

Belton Independent School District
High Point Elementary
2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan



**HIGH POINT
ELEMENTARY**

Mission Statement

To equip individuals to become lifelong learners and engaged citizens.

Vision

We provide a learning community that supports each individual's academic and personal growth.

Value Statement

As High Point Colts, we will...

Care for others,

Overcome obstacles,

Listen with an open heart,

Take risks when learning, and be

Safe, respectful, and responsible.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	5
School Processes & Programs	6
Perceptions	8
Priority Problem Statements	10
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	12
Goals	14
Goal 1: Strengthen and support the engagement of all stakeholders in the pursuit of the BISD vision. Key Progress Measure: Establish at least one new strategic partnership between each campus/department and a community organization, business, industry leader, or institution of higher education by January of 2026.	14
Goal 2: Ensure exceptional learning experiences for each and every student. Key Progress Measure: Increase the percentage of students demonstrating critical thinking, with an emphasis on asking questions and evaluating arguments from 47% to 55% in alignment with the Journey of a Graduate Competency Rubric by May of 2026. Key Progress Measure: Meet all House Bill 3 Goals and progress measures.	17
Goal 3: Attract, retain, and support a world-class team of employees. Key Progress Measure: Achieve 80% staff participation in creating and pursuing a professional learning goal aligned with the BISD leadership definition by May 2026.	23
Goal 4: Develop a district-wide culture of value, support, and growth amongst all students and staff. Key Progress Measure: Implement Hope Squad at 100% of campuses as measured by active Hope Squad teams with trained students and advisor at each campus, and conduct a minimum of one Hope Squad event by May 2026.	24
Goal 5: Maximize our use of resources for both current priorities and plans for the future. Key Progress Measure: Implement Teacher Incentive Allotment systems of support across 100% of designated campuses by May 2026.	30
Plan Notes	31

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

While the school demonstrates strengths in serving a diverse student population, fostering academic achievement, and providing community support through charitable initiatives, significant challenges exist. Community and stakeholder engagement is not as robust as it could be. Attendance rates are below expectations and tardies and partial day absences cause an increased loss of instructional time. Faculty absences are elevated compared to peer campuses. Knowledge of when to write a discipline referral may not be clear. Teachers do not have a clear understanding of identifying threats/bullying and then reporting appropriately. Furthermore, the high number of families requiring holiday support, the eligibility for Title I status based on free and reduced lunch data, and the significant number of students qualifying for Project Heartbeat highlight substantial socio-economic needs within the student population that require targeted attention. We currently build cohorts of students like Gifted and Talented and students receiving resource and/or inclusion services. A teacher might have one class that has students receiving services for GT and the other class may have students receiving services through Special Education. Our Highly Modified Resource class has reached a high number of students (16) compared to other campuses that may have less than 10.

Demographics Strengths

- Diverse mixture of socio-economic backgrounds with both staff and students.
- We have a high number of GT students compared to peer campuses.
- We have a relatively low mobility rate compared to peer campuses.
- Behavior screener data has shown reduction in high concern students
- Referrable behaviors have reduced from previous school years.
- We have a robust food drive / project Angel Tree Christmas programs

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Currently, 24% of students receive Tier 3 Interventions and 30% receive Tier 2 Interventions (total of 54% in T2/T3).

Root Cause: The direct instruction across the campus is not consistent, lacking higher order questioning, think alouds, and modeling.

Problem Statement 2: Faculty absences are higher than peer campuses which causes a strain and potential missed instruction for groups or classes of students.

Root Cause: When substitutes do not pick up the job, classes are shared or a staff member is pulled from their assigned role in servicing students to cover the unfilled position.

Problem Statement 3: Two hundred twelve discipline referrals have been written from August 19 to March 21.

Root Cause: Students struggle to self-regulate and show safe, respectful, and responsible behaviors.

Problem Statement 4: Bullying, threats, and self-harm threats are not consistently reported.

