prevents students from acquiring the foundational skills necessary for academic success.

Additionally, some students may view office referrals as an escape from class responsibilities or consequences, which can result in repeated offenses. It’s important that students begin to see the office not as a place of punishment, but as a space for recognition—such as signing the achievement board for passing assessments or celebrating personal milestones.

To close learning gaps and ensure long-term academic progress, students must be present and engaged in the classroom daily.

How do we describe our school? What is our story?

What are the attendance/tardy, truancy and drop-out/retention rates? What trends are seen over the last 3-5 years? What strategies are in place to promote high attendance?

Steadham's attendance this year is shown here Period 1- 95.60% Period 2- 94.37% Period 3- 93.48% Period 4- 91.44% Period 5-94.39%. The attendance starts off really well, and throughout the year it begins to drop, and then it moves back up towards Period 5. Data shows that the % rate for the students to be here has slightly dropped over the year. The school uses Skyward to track students who are absent and tardy, if the students have an ongoing issue with coming to school the teachers and admin get involved to figure out why the student is late, or absent. The administration will contact parents, and move towards a meeting to speak with parents on the seriousness of having the student here daily, which can lead to truancy for the parents.

Students Race/Ethnicity (7 groups)

How many students do we serve by race/ethnicity? List the percentage of each group: African American, Asian, Hispanic, White, American Indian, Pacific Islander, Two-or-More Races.

Steadham Elementary serves the following student population by ethnicities: African American 34.29%; Asian-4.08%; White-15.51%; Hispanic-42.24%; American Indian .61%; Hawaiian/Pacific Island-.20%; Mult-Racial-3.06%

How does this information differ from the previous 3-5 years?

How do we describe our school? What is our story?

African American- 23-24 school year-33.48%; 22-23 school year-31.08%; 21-22 school year-29.77%-The African American population has slowly increased over the last three years.

Asian-23-24 school year-5.36%; 22-23 school year 3.47%; 21-22 school year 4.40-The Asian population has slightly fluctuated over the past three years.

White-23-24 school year-20.09%; 22-23 school year-22.59%; 21-22 school year 19.71- The White population has slightly fluctuated over the past three years.

Hispanic-23-24 school year-37.28%; 22-23 school year 37.45%; 21-22 school year 41.30%. The Hispanic population declined from the 21-22 school year, but has increased this school year 2024-2025.

American Indian-23-24 school year-0.45%; 22-23 school year 0.39%; 21-22 school year 0.42%- The American Indian population has slightly fluctuated over the past three years.

Two or more races-23-24 school year-3.35%; 22-23 school year 0.39%; 21-22 school year-4.40%; -- In two or more races the student population has fluctuated for the last three years.

Overall, the student population has remained constant over all the last three years with slight fluctuations in all the student groups.

Student Groups

What Student Groups do we serve? List the percentage in each group: economically disadvantaged, English learner, special education, former special education, continuously enrolled and non-continuously enrolled. Also include Title I, homeless, migrant, gifted and talented, and at-risk. List the percentage of other designations, such as homelessness, and discuss trends, etc.

We serve a population of approximately 490 students.

Steadham has a high number of Special Education students 21.43%.

Steadham is a Title I campus with a Free and Reduced Lunch population of 53.06% (46.92 % African American, 37.31% Hispanic, 8.85 % White, 2.31% Asian, 0.38% American Indian/Pacific Islander and 4.23% multi-race).

We serve American Indian-(3)-0.61%, Asian-(20)-4.08%, Black African American-(168)-34.29%, Hispanic/Latino-(207)-42.24%, White (76)15.51%, Hawaiian/Pacific Island (1)-.20%, Two or More (15)3.06%, Emergent Bilingual (166)-33.88%, Immigrant(20)-4.08%, Economic Disadvantage(354)72.24%, Military Connected(8)1.63%, Foster Care(0), Dyslexia(24)4.90%, Homeless(15)3.06%. Special Education (105)21.43%. Gifted and Talented (5)1.02%.

How do we describe our school? What is our story?

What do we know about the needs of each of the groups of students we serve, especially those who are failing or at risk of failing?

The students that are at an Economic Disadvantage are served the most in our school. These students are the ones with the biggest gaps and need the most assistance when it comes to food, counseling, have the most gaps, and fall into the at risk category year after year. Students that don't have what they need at home to be successful are the ones that struggle and need extra love from teachers, and staff in order to have a productive year in closing gaps, feeling good about themselves, and working through any personal issues that may be occurring within the home.

We also have an increase this year in new teachers that were not familiar with the Amplify/Eureka curriculum and Reading Academy strategies that were introduced a few years ago to increase academic success.

Staff Data

Who are our staff members? How do their skills, training and certification align with our students' needs and demographics? Discuss the percentage of state certified (traditional certification and alternative certification methods), number years' experience, race/ethnicity, school leaders preparation and leadership capabilities. and how these differ from previous years.

Steadham Elementary is made up of a total of 53 staff members (31 teachers, 5 professional support staff, 2 campus administrators, and 14 educational aids.) There are only 4 male teachers, while the rest of the teaching staff is female. Our staff ethnicity is highly diverse, comprised of the following races: white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian. For the 2023-2024 School Year, Beginning Teachers comprised 9.6% of the staff, 1-5 Years of Experience comprised 14.5% of the staff, 6-10 Years of Experience comprised 35% of the staff, 11-20 Years of Experience comprised 21.8% of the staff, and over 20 Years of Experience comprised 19.1% of the staff. Our campus administration represents two diverse races (Hispanic and Black) and has been actively involved in changing the culture of the school this year by being able to communicate with parents in both English and Spanish.

Demographics Strengths

Strengths			
•	Special programs align with student needs		
•	Steadham has a diverse student population.		
•	Community involvement has increased.		
•	Parental involvement has increased.		

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): According to Review 360 Discipline Data, for the 2024-2025 school year, Seadham had 233 discipline incidents, a significant increase from the 118 discipline incidents Seadham had in the 2023-2024 school year.

