Keller Independent School District

Whitley Road Elementary School

2025-2026 Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
January 09, 2026 at 09:53 AM

Table of Contents

Demographics 3

Student Learning 6

School Processes & Programs 9

Perceptions 11

Demographics

Summary

Our campus is comprised of approximately 337 K-4th grade students.

The enrollment for Whitley Road Elementary, as indicated on the 2024-2025 Summer PEIMS snapshot report, was 337 students.

Student Ethnic Distribution is as follows:

24-25 Student Ethnic Distribution	
African American	9.7%
Hispanic	30.3%
White	46.5%
Native American/Alaskan	0.6%
Asian	3.2%
Pacific Islander	1.2%
2 or More Races	8.5%

Student distribution by program:

(2023-2024)

24-25 Student Distribution by Program	
Economically Disadvantaged	62.1%
AT-Risk	34.4%
Section 504	5.9%
Limited English Proficiency	9.1%
Special Education	37.9%
Gifted & Talented	5.9%

At risk and special education populations have increased since the previous year.

Student distribution by program (2023-2024) for comparison

23-24 Student Ethnic Distribution	
African American	6.8%
Hispanic	29.8%
White	50.1%
American Indian	0.3%
Asian	3.8%
Pacific Islander	1.9%
2 or More Races	7.3%

Student distribution by program:

(2023-2024)

23-24 Student Distribution by Program	

Economically Disadvantaged	62.2%
AT-Risk	30.1%
Section 504	5.7%
Limited English Proficiency	8.9%
Special Education	32%
Gifted & Talented	6.2%

24-25 Teacher Demographics	
White	80.9%
Hispanic	18.6%
Black	0.5%
Other	0%

24-25 Teacher Years of Experience	
Beginning	0%
1-5 Years	28.9%
6-10 Years	27.1%
11-20 Years	29.6%
Over 20 Years	14.4%

Strengths

Our student population is diverse.

We provide on-site programs with specially certified teachers to meet the needs of our students.

Our teachers have a wide range of experience with the majority of our teachers having 6 or more years of expereince.

More parents applied for services such as free/reduced meals, counseling, and testing for academic support.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There has been a significant increase in students enrolled in programs which require specialized support to address varying academic, behavior, and emotional needs	Many students moved from 504 plans to IEPs; our number of students in Life Skills increased, and many students enrolled from surrounding districts with IEPs in place.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Fall 2024-Spring 2025 MAP Growth

Percentage of Students who met or exceeded their end of year MAP growth projections:

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	69.8%	72.1%
First Grade	23.5%	47.1%
Second Grade	52.5%	63.9%
Third Grade	53.2%	62.9%
Fourth Grade	51.3%	46.1%

Campus-wide, 57% of student met or exceeded their end of year MAP growth Projections in math and 50% in reading. In 23-24, 57% of students met growth in math and 49% met growth in reading.

Spring 2025 MAP Achievement

Percentage of Students with an EOY RIT score on the Average to Above Average Range (40th percentile +):

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	80%	86%
First Grade	63%	73%
Second Grade	63%	69%
Third Grade	66%	71%
Fourth Grade	59%	66%

Campus-wide, 72% of students performed at the average range or above in math, and 66% in reading. In 22-23, 69% of students performed at or above the average range in math, and 62% in reading.

Previous Year's SCores:

Fall 2023-Spring 2024 MAP Growth

Percentage of Students who met or exceeded their end of year MAP growth projections:

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	63%	77%
First Grade	31%	51%
Second Grade	56%	56%
Third Grade	64%	70%
Fourth Grade	30%	36%

Campus-wide, 57% of student met or exceeded their end of year MAP growth Projections in math and 49% in reading. In 22-23, 55% of students met growth in math and 49% met growth in reading.

Spring 2024 MAP Achievement

Percentage of Students with an EOY RIT score on the Average to Above Average Range (40th percentile +):

Grade Level	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	80%	86%
First Grade	63%	73%
Second Grade	63%	69%
Third Grade	66%	71%
Fourth Grade	59%	66%

Campus-wide, 72% of students performed at the average range or above in math, and 66% in reading. In 22-23, 69% of students performed at or above the average range in math, and 62% in reading.