Root Cause: There is not a clear system of how to make a report and potentially unsure of how to identify these types of behaviors.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

The school demonstrates strengths in allotted time for long range planning, and strong early literacy performance, particularly in Kindergarten and 1st grade. However, there are significant concerns regarding declining STAAR Math scores across all grade levels, with substantial drops in student progress and achievement. Potential contributing factors include the new STAAR 2.0 test, misalignment of instruction with assessments, and teacher transitions in 4th grade. There is a need for targeted interventions and support, especially in math, to address the low growth and achievement rates. Reading small group instruction was a focus this year and while some grade levels made gains and are consistent in meeting with students, not every grade level meets with students nor are students' needs being met in a whole group setting.

Student Learning Strengths

- Long range planning /unified planning
- Common formative assessments
- KDG continue to maintain Masters & Approaches percentages
- 1st increases Masters, if you add the Masters and the Meets %, it is most of grade level

Renaissance Data

- RDG Ren- K/1/2 did make expected growth
- RDG Ren- 55% KDG above BMK expectations (Masters)
- RDG Ren- 72% KDG at Meets & Masters level combined

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): We have not hit the student growth percentile goal of 65 (1.5 years growth) in any grade level or subject.

Root Cause: There is a disconnect and misalignment from grade level to grade level due to a lack of collaborative efforts around standards, needs of students, and how to use the data to respond in order to see positive results.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): There's low growth for all sub groups on Math STAAR.

Root Cause: There's been a lack of focus on math instruction and more emphasis on reading this year.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Instruction is not aligned to summative assessments.

Root Cause: There's a lack of confidence in writing higher order questioning and getting students to discuss with peers.

Problem Statement 4: Students receiving services through Special Education are not "meeting" on STAAR.

Root Cause: There's a high number of students (26%) receiving special education services through the general education classroom. General education teachers have limited understanding or strategies to meet the needs of each and every student.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

HPE has several strengths contributing to a positive school climate. Campus celebrations have increased, providing consistency and motivating students, particularly through goal-related rewards like bell ringing. The PLC process has improved with rotating leadership for data meetings, increased collaboration, protected planning time, and a more efficient schedule. Professional learning is well-received, with teachers reporting growth and benefiting from feedback mechanisms and extended classroom time in August. Discipline data shows a positive trend due to a consistent referral system, teacher support, root cause analysis training, and a smoother behavior MTSS process. Finally, the MTSS system is well-documented, has established strong Tier 3 interventions in early grades for literacy support, and is aligned with academic and behavior referral data in upper grades.

HPE is working to enhance several areas. While campus celebrations are a strength, there's room to improve student engagement with incentives and ensure broader participation in events. The PLC process could benefit from clearer guidance for some grade levels, improved accessibility of resources, and better onboarding for new teachers. Professional learning could be more impactful by streamlining training and addressing teacher needs for more classroom preparation time. When it comes to discipline, clarifying referral procedures and ensuring consistent implementation of programs like DBRC would be helpful. Finally, the MTSS process is managing a significant number of special education evaluation referrals, which may require further attention.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Campus Celebrations

- The increase in celebrations has a positive effect on the whole campus.
- The celebration plan allows for consistency.
- Students love bell ringing when students reach their personal goals.
- PE - Jump rope Karate / Driver's License / Marathon
- Music - Recorder Black Belt

PLC Process

- Grade level teachers take turns leading Data Meetings.
- Increase in collaboration
- Safer place to discuss data, needs, and next steps.
- Protected time for Long Range Planning, Tuesday Planning Meetings, and Wednesday Data Meetings
- The schedule for data meetings allow for more time to have time to work during conference times.

Professional Learning

- Seeking feedback after each learning session.
- More time in the classroom in August was helpful.
- Teachers report that professional learning is supporting teacher growth.

Discipline Data

- Last 3 years, HPE has worked to put a system in place for behavior referrals with consistent consequences.
- Teachers understand the process of discipline referrals.
- Teachers feel supported in the discipline process.
- Training has helped teachers identify the root cause of behaviors.
- Training for behavior support has been continuous.
- Behavior MTSS process has made behavior management a smoother process.