Root Cause: As a school we are not consistent in implementing our discipline system due to some staff not following the school-wide discipline plan, and a lack of understanding of implementation and follow-through with classroom management. (Top incidents: disruptive/disrespectful behavior, physical confrontation, disorderly conduct)

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): According to the Percentage In Attendance Report, for the 2024-25 school year, Steadham's attendance of 93.77% was below the previous year average 94.49%

Root Cause: Some parents are not consistently bringing students to school regularly and on time and parents also are checking students out of school early due to lack of consequences or accountability.

Problem Statement 3: Lack of overall parental involvement. Most events and initiatives are planned and implemented by staff.

Root Cause: As a school, we are not consistently providing opportunities for families to become involved and teachers have not been consistent in promoting parent involvement.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

	2025 MATH GRADE 03 (ENGLISH + SPANISH)												
		DNM	APPROACHES+	MEETS+	MASTERS								
CAMPUS NAME	N Tested	%	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	D1 POINTS	D1 RAW	D1 SCALE	D1 RATING	
STEADHAM EL	82	41%	59%	▲ 13	39%	▲ 18	11%	▲ 8	109	36	62	D	
GISD 3RD GRADE	3,558	29%	71%	▲ 3	47%	▲ 7	21%	▲ 6	139	46	74	C	

	2025 MATH GRADE 04 (ENGLISH + SPANISH)												
		DNM	APPROACHES+	MEETS+	MASTERS								
CAMPUS NAME	N Tested	%	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	D1 POINTS	D1 RAW	D1 SCALE	D1 RATING	
STEADHAM EL	82	45%	55%	▲ 7	27%	▼ -1	6%	▼ -1	88	29	55	F	
GISD 4TH GRADE	3,517	32%	68%	■ 0	45%	▼ -1	22%	■ 0	135	45	73	C	

	2025 MATH GRADE 05 (ENGLISH + SPANISH)												
		DNM	APPROACHES+	MEETS+	MASTERS								
CAMPUS NAME	N Tested	%	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	D1 POINTS	D1 RAW	D1 SCALE	D1 RATING	
STEADHAM EL	72	31%	69%	▼ -16	46%	▼ -19	15%	▼ -9	130	43	72	C	
GISD 5TH GRADE	3,600	24%	76%	■ 0	51%	■ 0	26%	▲ 5	153	51	78	C	

STEADHAM 2024-2025 MATH STAAR COMPARED TO GISD AVERAGE

CAMPUS NAME	2025 READING LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 03 (ENGLISH + SPANISH)														
	N Tested	DNM	APPROACHES+		MEETS+		MASTERS		D1 POINTS	D1 RAW	D1 SCALE	D1 RATING			
		%	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^							
STEADHAM EL	81	37%	63%	▲	6	32%	▲	14	9%	▲	3	104	35	60	D
GISD 3RD GRADE	3,548	27%	73%	▲	5	47%	▲	5	23%	▲	4	143	48	76	C

	2025 READING LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 04 (ENGLISH + SPANISH)													
		DNM	APPROACHES+			MEETS+			MASTERS					
CAMPUS NAME	N Tested	%	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^	%	Δ^^			D1 POINTS	D1 RAW	D1 SCALE	D1 RATING
STEADHAM EL	82	29%	71%	▲ 1	44%	▲ 16	13%	■ 0			128	43	72	C
GISD 4TH GRADE	3,514	22%	78%	▲ 2	56%	▲ 6	27%	▲ 4			161	54	82	B

	2025 READING LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 05 (ENGLISH + SPANISH)														
CAMPUS NAME	N Tested	DNM	APPROACHES+		MEETS+		MASTERS		D1 POINTS	D1 RAW	D1 SCALE	D1 RATING			
		%	%	Δ^	%	Δ^	%	Δ^							
STEADHAM EL	72	25%	75%	▼	-10	53%	▼	-7	29%	▼	-4	157	52	79	C
GISD 5TH GRADE	3,598	22%	78%	▲	25	60%	▲	7	34%	▲	5	172	57	86	B

2024-2025

STEADHAM READING STAAR DATA COMPARED TO GISD AVERAGE

Student Performance
1. What progress has been made by students? Describe the domain ratings: Student Achievement, School Progress, and Closing the Gaps.

Student Performance			
Steadham students in the same cohort showed growth overall, as shown below, from 3rd to 4th grade and from 4th to 5th grade compared to their previous year STAAR scores.			
Steadham STAAR MATH	2023-2024	2024-2025	Growth (+/-)
3rd Grade / 4th Grade	(3rd) 50	(4th) 55	+ 5
4th Grade / 5th Grade	(4th) 54	(5th) 72	+ 18
Steadham STAAR READING	2023-2024	2024-2025	Growth (+/-)
3rd Grade / 4th Grade	(3rd) 53	(4th) 72	+19
4th Grade / 5th Grade	(4th) 64	(5th) 79	+15
Steadham saw growth within 5th grade African American students which contained an increase from 60% to 64% in Reading Language and Arts MAP, and an increase from 29% to 40% in Science MAP. 4th grade Latino students saw an increase from 36% to 37% in Math MAP.			
2. What is the academic performance for each student group? Describe significant findings in STAAR results disaggregated by 7 Race/Ethnicity and 7 Student Groups in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Social Studies. Describe how scores differ from previous years.			

Student Performance

Using the Texas Education Agency 2023-2024 STAAR Performance Chart to observe patterns and trends, the data shows the following. Third Grade Reading, all demographic groups show growth in “approaches” from 2023 to 2024 but are lacking in the “masters” area for reading. Additionally, the African American group shows a decline in “meets”, however, Hispanic and White groups demonstrate growth in “meets” and “approaches”. In regard to Third Grade Mathematics, the campus shows a decline across the board through all the demographic groups that are aligned with the decline of not just district but also the state. The decline for Steadham Elementary was sharper in comparison with the district by 9% more points.

The Fourth-grade analysis shows the following. Fourth Grade Reading, for “approaches” all demographics grew by an average of 11% points, with “meets” all demographic groups show inconsistent numbers, also the African American group declined by 17%, the Hispanic group grew by 26%, and the White group declined 15%. The “masters” data shows that all demographic groups are down by 66 points total points, with an average decline of 22%. Therefore, the District and campus show a decline as does the State of Texas, however, Steadham shows a bigger decline of 10%.