Strengths

The percentage of third graders who met or exceeded growth goals increased from 55% in second grade to 70% in third grade in math and from 52% to 64% in reading.

The percentage of second graders who met or exceeded growth goals increased from 46% in first grade to 56% in second grade in math and from 33% to 56% in reading.

The percentage of students campus-wide in the average or above average RIT ranges improved in both reading and math from 22-23 to 23-24.

The percentage of students campus-wide who met or exceeded growth in math increased from 55% in 22-23 to 57% in 23-24.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus-wide, the percentage of students who fall within the average to above average RIT ranges is increasing, but the percentage of students who meet projected growth is stagnant.	Teachers require professional development in Small group instruction in order to address individual student needs in all performance level bands.
2 ★	MAP achievement and growth scores have consistently dropped from kindergarten to first grade over the last 3 years.	Based on observations, the level of rigor, academic expectations, and student independence declines in first grade.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Teachers plan weekly with grade levels, and participate in weekly PLC's and Nine-Week planning days

PLCs are used for data analysis and professional development.

Nine-Week planning days were days set aside each 9 week grading period for teachers to prioritize high-leverage standards and align assessments for math and reading.

MTSS: MAP data are used in the beginning, middle, and end of year to track students' growth in the areas of reading and math. Students who demonstrate low growth and/or achievement scores may be referred to our student intervention team and identified as needing additional intervention. Intervention may be provided by a classroom teacher or a specialist based on student needs.

Classroom and intervention teachers used iStation ISIP data monthly to progress monitor growth of all students.

PBIS: Campus uses a behavior matrix to determine teacher or office management of behavior. Each teachers creates a STAR matrix with their students to address classroom specific expectations and uses Starbucks and Golden Starbucks for positive reinforcement.

Counseling: The counselor meets with classes for guidance lessons, small groups for focused intervention, and individual students when needed. We established a school-wide "reset" process for students to use when they are feeling overwhelmed or upset.

We use a paraprofessional staff member to assist with students who need additional support or intervention for behaviors that impede the learning of themselves and/or others.

Strengths

Consistent, regular teacher planning days and times allowed for collaboration and grade-level curriculum alignment.

Campus used PLCs to regularly review district testing data and adjust instruction as needed.

Campus PBIS practices including logical behavior consequences, matrices, and rewards are consistent and effective.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Student achievement and growth were inconsistent across classrooms and grade levels.	There have not been intentional opportunities to plan vertically and ensure alignment of best practices and instructional strategies across grade levels.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

32 Families completed the district Title I survey.

51 Families completed the Campus Climate Survey.

28 Staff members participated in the Campus Climate Survey

39 staff members participated in one-on-one interviews providing campus feedback.

86% of parents agreed that they are actively involved in their child's school activities.

55% of parents agreed that they frequently volunteer to help on special projects at their child's school.

Staff expressed that they would like to reconsider tracking student data in the form of data binders and to revisit co-curricular transition expectations.

Staff expressed that planning, PLCs, and communication were beneficial.

92% of staff believed that students get along with each other, treat each other fairly, and show respect to each other. However, on the survey item that states "Students behave so that teachers can teach and students can learn", 25% of teachers disagreed.

Parent and Staff participation on Academic Title I Nights:

Academic Title I Nights	# of Families	# of Staff
Winter Wonderland	131 Families	35 Staff
STEAM Night	54 Families	29 Staff
Art & Science Night	138 Families	32 Staff

Weekly Campus newsletter sent to all families every Friday afternoon containing school and grade level information.

Strengths

Families feel welcome at school, and that communication is effective.

98% of families agreed that teachers have high standards for achievement and that teachers work hard to make sure that students do well.

Staff expressed that planning, PLCs, and communication were beneficial.

92+% of teachers report that students get along, are fair, and treat each other with respect.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	14% of parents believed that they were not actively involved in their child's activities, and 45% disagreed that they volunteered to help with special projects in their child's school.	Many of our parents work one or more jobs and cannot attend in-person events due to their work schedules. The school does not offer alternative options for some events.
2 ★	25% of teachers report that student behavior impedes teaching and learning.	There may be inconsistent behavior expectations across campus, or a lack of understanding between student "engagement" and "compliance".

★ = Priority