MTSS

- HPE MTSS Process and System recorded in Hp Google Drive.
- Established strong Tier 3 intervention in K and 1st to support high numbers of students needing early literacy support.
- Academic and Behavior Referrals were the most in grades 2nd, 3rd, and 4th which is aligned to the HPE MTSS Process

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Collaborative planning within collaborative results in varied implementation across classes and grade levels.

Root Cause: Our current reality with team planning is typically which skill is being taught next week by subject and operational (housekeeping) topics being discussed. We do not have a strong focus on the 4 PLC questions.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): There is a high number of special education referrals (15 for speech and 27 for learning disability).

Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is not at the rigor or depth of complexity as the standards. Potentially there could be a lack of understanding on unpacking TEKS to fully know how we know students are learning it.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Some teams do not know what type of data to bring for data team meetings.

Root Cause: A lack of understanding in common formative assessments/common summative assessments and their purpose.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Our campus demonstrates several strengths in the area of perceptions, fostering a positive and collaborative environment. Multiple recognition methods for staff and students exist, and staff appreciate the opportunity to provide input on celebration and recognition practices. Individuals feel empowered through leadership opportunities, and feedback is valued and acted upon, creating a safe space to voice concerns. Learning strands aligned with campus goals are offered, data meetings are flexible and timely, and long-range planning is beneficial for unit development. Increased teacher leadership is also a positive aspect. High family involvement is evident during student performances and interactive events like STEAM night. Data shows a significant decrease in high-risk behaviors and an increase in responsible low-risk behaviors from the beginning to the middle of the year.

Several areas within perceptions require attention to improve. Low participation in staff feedback check-ins make it difficult to truly see the big picture. Inconsistent use of programs like Freckle and a need for more targeted, teacher-led professional learning sessions to address staff needs and ensure learning strands are effectively elevating practice. The Learning Showcase's lack of participation also shows a need to determine what events are needed to ensure involvement. Confusion surrounding events like March Madness and a lack of clarity regarding STAAR testing (especially for first-time 3rd-grade parents) and standard-based report cards hinders effective parent communication and understanding. Inconsistent grade-level independence in planning and executing learning experiences, along with difficulties onboarding new mid-year teachers, suggests a need for improved collaborative structures and support systems. Although long range half day planning sessions are helpful, there is not always evidence of this work transferring over to weekly collaborative plannings. Staff members may not have a growth mindset of a 'culture of can' mindset to meet the needs of each and every learner in the classroom despite labels.

Perceptions Strengths

- There's multiple modes of trying to recognize achievements of staff and students.
- Staff appreciate the attempt to gather input from staff about their feelings around celebrations and recognitions at the beginning of the year.
- Individuals feel empowered when giving opportunities to lead.
- Feedback is responsive ; a feeling of being able to voice concerns without a fear of judgement is evident.
- We have learning strands offered for teachers to choose from that align to campus goals.
- Flexibility of having data meetings when data happens; it's helpful and the data is more useful.
- Long range planning is super beneficial and allows teachers to map out the big picture of unit plans.
- More teacher leadership allowance is positive.
- Higher family involvement for performance nights than non performance nights.
- STEAM night is interactive/hands on family involvement.
- High risk behavior students declined from 30 to 17 from beginning of year to middle of year.
- Responsible low risk increased from 79.7% to 85% from beginning to middle of the year.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): High percentage of students receiving special education services (~25%) or intervention services through Tier 2 or Tier 3 (~54%).

Root Cause: Lack of teacher capacity to effectively meet the needs of diverse learners.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Professional learning strands do not allow for shared knowledge and alignment amongst the entire staff when trying to manage change.

Root Cause: There's not a consistent opportunity for the whole staff to collaborate on the same learning.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Low participation with stakeholders in prioritizing attendance, partnerships in academic events, and volunteer opportunities.

Root Cause: Lack of parent/family understanding regarding how these factors affect student growth and progress.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Currently, 24% of students receive Tier 3 Interventions and 30% receive Tier 2 Interventions (total of 54% in T2/T3).