Considering the Fourth Grade Mathematics data, the demographic groups of Hispanic and African American declined in approaches by 10.5%, but the White group grew by 6%. In regard to “meets”, the demographic groups of African American and White are both in decline by over 20%, however, the Hispanic group grew by 12%. The declines continued in the “masters” since all demographic groups dropped by 39 points total, with an average decline of 13%. Overall with 4th grade Mathematics, the District showed a 2% growth, however Steadham declined by 12% which was 11 points lower than the State average.

Analyzing Fifth Grade shows the following. Fifth Grade Reading, all Demographics are significantly up except for the White group, since they dropped by 11%. It is also the case with “meets” because all the demographics groups grew except for the White group, due to a drop of 5%. The masters section shows that the only group showing growth is the African American which grew by 4%, however, the Hispanic and White group show an average drop of 4.5%. The data demonstrates that the District and Campus show a decline as does the State of Texas, however, Steadham Elementary shows only a 5% drop compared to the State’s 8% drop. The Fifth Grade Mathematics data demonstrates the following findings. For approaches, the demographic groups of Hispanic and White show growth, but the African American group show a 31% decline. Additionally, all demographics groups grew by an average growth of over 16% in the meets section. Finally, for the “masters”, the demographic groups of Hispanic and White dropped by 1%, however, the African American group grew by 11%. Overall analysis of 5th grade shows that the Campus grew by 2%, which is in contrast with District and the State of Texas decline for the years 2022 to 2023.

3. How does student performance on state assessments compare with student performance on local benchmark assessments and the students’ report cards?

Student Performance
Hispanics had a 12% growth in comparison to African American 1% growth in reading according to their report card. In the benchmark for math 37.4% of grades 2-5 did not meet standards versus 17.8% who met the standard. Both report card and benchmark showed growth for white and 1 % for African American, but not for Hispanic. It seems that hispanic is showing more growth only on report cards and not on benchmarks according to the data given.
4. How do we perform compared to a group of campuses of similar type, size, grade span, and student demographics? Are we earning Distinction Designations for achievement?
Steadham earned a "B" (88) rating on 2023-2024 based mostly on Growth. Domain 1 (student achievement) received a score of 69, while Domain 2 (school progress) received a score of 90. In comparison to a group of similar campuses, in 2024 Overall STAAR results, Steadham earned a significantly higher rating than the other GISD campus in its comparison group. In 2025 Overall STAAR results, Steadham earned a higher scores in achievement and growth than both of the other two GISD campuses in its campus comparison group.
5. What is the performance status of our students for CCMR (College, Career, and Military Readiness)?
The College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance Status component measures students' preparedness for college, the workforce, or the military. This component differs from the CCMR component in the Student Achievement domain. SEE-2023 Closing the Gap Performance Targets
6. How does the campus systemically address reteaching for students who are absent, particularly for students who are at-risk of failing?

Student Performance
Reteaching for students who are absent, particularly for students who are at risk for failing, is addressed according to teacher preference. A survey of teachers indicated that reteaching is primarily addressed in small group, sending home missed assignments, tutoring and peer support. Most teachers responded that the reteaching is effective sometimes. Some teachers offer afterschool tutoring for Kindergarten– 5th grade students in addition to reteaching.

Student Learning Strengths

Strengths			
•	Students in 5th grade showed significant growth in 2024-2025 5th Grade Reading and Math STAAR compared to thier previous year (4th Grade STAAR) scores.		
•	Students in 4th grade showed significant growth in 2024-2025 for 4th grade RLA STAAR compared to thier previous year (3rd Grade STAAR) scores.		
•	GenEd Kinder, 1st, and 2nd grade 2024-2025 Reading/Math BOY to EOY MAP scores improved compared to previous years.		
•	AA Students showed growth in Reading MAP		

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Based on Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 Kinder Spanish Reading MAP data, only 18% of students met growth projection. Based on Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 1st grade Spanish Reading MAP data, only 19% of students met growth projection. Based on Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 2nd grade Spanish Reading MAP data, only 31% of students met growth projection.

Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction was not differentiated and targeted interventions were not provided with fidelity in Kinder-2nd grade bilingual. Classroom management in Kinder bilingual. Teacher capacity in Kinder and 1st grade bilingual

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Steadham 4th grade STAAR MATH: 4th Grade showed only a 5 point Growth from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 compared to a 19 point Growth in RLA in the same grade level and student cohort.

Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction was not differentiated and targeted interventions were not provided with fidelity.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Steadham STAAR overall results show a combined 2 point decline in Domain 1 (student achievement) compared to previous year (2025 D1 score 67; 2024 D1 score 69), as well as a significant drop in Domain 3 (Closing the Gaps) subpopulations Hispanic and African American not meeting Achievement Targets.

Root Cause: Students are coming in below grade level due to multiple high risk factors (per Garland ISD Risk Factors Analysis Data), such as our high Mobility Rate 21%, high numbers of Special Education students 21%, high African American student population 34%; also, Economically disadvantaged students increased by 4%, Immigrant status increased by 500%, and Homeless status also by 500% from last year.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

SCHOOL PROCESSES AND PROGRAMS

Personnel Policy and Procedures
What is the process for recruiting, selecting, assigning, inducting and retaining high-quality educators? Are high quality teachers placed in classrooms/ subjects based on student need and teacher strength? The process for recruiting, selecting, assigning, inducting and retaining high-quality educators includes: 1. Teacher job fairs 2. Conducting thorough interviews which includes asking effective questions and ensuring stakeholders are part of the interview committee (Ex. Grade level lead, department lead). 3. Understanding the needs of the position 4. Supportive working environments 5. Ongoing professional development.
Professional Practices
How does our campus develop instructional leaders? Are their roles and responsibilities clear? 1. Professional development leadership opportunities. 2. Delegating team leads and changing team leads every two years to allow other staff opportunities to lead. 3. Roles are quite clear as to what responsibilities various leaders on campus are responsible for.
What is our process for developing a focused improvement plan that addresses the root causes of low performance? Are our stakeholders involved in this process? How do we track progress towards intended outcomes or performance objectives?

