

Fort Bend Independent School District

Goodman Elementary

2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: B

Includes TEA Targeted Improvement Plan Requirements



Mission Statement

FBISD exists to inspire and equip all students to pursue futures beyond what they can imagine.

Goodman elementary will provide high quality instruction, celebrate diversity, and promote a safe learning environment for all students through measurable actions and systems to be implemented by all stakeholders.

Vision

Fort Bend ISD will graduate students who exhibit the attributes of the District's Profile of a Graduate.

Goodman Elementary strives to be an exemplary campus focused on student centered practices and inclusiveness in a safe and supportive learning environment.

Value Statement

LGE strives to grow all scholars beyond what we can imagine!

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	9
School Processes & Programs	10
Perceptions	13
Priority Problem Statements	15
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	17
Goals	18
Goal 1: Priority 1: Increase successful student outcomes through enhanced learning opportunities	19
Goal 2: Priority 2: Create and sustain a culture and climate of professionalism, accountability, and communication (PAC) where stakeholders (student, parents, and staff) are valued, inspired, and engaged.	32
Goal 3: Priority 3: Exhibit financial responsibility through transparent budgeting processes and effective management of resources aligned to the district strategic plan.	39
Addendums	41

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Lula Belle Goodman serves 857 students in grades K through 5. The student population is 67% Hispanic, 29% African American, 0.12% Asian, and 1% White, with the remaining identifying as Two or More Races or other. 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, 50% are Emergent Bilinguals, and 16% receive special education services. The campus also supports students identified as at-risk (56%), homeless (1.75%), and gifted (1.98%). The staff includes 61 teachers, 8 educational aides, and 11 administrative support staff. While staff experience varies, ongoing development is needed in supporting linguistically diverse students and those with disabilities. The school operates as a Title I Schoolwide Program and serves a highly diverse population that requires intentional focus on equity, inclusion, and access to rigorous instruction.

Goodman Elementary serves a diverse population of students receiving special education services, with the majority identified as having learning disabilities (48.89%), followed by autism (18.52%) and speech impairments (14.81%). A smaller percentage of students are identified with intellectual disabilities (9.63%) and other health impairments. Most students receive instruction in resource room settings (55.56%), while others are served in mainstream classrooms (23.70%) or self-contained environments (11.11%).

Student Demographics	Count	Percent
Gender		
Female	447	52.16%
Male	410	47.84%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic-Latino	572	66.74%
Race		
American Indian - Alaskan Native	2	0.23%
Asian	1	0.12%
Black - African American	250	29.17%
Native Hawaiian - Pacific Islander	2	0.23%
White	14	1.63%
Two-or-More	16	1.87%

Special Education Services

	Count	Percent
Primary Disabilities		
No Disability	0	0.00%
Orthopedic impairment	0	0.00%
Other health impairment	6	4.44%
Auditory impairment	1	0.74%
Visual impairment	0	0.00%
Deaf-Blind	0	0.00%
Intellectual disability	13	9.63%
Emotional disturbance	4	2.96%
Learning disability	66	48.89%
Speech impairment	20	14.81%
Autism	25	18.52%
Developmental delay	0	0.00%
Traumatic brain injury	0	0.00%
Noncategorical early childhood	0	0.00%
Instructional Settings		
Speech Therapy	12	8.89%
Homebound	1	0.74%
Hospital Class	0	0.00%
Mainstream	32	23.70%
Resource Room	75	55.56%
VAC	0	0.00%
Off Home Campus	0	0.00%
State School	0	0.00%
Residential Care	0	0.00%
Self Contained	15	11.11%
Full-Time Early Childhood	0	0.00%
Nonpublic Day School	0	0.00%

Student Indicators

	Count	Percent
At-Risk	481	56.13%
Foster Care	8	0.93%
IEP Continuer	0	0.00%
Immigrant	0	0.00%
Intervention Indicator	4	0.47%
Migrant	3	0.35%
Military Connected	5	0.58%
Transfer In Students	0	0%
Unschooling Asylee/Refugee	0	0%
Economic Disadvantage		
Economic Disadvantage Total	715	83.43%
Free Meals	535	62.43%
Reduced-Price Meals	14	1.63%
Other Economic Disadvantage	166	19.37%
Homeless and Unaccompanied Youth		
Homeless Status Total	15	1.75%
Shelter	1	0.12%
Doubled Up	13	1.52%
Unsheltered	1	0.12%
Hotel/Motel	0	0.00%
Not Unaccompanied Youth	12	1.40%
Is Unaccompanied Youth	3	0.35%