Root Cause 1: The direct instruction across the campus is not consistent, lacking higher order questioning, think alouds, and modeling.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: We have not hit the student growth percentile goal of 65 (1.5 years growth) in any grade level or subject.

Root Cause 2: There is a disconnect and misalignment from grade level to grade level due to a lack of collaborative efforts around standards, needs of students, and how to use the data to respond in order to see positive results.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: There's low growth for all sub groups on Math STAAR.

Root Cause 3: There's been a lack of focus on math instruction and more emphasis on reading this year.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: Collaborative planning within collaborative results in varied implementation across classes and grade levels.

Root Cause 4: Our current reality with team planning is typically which skill is being taught next week by subject and operational (housekeeping) topics being discussed. We do not have a strong focus on the 4 PLC questions.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: There is a high number of special education referrals (15 for speech and 27 for learning disability).

Root Cause 5: Tier 1 instruction is not at the rigor or depth of complexity as the standards. Potentially there could be a lack of understanding on unpacking TEKS to fully know how we know students are learning it.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: High percentage of students receiving special education services (~25%) or intervention services through Tier 2 or Tier 3 ~54%).

Root Cause 6: Lack of teacher capacity to effectively meet the needs of diverse learners.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 7: Professional learning strands do not allow for shared knowledge and alignment amongst the entire staff when trying to manage change.

Root Cause 7: There's not a consistent opportunity for the whole staff to collaborate on the same learning.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 8: Low participation with stakeholders in prioritizing attendance, partnerships in academic events, and volunteer opportunities.

Root Cause 8: Lack of parent/family understanding regarding how these factors affect student growth and progress.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 9: Instruction is not aligned to summative assessments.

Root Cause 9: There's a lack of confidence in writing higher order questioning and getting students to discuss with peers.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 10: Some teams do not know what type of data to bring for data team meetings.

Root Cause 10: A lack of understanding in common formative assessments/common summative assessments and their purpose.

Problem Statement 10 Areas: School Processes & Programs

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 Reading and math goals for PreK-3
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Progress Domain
- Federal Report Card and accountability data

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Other PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- State-developed online interim assessments
- Grades that measure student performance based on the TEKS

Student Data: Student Groups

- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Dyslexia data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Discipline records

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation

Goals

Goal 1: Strengthen and support the engagement of all stakeholders in the pursuit of the BISD vision.

Key Progress Measure: Establish at least one new strategic partnership between each campus/department and a community organization, business, industry leader, or institution of higher education by January of 2026.

Performance Objective 1: Establish at least one new strategic partnership between each campus/department and a community organization, business, industry leader, or institution of higher education by January of 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: Agendas, minutes, planned event(s)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Establish a strategic partnership with First Temple Church by meeting quarterly with Miguel Garcia and devising a plan that addresses each system's needs.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Support received by each party to increase performance of church and school.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
<p>Problem Statement 3: Low participation with stakeholders in prioritizing attendance, partnerships in academic events, and volunteer opportunities. Root Cause: Lack of parent/family understanding regarding how these factors affect student growth and progress.</p>

Goal 1: Strengthen and support the engagement of all stakeholders in the pursuit of the BISD vision.

Key Progress Measure: Establish at least one new strategic partnership between each campus/department and a community organization, business, industry leader, or institution of higher education by January of 2026.

Performance Objective 2: By May of 2026, at least 70% of families will report feeling well informed and connected to the school community.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Quarterly surveys, sign-in sheets, exit tickets after family events

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Form a team of staff and family to collaborate on the needs, hopes and dreams of family involvement at HPE. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parents and staff feel heard, valued, and supported in their hopes and dreams. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Communicate events and collaborative opportunities well in advance through the school newsletter and ParentSquare. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in family involvement Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Schedule parent information nights to include grade level expectations, standards based grading for K-2 and numeric grading for 3-5, STAAR expectations, and attendance and why it's important. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase parent knowledge of school operations Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Perceptions 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Accomplished			

 No Progress

 Accomplished

 Continue/Modify

 Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Low participation with stakeholders in prioritizing attendance, partnerships in academic events, and volunteer opportunities. **Root Cause:** Lack of parent/family understanding regarding how these factors affect student growth and progress.