Personnel Policy and Procedures

Weekly data meetings, 504 meetings, parent conferences, PLCs, Branching Minds documentation.

Comprehensive Needs Assessment is completed as a staff with personnel from different grade levels and departments are mixed into committees. We follow the district expectation for Campus Improvement Plan stakeholders (Parents, Teachers, SpEd Teacher, Principal, Other School Leaders - Asst. Principal, Instructional Coaches, Paraprofessionals, LEA administrators - Assigned by district, Specialized Instructional Support - (Counselor, Diagnostician, etc.), School staff who will carry out the plan, Other Individuals As determined by the school, Community Members - Reside in LEA can not be a parent, Business Members - Do not have to reside in the LEA)

Data monitoring for all related assessments (CBAs, MAP (Next school year i-Ready), STAAR, STAAR interim assessments, Checkpoints, TELPAS, Circle (for PreK), both from current and previous year to track growth.

Programs and Opportunities for Students

What programs are operating in a school? Are these programs aligned with our vision, mission, goals, and values? Do our programs focus on a safe environment and high expectations?

Programs and Extracurricular Activities that are operating in our school include: Pre-K, Bilingual, SpEd, Dyslexia, Gifted and Talented, ABC, Robotics, Freedom League, Kiwanis club (BUG Program and K-Kids), Golden Eaglets,

Yes, these programs and activities are aligned Steadham's visions, missions, goals, and values.

Yes, these programs help to provide a safe place for all students and promote high expectations.

How are all students, especially those at-risk, given opportunities to meet challenging state academic standards with a well-rounded program of curriculum and instruction? Consider data for increasing the amount and quality of learning time and providing enrichment and acceleration.

1. Teachers collaborate during data and instruction PLCs and team meetings. 2. Students participate in intervention through small and pull-out groups. 3. Students have the opportunity to practice skills on an independent level through programs such as Amplify, and iReady. 4. Students are provided checkpoints to ensure that they are mastering concepts being taught in a unit. 5. Teachers reteach and reinforce as needed.

What is our personal technology plan for each student? Explain data for personalized or blended learning experiences supported by technology.

Personnel Policy and Procedures

Students are provided 1:1 devices at school. Students use independent level programs (Amplify and iReady) at home and school.

Procedures

What actions do we take to support powerful teaching and learning? Do we align curriculum and assessment to TEKS with a year-long scope and sequence?

1. Teachers are expected to collaborate and adapt weekly lesson plans through a Lesson Customization Framework document. 2. Teams collaborate on content needs and plan together. 3. Teachers use Garland ISD's curriculum which aligns objectives and assessments to the TEKS. 4. Other procedures and professional opportunities/safeguards are in place such as goal setting, T-TESS, monitoring, walk throughs, pre/post conferences, professional development.

Are our lesson plans and instruction objective and data driven? Do they include critical thinking, formative assessments, and interventions?

Yes, teachers are expected to collaborate and adapt weekly lesson plans through a Lesson Customization Framework document.

Yes, the lesson plan components include: Focus Learning Objective, Evidence of Learning, Teacher Table, Stations, Small Groups, as well as, flexible grouping based on student needs and personal pathway i-Ready platform for additional support in closing the gaps)

Do we have a plan for the integration of technology? Explain findings on how technology is integrated into instructional and administrative programs.

Personnel Policy and Procedures

Yes, technology is integrated using various platforms: Canvas, iReady, Amplify, Seesaw. Using technology to support personalized or blended learning experiences.

What are the procedures to support students during all transitions: early childhood into elementary, elementary into middle/junior high or junior high into high school, high school to postsecondary?

Procedures to support students include: Child Find, Pre-Kinder, Early Childhood Classrooms, Kinder Roundup, PreK graduation, 5th grade promotion, 5th grade choice of subject and scheduling, awards ceremonies, 5th grade visits middle school, classes visits next grade-level, Senior Walk.

What are the significant findings in classroom management? Explain procedures used to reduce overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.

Procedures that are used to reduce the overuse of discipline practices include: 1. Restorative practices 2. Lunch bunch 3. SEL lessons 4. Nest points (school-wide incentive) 5. PBIS (school wide discipline prevention practices)

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Strengths			
•	Intervention opportunities for at-risk students		
•	Support of powerful teaching and learning opportunities		

Strengths			
•	Integration of technology into instruction		
•	Teacher retention		

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): As a staff we are not consistent or on the same page when following the Steadham discipline flow chart when addressing classroom managed vs. office managed behaviors. Process for addressing student behavior in the classroom, and classroom management systems overall.

Root Cause: Lack of understanding of teacher managed discipline expectations and lack of classroom management implementation of strategies and systems to proactively address behaviors.

Problem Statement 2: Adherence to dismissal procedures: Dismissal does not run smoothly and it is difficult to locate students in an efficient manner.

Root Cause: Staff members are not working as a team to implement and reinforce dismissal procedures. Also, parent communication when switching transportation modes is lacking.

Problem Statement 3: New Technology and implementation of fee for destruction of current devices: Students would benefit from updated devices and encouragement to better care for current devices.

Root Cause: Students know that there is no consequence for mishandling of Chromebooks/ iPads, therefore they continue to destroy them. Chromebooks/ iPads are destroyed and do not work properly.

Problem Statement 4: Teacher Recruitment and Retention of new and first year teachers: In recent years Steadham has seen high staff turnover, especially with 1st year teachers.