Goal 2: Ensure exceptional learning experiences for each and every student.

Key Progress Measure: Increase the percentage of students demonstrating critical thinking, with an emphasis on asking questions and evaluating arguments from 47% to 55% in alignment with the Journey of a Graduate Competency Rubric by May of 2026.

Key Progress Measure: Meet all House Bill 3 Goals and progress measures.

Performance Objective 1: By May 2026, 50% of students in grades K-5 will reach a student growth percent of 65 (1.5 years of growth) measured by Star Renaissance Early Lit, Reading, and Math taken at BOY and EOY.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Lesson plans, team planning agendas

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: The Guiding Coalition will teach, model, facilitate, and monitor a strategic data protocol that focuses on individual student growth.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student growth</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Guiding Coalition Teacher Leaders</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: "Response Days" will be embedded in the Tier 1 lesson cycle to ensure there is adequate time to assess, reteach, and reassess student learning.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Identify the percent of students at proficient levels from initial teach and the percent at proficient after reteach; an increase in students reaching proficiency</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Guiding Coalition</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Moderate Progress			

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Technology will be limited in use to student mastery of math and reading or student generated product aligned to Texas standards.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: stronger foundation in math and reading skills and more authentic tasks</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, Instructional Coach, Guiding Coalition</p> <p>ESF Levels: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: Currently, 24% of students receive Tier 3 Interventions and 30% receive Tier 2 Interventions (total of 54% in T2/T3). Root Cause: The direct instruction across the campus is not consistent, lacking higher order questioning, think alouds, and modeling.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 1: We have not hit the student growth percentile goal of 65 (1.5 years growth) in any grade level or subject. Root Cause: There is a disconnect and misalignment from grade level to grade level due to a lack of collaborative efforts around standards, needs of students, and how to use the data to respond in order to see positive results.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: There's low growth for all sub groups on Math STAAR. Root Cause: There's been a lack of focus on math instruction and more emphasis on reading this year.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 1: Collaborative planning within collaborative results in varied implementation across classes and grade levels. Root Cause: Our current reality with team planning is typically which skill is being taught next week by subject and operational (housekeeping) topics being discussed. We do not have a strong focus on the 4 PLC questions.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: There is a high number of special education referrals (15 for speech and 27 for learning disability). Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is not at the rigor or depth of complexity as the standards. Potentially there could be a lack of understanding on unpacking TEKS to fully know how we know students are learning it.</p>
Perceptions
<p>Problem Statement 1: High percentage of students receiving special education services (~25%) or intervention services through Tier 2 or Tier 3 (~54%). Root Cause: Lack of teacher capacity to effectively meet the needs of diverse learners.</p>

Goal 2: Ensure exceptional learning experiences for each and every student.

Key Progress Measure: Increase the percentage of students demonstrating critical thinking, with an emphasis on asking questions and evaluating arguments from 47% to 55% in alignment with the Journey of a Graduate Competency Rubric by May of 2026.

Key Progress Measure: Meet all House Bill 3 Goals and progress measures.

Performance Objective 2: The percentage of 3rd-grade learners scoring meets grade level or higher on STAAR reading will increase from 38% to 40% by June 2026. The percentage of 3rd-grade learners scoring meets grade level or higher on STAAR math will increase from 25% to 27% by June 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Collaborative teams will create, analyze, and respond to common formative assessments to monitor progress towards priority standards.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased percentage of students at proficient.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Guiding Coalition</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: By December 2025, collaborative teams will complete one full unit planning cycle that includes the backward design model, progression ladders, and team-developed common formative and summative assessments.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increased assessment data</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principals, instructional coach, guiding coalition</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Accomplished			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Currently, 24% of students receive Tier 3 Interventions and 30% receive Tier 2 Interventions (total of 54% in T2/T3). **Root Cause:** The direct instruction across the campus is not consistent, lacking higher order questioning, think alouds, and modeling.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: We have not hit the student growth percentile goal of 65 (1.5 years growth) in any grade level or subject. **Root Cause:** There is a disconnect and misalignment from grade level to grade level due to a lack of collaborative efforts around standards, needs of students, and how to use the data to respond in order to see positive results.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Collaborative planning within collaborative results in varied implementation across classes and grade levels. **Root Cause:** Our current reality with team planning is typically which skill is being taught next week by subject and operational (housekeeping) topics being discussed. We do not have a strong focus on the 4 PLC questions.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Professional learning strands do not allow for shared knowledge and alignment amongst the entire staff when trying to manage change. **Root Cause:** There's not a consistent opportunity for the whole staff to collaborate on the same learning.

Goal 2: Ensure exceptional learning experiences for each and every student.

Key Progress Measure: Increase the percentage of students demonstrating critical thinking, with an emphasis on asking questions and evaluating arguments from 47% to 55% in alignment with the Journey of a Graduate Competency Rubric by May of 2026.

Key Progress Measure: Meet all House Bill 3 Goals and progress measures.

Performance Objective 3: Increase the percentage of students demonstrating critical thinking, with an emphasis on asking questions and evaluating arguments from 47% to 55% in alignment with the Journey of a Graduate Competency Rubric by May of 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: district Critical Thinking data collection

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Provide ongoing learning around the BISD Critical Thinking Rubric that supports the connection to the instructional playlist.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: increase in understanding of the critical thinking rubric and its application</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs, instructional coach</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Create an instructional playlist to include clear expectations around: teacher modeling/thinking aloud, higher order questioning, sentence stems, and turn and talk.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student learning</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Guiding Coalition</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Considerable			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: We have not hit the student growth percentile goal of 65 (1.5 years growth) in any grade level or subject. **Root Cause:** There is a disconnect and misalignment from grade level to grade level due to a lack of collaborative efforts around standards, needs of students, and how to use the data to respond in order to see positive results.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Collaborative planning within collaborative results in varied implementation across classes and grade levels. **Root Cause:** Our current reality with team planning is typically which skill is being taught next week by subject and operational (housekeeping) topics being discussed. We do not have a strong focus on the 4 PLC questions.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: High percentage of students receiving special education services (~25%) or intervention services through Tier 2 or Tier 3 (~54%). **Root Cause:** Lack of teacher capacity to effectively meet the needs of diverse learners.

Goal 3: Attract, retain, and support a world-class team of employees.

Key Progress Measure: Achieve 80% staff participation in creating and pursuing a professional learning goal aligned with the BISD leadership definition by May 2026.

Performance Objective 1: By May of 2026, all staff will have developed and pursued a professional goal aligned with the BISD Leadership definition through the T-TESS process.

Evaluation Data Sources: T-TESS goal setting, Laserfische Forms

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: During beginning of the year professional learning, there will be explicit learning around the BISD Leadership definition.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: shared knowledge around leadership definition and behaviors that support it</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 2: Strategic Staffing</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Accomplished			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: The BISD Leadership Definition will be visible and woven into campus culture through newsletters, collaborative team discussions, and staff meetings.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff will increase their knowledge of the leadership definition.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
<p>Problem Statement 2: Professional learning strands do not allow for shared knowledge and alignment amongst the entire staff when trying to manage change. Root Cause: There's not a consistent opportunity for the whole staff to collaborate on the same learning.</p>

Goal 4: Develop a district-wide culture of value, support, and growth amongst all students and staff.

Key Progress Measure: Implement Hope Squad at 100% of campuses as measured by active Hope Squad teams with trained students and advisor at each campus, and conduct a minimum of one Hope Squad event by May 2026.

Performance Objective 1: By March 2026, we will establish at least two opportunities for students to actively contribute to and promote the campus vision and mission as evidenced by student participation rates and documented contributions to relevant initiatives.