Root Cause: Low teacher salaries and challenges related to students' behaviors.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Student Engagement
How does the attendance rate differ between the 7 race/ethnicity groups and 7 student groups? Include how current data differs from previous years. The percentage of attendance between our 7 ethnicity groups is similar. Attendance starts out strong. The 1st Period attendance was 96.4% . Period 2- 95.4% , Period 3 was 94.2% Period 4 was 92.9% Period 5 was 93.9% and Period 6 -96.9. The data shows that our attendance took a dip in the 4th and 5th period. The Fourth period shows the lowest attendance rate, but in the 6th period it increases to 96.9. As I looked at attendance in previous years, some of the attendance rates were at 88%. This year attendance is much better with all of our grading periods in the 90%. Steadham works hard giving 40 Nest points to each class that has perfect attendance. Students' names were put onto Mr. Martinez's wheel if they had perfect attendance. They had a chance to win various items.
What is significant in the data about behavior, disciplinary patterns, DAEP placements and any differences between the 7 race/ethnicity groups and 7 student groups? According to Review 360 Discipline system, African American students account for 34% of our school population but account for 46% of the incidents. Though this is a decrease from last year in percentage, it is still an over representation of discipline. Top behaviors recorded include physical confrontation and disorderly conduct. Boys account for 89% of the discipline referrals recorded.
How do students describe their school and learning environment? Are the processes and programs in place helping them find success from one grade level to the next? Do they feel safe and have a sense of belonging? Is school challenging for them, worth their time and providing a well-rounded education?

Student Engagement						
Based on Student S Do they feel safe an						
Based on Student Success Panorama Survey, Social emotional learning is showing a positive outcome of 60% with growth mindset and self management being most successful. Areas of growth for students would be for self efficacy, grit, and emotion regulation. The following data I found from the Winter 2024 Family Survey: Q.7: How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school: The school provides little information about involvement opportunities?: 68% responded "not a problem at all". Q3. This school provides materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve student achievement: 67% responses answered always. Do they feel safe and have a sense of belonging? Out 50 responses, 78% always felt that the campus is safe, and 88% always felt welcomed in school. Q.3: How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school: Concerns about getting to the school safely? 96% responded "not a problem at all".						
Staff Engagement						
What is the staff turnover rate and how does it compare with previous years? Discuss staff mentoring results, staff perceptions of academic expectations, and average number of staff absences. Summarize any climate and culture survey reports.						

Student Engagement

There were only 9 staff responses recorded in the panorama survey (Winter 2024). From the data collected, the sense of belonging for staff is at 93% (up by 3 since last survey), but the school climate is at 67% (down by 11 since last survey). There were 7 responses of feeling extremely supported and 2 responses of feeling quite supported when staff was feeling challenges at work that there was support coming from our school leaders. Of all the categories, school climate is at the lowest percentage of 67%. Responses show that 38% of students are enthusiastic about being at school on most days, and 89% of students are helping each other without being prompted. Overall, the positive working environment is at 78%.
Turnover rate:
2018 - 23 new hires
2019 - 3 new hires
2020 - 4 new hires
2021 - 9 new hires due to new sections added to the campus
2022 - 13 new hires
2023 - 5 new hires
2024 - 7 new hires

How do teachers describe their school? Are the processes and programs in place helping them find success with their students? Do they feel safe and have a sense of belongingness?
According to Steadham, family is the one word that describes our school the best. 90% of teachers feel that their students find success with current processes and programs. 100% of staff feel safe and a sense of belonging.

How are they supported by strong administration? Do they receive powerful professional development to develop their skills? Do teachers work together to support each other?
Results from 2025 Informal survey reports teachers feel supported and given positive encouragement from Admin. Results from 2023-2024 survey. An average of 93% of the survey responders feel a sense of belonging. All eight responders feel like they belong at Steadham. 100% favorable rating was reported that the admin cares about its teachers. 89% of the teachers feel they have opportunities to learn and grow in the profession. Respondents reported a 78% favorable rating on positivity in the working environment.

Student Engagement

How are parent/family/guardian/community participation rates measured?

Parents are encouraged to be involved in school activities and recruited to serve on campus committees. 86% of the respondents agreed/strongly agreed that parents have been encouraged to participate. 96% of parents have a favorable rating of feeling welcome at Steadham

How do parents and the community view the climate and culture of the district and campuses? Summarize any climate and culture survey reports.

Q.11: I feel welcome at this school.

Favorable: 96%, Q.3: How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school:

Concerns about getting to the school safely? Not a problem at all 96%, Q3 How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school:

You feel unsure about how to communicate with the school? Not a problem at all 82%, Q.8: How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school:

The school is not welcoming to parents? Not a problem at all 82%, Q.10: How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school:

You do not feel a sense of belonging with your child's school community? Not a problem at all 82%, Q.9: How big of a problem is the following issue for becoming involved with your child's current school:

The school does not communicate well with people from your culture? Not a problem at all 86%

Are there any barriers that prevent participation by parents/guardians/community?

Student Engagement

According to the 24-25 Panorama Survey, Q1 parents receive information in a language they understand was 88% favorable (down 8 from the 23-24 Survey score of 96%). Q4 in regards to being made aware of and recruited to serve on campus or district committees was only 63% favorable (an increase of 2 from the 23-24 score of 61%). Q7 asked if parents had received a copy of the School Parent Compact was only 68% favorable (up 18 from the 23-24 score of 50%) which leads to Q8 asking if the compact purpose was explained, was 46% favorable in the 23-24 survey and is now up 21 to a 67% favorable. Q9 in regards to receiving a copy of the written Parent Involvement Policy parents reported 62% favorable which is an increase of 8 from the previous survey but one of our lowest favorable percentages. Q11 stated "I feel welcome at this school" and scored 96% which is no change from the previous survey but shows that parents feel welcome at Steadham.

How do parents and guardians learn and understand about their child's learning standards, learning expectations and progress?

In the Family Support section, Q4 asks, "How often do you help your child understand the content s/he is learning in school?" 25% of parents answered "almost all of the time" 55% said "frequently," overall this was 71% favorable. In the Additional Questions section, Q5 states, "I am aware of the curriculum my child is learning." Responses here are up 10 from the 23-24 survey and are at 85% favorable. Q6 says, "I understand the types of state and local tests my student takes and how the school uses those results to help my child learn" and is 82% favorable (an increase of 7 from the 23-24 survey).

How do parents and guardians describe their child's school? Do they feel welcome at school? Do they believe their children are safe at school and going to and from school?