Evaluation Data Sources: surveys, principal advisory committee minutes/agendas, award announcements

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Initiate a Principal Advisory Team where students welcome guests during community visits, are on duty during arrival greeting staff and students, and visit classrooms and report feedback to staff.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in students feeling valued and heard as well as an increase in knowing the goals and direction of the school.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Implement a plan for recognizing students who exemplify the Journey of a Graduate Competencies.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase JOG language throughout the campus, increase student connectedness</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Counselors</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Considerable			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Low participation with stakeholders in prioritizing attendance, partnerships in academic events, and volunteer opportunities. **Root Cause:** Lack of parent/family understanding regarding how these factors affect student growth and progress.

Goal 4: Develop a district-wide culture of value, support, and growth amongst all students and staff.

Key Progress Measure: Implement Hope Squad at 100% of campuses as measured by active Hope Squad teams with trained students and advisor at each campus, and conduct a minimum of one Hope Squad event by May 2026.

Performance Objective 2: By May 2026, the guiding coalition will demonstrate measurable progress toward becoming a high-functioning team, as evidenced by results aligned to the Guiding Coalition Checklist.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Guiding Coalition checklist

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Use the book Amplify Your Impact Coaching Collaborative Teams to build leadership capacity of the Guiding Coalition.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Guiding Coalition (GC) will have increased confidence in leading collaborative teams and the larger team through data protocols to increase student achievement across the campus.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals</p> <p>ESF Levels: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: The Guiding Coalition will engage in learning walks together to calibrate on instructional strategy delivery and monitor how the PLC Process is executed during instructional time.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: leadership capacity within the GC is increased and teams build momentum for impact</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach</p> <p>ESF Levels: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Moderate Progress			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> No Progress</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Accomplished</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Continue/Modify</div> <div style="text-align: center;"> Discontinue</div> </div>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Collaborative planning within collaborative results in varied implementation across classes and grade levels. **Root Cause:** Our current reality with team planning is typically which skill is being taught next week by subject and operational (housekeeping) topics being discussed. We do not have a strong focus on the 4 PLC questions.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Professional learning strands do not allow for shared knowledge and alignment amongst the entire staff when trying to manage change. **Root Cause:** There's not a consistent opportunity for the whole staff to collaborate on the same learning.

Goal 4: Develop a district-wide culture of value, support, and growth amongst all students and staff.

Key Progress Measure: Implement Hope Squad at 100% of campuses as measured by active Hope Squad teams with trained students and advisor at each campus, and conduct a minimum of one Hope Squad event by May 2026.

Performance Objective 3: Implement Hope Squad at 100% of campuses as measured by active Hope Squad teams with trained students and advisor at each campus, and conduct a minimum of one Hope Squad event by May 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: meeting minutes

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Develop a selection process to design the Hope Squad. Use their input on the plan for a Hope Squad event.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: student connectedness, increase in kindness</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Goal 4: Develop a district-wide culture of value, support, and growth amongst all students and staff.

Key Progress Measure: Implement Hope Squad at 100% of campuses as measured by active Hope Squad teams with trained students and advisor at each campus, and conduct a minimum of one Hope Squad event by May 2026.

Performance Objective 4: By March 2026, social, emotional, and behavioral learning will be implemented with fidelity through all homeroom classrooms to include following the SEL YAG and being responsive to class needs.

Evaluation Data Sources: discipline data, lesson plans, fidelity checks

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Ensure all staff have access to the SEL YAG as well as online resources.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Consistent behaviors aligning to safe, respectful, responsible core values, increase in instructional time</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Counselors</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Some Progress			
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Goal 5: Maximize our use of resources for both current priorities and plans for the future.

Key Progress Measure: Implement Teacher Incentive Allotment systems of support across 100% of designated campuses by May 2026.