According to the 2024-2025 Panorama Survey Data most parents at Steadham Elementary enjoy our school climate and culture. 71% of parents strongly agree and feel welcomed at Steadham Elementary. 50% of parents feel that they are encouraged to get involved in school functions. 96% of parents feel that their child is able to get to and from school safely.

Perceptions Strengths

Strengths			
•	96% of parents feel welcomed.		
•	0 DAEP placements.		
•	Increase in family and community engagement opportunities. (Family nights)		

Strengths			
•	100% of teachers feel that they feel a sense of belonging, that their colleagues at school understand them as a person, feel respected as a person, and feel connected at school.		

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Male students, and African American students, are over represented in Office discipline referrals. 55.7% of our students on our campus are male but they account for 89.7% of total discipline referrals, and in particular, 34% of our students are African American but account for 46% of office referrals.

Root Cause: Lack of cultivating relationships with students and earning trust with families by clearly communicating expectations and consistently following the discipline model.

Problem Statement 2: Staff feeling overwhelmed. Staff feel like they need more time and notice to complete required expectations.

Root Cause: Work load outside of teaching.

Problem Statement 3: School family communication, parents understanding how school communicates and shares information. According to 2024-2025 Family Panorama Survey data, Q7 asked if parents had received a copy of the School Parent Compact was only 68% favorable (up 18 from the 23-24 score of 50% but still low) Q8 asking if the compact purpose was explained, was 46% favorable in 23-24 survey (up 21 to a 67%

Root Cause: Low turnout for Title I and Title III parent information and engagement events. School needs to do a better job of attracting parents to these meetings and ensure that parents know how school shares information (weekly call-out, newsletter, marquee sign, Tuesday folders, etc.)

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Steadham 4th grade STAAR MATH: 4th Grade showed only a 5 point Growth from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 compared to a 19 point Growth in RLA in the same grade level and student cohort.

Root Cause 1: Tier 1 instruction was not differentiated and targeted interventions were not provided with fidelity.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Steadham STAAR overall results show a combined 2 point decline in Domain 1 (student achievement) compared to previous year (2025 D1 score 67; 2024 D1 score 69), as well as a significant drop in Domain 3 (Closing the Gaps) subpopulations Hispanic and African American not meeting Achievement Targets.

Root Cause 2: Students are coming in below grade level due to multiple high risk factors (per Garland ISD Risk Factors Analysis Data), such as our high Mobility Rate 21%, high numbers of Special Education students 21%, high African American student population 34%; also, Economically disadvantaged students increased by 4%, Immigrant status increased by 500%, and Homeless status also by 500% from last year.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Based on Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 Kinder Spanish Reading MAP data, only 18% of students met growth projection. Based on Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 1st grade Spanish Reading MAP data, only 19% of students met growth projection. Based on Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 2nd grade Spanish Reading MAP data, only 31% of students met growth projection.

Root Cause 3: Tier 1 instruction was not differentiated and targeted interventions were not provided with fidelity in Kinder-2nd grade bilingual. Classroom management in Kinder bilingual. Teacher capacity in Kinder and 1st grade bilingual

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: According to the Percentage In Attendance Report, for the 2024-25 school year, Steadham's attendance of 93.77% was below the previous year average 94.49%

Root Cause 4: Some parents are not consistently bringing students to school regularly and on time and parents also are checking students out of school early due to lack of consequences or accountability.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 5: As a staff we are not consistent or on the same page when following the Steadham discipline flow chart when addressing classroom managed vs. office managed behaviors. Process for addressing student behavior in the classroom, and classroom management systems overall.

Root Cause 5: Lack of understanding of teacher managed discipline expectations and lack of classroom management implementation of strategies and systems to proactively address behaviors.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: According to Review 360 Discipline Data, for the 2024-2025 school year, Seadham had 233 discipline incidents, a significant increase from the 118 discipline incidents Seadham had in the 2023-2024 school year.

Root Cause 6: As a school we are not consistent in implementing our discipline system due to some staff not following the school-wide discipline plan, and a lack of understanding of implementation and follow-through with classroom management. (Top incidents: disruptive/disrespectful behavior, physical confrontation, disorderly conduct)

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 7: Male students, and African American students, are over represented in Office discipline referrals. 55.7% of our students on our campus are male but they account for 89.7% of total discipline referrals, and in particular, 34% of our students are African American but account for 46% of office referrals.

Root Cause 7: Lack of cultivating relationships with students and earning trust with families by clearly communicating expectations and consistently following the discipline model.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Perceptions

Goals

Goal 1: -Increase the percentage of ALL third-grade students achieving 'Meets Grade Level' on 3rd-grade Reading Language Arts STAAR exams to 61% by 2030 (2025-2026 target: 50%).

Performance Objective 1: Foundations

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR, Demonstration of Learning (DOL) & reteach

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Build teacher capacity to deliver Gradual Release lessons in district curriculum and provide differentiated PD and instructional support aligned to walkthrough trends. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 50% or more of third grade students will achieve Meets Grade Level in STAAR Reading Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Support Teacher. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Support Teachers, SPED teachers, and classroom Reading/Writing teachers will participate in PLC's weekly, learning meetings, and planning days twice each semester that include, creating and implementing Reading instructional agreements, and the use of protocols for lesson internalization and rehearsals, and analysis of student work and CBA data. Teachers will disaggregate data from iReady, unit assessments, and other formative assessments to plan targeted reteach from spiraled review and activities. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 50% or more of third grade students will achieve Meets Grade Level in STAAR Reading Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Support Teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Learning 2		Formative			Summative
		Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue					

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Steadham 4th grade STAAR MATH: 4th Grade showed only a 5 point Growth from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 compared to a 19 point Growth in RLA in the same grade level and student cohort. Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction was not differentiated and targeted interventions were not provided with fidelity.
Problem Statement 3: Steadham STAAR overall results show a combined 2 point decline in Domain 1 (student achievement) compared to previous year (2025 D1 score 67; 2024 D1 score 69), as well as a significant drop in Domain 3 (Closing the Gaps) subpopulations Hispanic and African American not meeting Achievement Targets. Root Cause: Students are coming in below grade level due to multiple high risk factors (per Garland ISD Risk Factors Analysis Data), such as our high Mobility Rate 21%, high numbers of Special Education students 21%, high African American student population 34%; also, Economically disadvantaged students increased by 4%, Immigrant status increased by 500%, and Homeless status also by 500% from last year.

Goal 2: Increase the percentage of ALL 3rd grade and 4th grade students achieving 'Meets Grade Level' on Math STAAR exams to 58% by 2030 (2025-2026 target: 47%).

Performance Objective 1: Foundations

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady, CBAs, STAAR, Demonstration of Learning (DOL) & reteach

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Build teacher capacity to deliver Gradual Release lessons in district curriculum. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 47% or more of third grade and fourth grade students will achieve Meets Grade Level in STAAR Reading Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Support Teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Support Teachers, SPED teachers, and classroom Math teachers will participate in PLC's weekly, learning meetings, and planning days twice each semester that include, creating and implementing Math instructional agreements, and the use of protocols for lesson internalization and rehearsals, and analysis of student work and CBA data. Teachers will disaggregate data from iReady, unit assessments, and other formative assessments to plan targeted reteach from spiraled review and activities. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 47% or more of third grade and fourth grade students will achieve Meets Grade Level in STAAR Math Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Support Teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Structured Math fact fluency practice (games, online platforms, timed practice) Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 47% or more of third grade and fourth grade students will achieve Meets Grade Level in STAAR Math Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Support Teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Steadham 4th grade STAAR MATH: 4th Grade showed only a 5 point Growth from 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 compared to a 19 point Growth in RLA in the same grade level and student cohort. Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction was not differentiated and targeted interventions were not provided with fidelity.

Goal 3: Increase the percentage of students achieving Early, Mid, Late Grade-Level performance on 1st grade READING i-Ready diagnostic from 20% at BOY 2025 to 67% at EOY 2026.

Performance Objective 1: Foundations

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Beginning, middle, and end-of-year i-Ready Growth Reading scores.
Percentage of students meeting grade-level proficiency on district assessments.
Monitoring of Exit ticket student growth.
Demonstration of Learning (DOL) & reteach

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Implement daily small-group guided reading and targeted phonics instruction during Intervention Time (WIN) using district-approved curriculum aligned to TEKS and provide ongoing progress monitoring every 3 weeks for students identified as at-risk. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 67% of first-grade students will meet or exceed grade-level expectations in Foundational Literacy Skills (phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Administrators and support teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Utilize literacy interventions during tutoring for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students through MTSS and RTI. Ensure all first-grade teachers complete or apply practices from the Texas Reading Academies. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 67% of first-grade students will meet or exceed grade-level expectations in Foundational Literacy Skills (phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Administrators and support teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue				

Goal 4: Increase the percentage of students achieving Early, Mid, Late Grade-Level performance on 1st grade MATH i-Ready diagnostic from 3% at BOY 2025 to 41% at EOY 2026.

Performance Objective 1: Foundations

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Beginning, middle, and end-of-year i-Ready Growth Reading scores.
Percentage of students meeting grade-level proficiency on district assessments.
Monitoring of Exit ticket student growth.
Demonstration of Learning (DOL) & reteach

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Provide targeted small-group instruction for students identified through i-Ready Diagnostic universal screener scores, and integrate hands-on manipulatives and digital tools to support conceptual understanding. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 41% of first-grade students will demonstrate mastery of grade-level math TEKS, as measured by state-aligned district benchmarks (i-Ready BOY to EOY growth met) Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Administrators and support teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide professional development for teachers on evidence-based strategies for early numeracy and problem-solving and monitor student progress every cycle using formative assessments and adjust interventions accordingly. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 41% of first-grade students will demonstrate mastery of grade-level math TEKS, as measured by state-aligned district benchmarks (i-Ready BOY to EOY growth met) Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Administrators and support teacher	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Goal 5: Eliminate all D-rated and F-rated campuses by 2030 (2025-2026 target: 18% of campuses).

Performance Objective 1: Excellence

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready, CBAs, STAAR interims, STAAR, Demonstration of Learning (DOL) & reteach

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Targeted student interventions will take place for two lowest demographic groups, and at risk students, throughout the school year, including WIN (daily intervention time), Tutoring (twice per week for selected students), and STAAR camp (three weeks leading to STAAR test) to address short falls in accountability, including the application of the 3Ds rule in 2025 accountability. District and campus leaders will monitor the implementation of the plan. * Campus Leadership Walks to ensure intervention strategies are implemented as designed. * Conduct three-week PLC reviews of i-Ready, DOLs, CBAs, and other formative assessment data to monitor student progress. * Submit quarterly progress summaries to EDL, noting students' movement toward grade-level performance. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: African American Math scores at or above 33% Meets grade level and Hispanic Math scores at or above 44% Meets grade level in 2026 STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: 3rd-5th Teachers, Special Education teachers, Administrator, Support teacher. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Learning 3		Formative			Summative
		Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: During weekly data meetings, collect and analyze student work samples specifically for targeted students, develop reteach, and schedule observation of reteach for math and reading, with a specific focus on the targeted student populations. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Domain 1 scaled score in TEA accountability of at least 70. African American Math scores at or above 33% Meets grade level and Hispanic Math scores at or above 44% Meets grade level in 2026 STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: 3rd-5th Teachers, Special Education teachers, Administrator, Support teacher. Title I: 2.52 Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Additional actions the school system will take if the plan is not successfully implemented are: * If midyear data shows fewer than 50% of students on track to meet growth targets, campus will: o Add after-school tutoring focused on high-priority TEKS. o Engage district instructional specialists for reteach cycles in Reading and Math. o Increase frequency of data meetings to biweekly until growth improves. Campus esources (time, staffing) needed to implement the school improvement strategy are: * Adjust the master schedule to ensure there is an embedded daily intervention block. * Reassignment of professional staff to support small-group Math and Reading instruction. * Allocation of Title I funds for supplemental instructional materials and teacher stipends for extended-day learning. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Domain 1 scaled score in TEA accountability of at least 70. African American Math scores at or above 33% Meets grade level and Hispanic Math scores at or above 44% Meets grade level in 2026 STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: 3rd-5th Teachers, Special Education teachers, Administrator, Support teacher. Title I: 2.51, 2.52	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Steadham STAAR overall results show a combined 2 point decline in Domain 1 (student achievement) compared to previous year (2025 D1 score 67; 2024 D1 score 69), as well as a significant drop in Domain 3 (Closing the Gaps) subpopulations Hispanic and African American not meeting Achievement Targets. **Root Cause:** Students are coming in below grade level due to multiple high risk factors (per Garland ISD Risk Factors Analysis Data), such as our high Mobility Rate 21%, high numbers of Special Education students 21%, high African American student population 34%; also, Economically disadvantaged students increased by 4%, Immigrant status increased by 500%, and Homeless status also by 500% from last year.