Performance Objective 1: Implement Teacher Incentive Allotment systems of support across 100% of designated campuses by May 2026.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Campus Leadership will implement a structured system of observation, feedback, and coaching for all teachers prioritizing Domains 2 and 3 in T-TESS rubric.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Reducing variability between classrooms across campus.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Moderate Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Provide teachers with T-TESS training on the evaluation rubric and process. During this training, explicitly highlight the overlap between our campus instructional focuses and the T-TESS rubric.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Clearer understanding of the rating scale and how the rubric correlates to campus goals.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals</p> <p>ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 Considerable			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Plan Notes

The campus will execute an Intensive Curriculum & Instruction Improvement strategy focused on maximizing instructional time and collaborative practice over 168 instructional days. Core curriculum resources include SAVVAS and Foundations for ELAR, and Go Math for mathematics. Daily instructional minutes are meticulously allocated by grade level (e.g., Kindergarten receives 140 minutes for ELAR and 90 for Math, while 3rd grade has 165 minutes for ELAR and 80 for Math), and dedicated time is scheduled for interventions ranging from 30 minutes in K-2 to 60 minutes in grades 3-5. This intensive instruction is supported by a robust assessment plan utilizing screeners (beginning, middle, end), fall/spring benchmarks, and common formative and summative assessments. Continuous improvement is driven by the Solution Tree PLC structure, where collaborative teams meet twice weekly for 45 minutes under the guidance of the instructional coach, adhering to the 4 Critical Questions protocol to analyze student data and refine practice.

Campus leaders will ensure fidelity and effectiveness of the Intensive Curriculum & Instruction Improvements plan through a multi-faceted monitoring system anchored in the PLC structure and assessment data. The instructional coach, who facilitates the twice-weekly, 45-minute PLC meetings, will serve as the primary monitor of the collaborative teams, verifying that teachers are consistently addressing the 4 Critical Questions—specifically, analyzing common formative and summative assessment data to diagnose student needs and collectively planning targeted interventions. Furthermore, leaders will conduct routine classroom observations, walkthroughs, and analysis of student assessment data to confirm the fidelity of high quality instruction. The analysis of student results from the beginning, middle, and end-of-year screeners and fall/spring benchmarks will provide the high-level evidence of the plan's impact, allowing leaders to adjust resources and professional development to support struggling teams or content areas throughout the instructional year.

If initial plan outcomes are unsatisfactory, the next-level work will intensify the focus on instructional precision and data-driven action by primarily targeting PLC Questions 2 and 3. Instructional coaches will assume a tighter monitoring role, moving teams beyond mere data discussion to conducting deep root-cause analyses of common formative assessment results to pinpoint the exact *why* behind student non-mastery. Concurrently, the campus will undertake a master schedule revision to secure equitable intervention times and protect high-leverage Tier 1 instructional blocks from interruptions. To ensure optimal teaching quality, leaders will strategically review teacher strengths and implement strategic teacher placements to align staff expertise with appropriate grade levels. Finally, the campus will strengthen and tighten lesson plan expectations, mandating detailed planning for small-group teaching and learning and ensuring an active, monitored component during student independent work time to immediately address learning needs.

Implementing the Intensive Curriculum & Instruction Improvements strategy requires a strategic reallocation of financial and human capital to directly support instructional demands and collaborative structures. Key resource shifts include adopting the Freckle by Renaissance digital platform to provide students with personalized, adaptive practice and intervention aligned with the curriculum, thereby strengthening both Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction. To boost the quality of the weekly PLC work, the campus will dedicate half-day planning days once per nine weeks, allowing grade-level teams to engage in deep, uninterrupted data analysis, curriculum mapping, and the collaborative creation of common formative assessments. Crucially, the campus will address the growing needs of its student population by securing additional special education staffing, ensuring that required services and intensive supports are adequately provided, particularly within the dedicated daily intervention block, maintaining compliance and maximizing student progress.

By May of 2026, all Grades ELA/Reading Meets Grade Level or Above STAAR Performance rate will increase from 49% to 54%.

By May of 2026, all Grades Math Meets Grade Level or Above STAAR Performance rate will increase from 32% to 37%.