Goal 6: Eliminate scores of zero points in 3rd-5th grades extended constructive responses (ECRs) in STAAR 2025-2026.

Performance Objective 1: Foundations

Evaluation Data Sources: Student writing samples, CBAs, STAAR interim, Demonstration of Learning (DOL) & reteach

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Build student understanding of ECR expectations by using anchor papers, teaching with real or released student samples from STAAR or mock ECRs and Compare 0-, 1-, and 2-point responses, as well as deconstruct the rubric and teach students in "kid-friendly" terms what earns points. Model Responses: Do think-alouds where the teacher writes a response live, showing how to plan and revise. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Eliminate scores of zero points in 3rd-5th ECRs in STAAR 2025-2026 Staff Responsible for Monitoring: 3rd-5th grade teachers, support teacher and administrators. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Expectation of daily writing (multi-sentence responses to prompts) in every 1st-5th grade classroom with a high emphasis on using transitional words, as well as, WIN (intervention time) 20 minute writing stations, at least three days a week, with focus on STAAR rigor ECRs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Eliminate socres of zero points in 3rd-5th ECRs in STAAR 2025-2026 Staff Responsible for Monitoring: 1st-5th grade teachers, support teacher and administrators. Problem Statements: Student Learning 3	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Steadham STAAR overall results show a combined 2 point decline in Domain 1 (student achievement) compared to previous year (2025 D1 score 67; 2024 D1 score 69), as well as a significant drop in Domain 3 (Closing the Gaps) subpopulations Hispanic and African American not meeting Achievement Targets. **Root Cause:** Students are coming in below grade level due to multiple high risk factors (per Garland ISD Risk Factors Analysis Data), such as our high Mobility Rate 21%, high numbers of Special Education students 21%, high African American student population 34%; also, Economically disadvantaged students increased by 4%, Immigrant status increased by 500%, and Homeless status also by 500% from last year.

Goal 7: Increase the percentage in Student Attendance from 93.77% in the 2024-25 school year to 95% in the 2025-2026 school year.

Performance Objective 1: Attendance

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Surveys, Title I meetings (Parent-School Compact), Parent information night responses, student attendance patterns.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Conduct surveys or interviews with students, parents, and teachers to understand why students are absent. Common reasons may include health issues, family problems, transportation difficulties, or disengagement with school. Analyze Attendance Patterns by tracking attendance data to identify trends such as chronic absenteeism or specific grade levels, classes, or times of the year where absenteeism spikes. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase the percentage in Student Attendance from 93.77% in the 2024-25 school year to 95% in the 2025-2026 school year. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, teachers and staff	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Build a positive school culture (PBIS centered) by creating a welcoming environment and ensuring the school environment is inviting and inclusive, as well as, develop a recognition system students that celebrates good attendance, as well as teacher recognition programs (Teacher of the Month, shout-outs, spotlight). Publicize students who achieve perfect or improved attendance in newsletters, assemblies, and social media. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase the percentage in Student Attendance from 93.77% in the 2024-25 school year to 95% in the 2025-2026 school year. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, teachers and staff - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue				

Goal 8: By May 2026, at least 75% of parents/guardians will participate in at least one school-sponsored engagement activity (such as Title I meetings/trainings, family literacy/math nights, parent-teacher conferences, or volunteer opportunities), as measured by sign-in sheets and parent surveys.

Performance Objective 1: Climate and Culture

Evaluation Data Sources: Title I and Family and Community Involvement Parent sign-in sheets
Review 360 discipline data
Schedule of calendar of events

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Developing a Family and Community Involvement calendar of events, with at least one parent involvement opportunity for all families and community each month of the school year, and promoting it in all sources of communication (call-outs, weekly newsletter, social media, Flyers in Tuesday folders) Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased school and home relationships, and increase parent and family engagement in school activities and student learning to strengthen the home-school partnership and support student academic growth. Decreased OSS and ISS placements. Student growth in math and reading. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Counselor, Support Teacher, Teachers Funding Sources: PFE Budget - 6300 Parent Involvement. Supplies T1 - Parent Engagement - .8 Parent Involvement - \$2,323	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
No Progress Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✗ Discontinue				

Goal 9: Increase the percentage of Emergent Bilingual students who achieve Meets Grade Level on STAAR Math from 46% in 2025 to 60% in 2026.

Performance Objective 1: English Language Proficiency

Evaluation Data Sources: CBAs, TELPAS, STAAR interim, STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Provide daily small-group instruction focused on academic vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and writing skills in both English and content areas. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Emergent Bilingual students who achieve Meets Grade Level on STAAR Math from 46% in 2025 to 60% in 2026. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: TELPAS Administrator, Principal, Teachers, Support Teacher, EB Paraprofessional Title I: 2.51, 2.52	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Title I Personnel

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Paulette Brody	Support Teacher Title I	Title I	1.0

Campus Funding Summary

6300 Parent Involvement. Supplies T1					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
8	1	1	PFE Budget	Parent Engagement - .8 Parent Involvement	\$2,323.00
Sub-Total					\$2,323.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$2,323.00
+/- Difference					\$0.00
Grand Total Budgeted					\$2,323.00
Grand Total Spent					\$2,323.00
+/- Difference					\$0.00