Student Programs

	Count	Percent
Dyslexia	58	6.77%
Gifted and Talented	17	1.98%
Regional Day School Program for the Deaf	1	0.12%
Section 504	5	0.58%
Special Education (SPED)	135	15.75%
Bilingual/ESL		
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	430	50.17%
Bilingual	373	43.52%
English as a Second Language (ESL)	31	3.62%
Alternative Methods for Bilingual Education	3	0.35%
Alternative Methods for ESL	17	1.98%
Title I Part A		
Schoolwide Program	857	100.00%
Targeted Assistance	0	0.00%
Targeted Assistance Previously Participated	0	0.00%
Title I Homeless	0	0.00%
Neglected	0	0.00%

Student Demographics	Count	Percent
Gender		
Female	447	52.16%
Male	410	47.84%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic-Latino	572	66.74%
Race		
American Indian - Alaskan Native	2	0.23%
Asian	1	0.12%
Black - African American	250	29.17%
Native Hawaiian - Pacific Islander	2	0.23%
White	14	1.63%
Two-or-More	16	1.87%

Demographics Strengths

- **Cultural and Linguistic Diversity**

- Goodman Elementary serves a highly diverse population of students, with 67% Hispanic and 29% African American enrollment.
- This diversity fosters a rich learning environment that supports **culturally responsive teaching and inclusive schoolwide activities**.

- **Emergent Bilingual Student Population (50%)**

- Half of the student population is developing bilingualism, providing opportunities to **expand biliteracy and English language acquisition programs**.
- This population represents a **linguistic and cultural asset** for the school community.

- **Inclusive Special Education Programming**

- The campus serves 16% of students receiving special education services across a range of instructional settings, including **mainstream, resource, and self-contained classrooms**.
- This demonstrates a **commitment to individualized supports and inclusive practices**.

- **Title I Schoolwide Program Supporting Equity**

- With 83% of students identified as economically disadvantaged, Title I resources **provide extended learning, tutoring, and family engagement initiatives** to meet the needs of all learners.

- **Identified Gifted and Talented Students (1.98%)**

- A small but active GT population allows for **enrichment opportunities and peer leadership initiatives**, supporting a **culture of high expectations and academic excellence**.

- **Proactive Data Tracking of Student Subgroups**

- The campus maintains clear identification and monitoring of **at-risk students (56%), homeless students (1.75%), and students with disabilities (16%)**.
- This strength supports **targeted intervention planning, MTSS implementation, and continuous improvement efforts**.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy.

Root Cause: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices.

Root Cause: Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

TELPAS OVERALL PERFORMANCE					
	No Rating	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Advanced High
Kinder	2.56%	84.62%	12.82%	0%	0%
1st	100%	No rating	No rating	No rating	No rating
2nd	7.25%	31.88%	49.28%	10.14%	1.45%
3rd	3.70%	13.58%	38.27%	38.27%	6.17%
4th	10.67%	8%	33.33%	37.33%	10.67%
5th					

The TELPAS (Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System) performance data reveals critical insights into the language development progress of students across grade levels Kinder through 5th. The data highlights areas of strength and concern that will inform targeted strategies for school improvement.

In **Kindergarten**, a significant majority of students (84.62%) are at the **Beginning** level of English proficiency, with only 12.82% reaching **Intermediate** and no students achieving **Advanced** or **Advanced High** levels. This indicates a need for early intervention strategies and enhanced language support in foundational years.

In **2nd grade**, there is a more balanced distribution, with 49.28% of students at the **Intermediate** level and 10.14% reaching **Advanced**. However, 31.88% remain at the **Beginning** level, indicating ongoing support is needed to move students toward higher proficiency.

3rd and 4th grades show promising trends, with over 75% of students in each grade reaching **Intermediate** or higher. Notably, **3rd grade** has 38.27% at both **Intermediate** and **Advanced**, while **4th grade** has 37.33% at **Advanced** and 10.67% at **Advanced High**. These grades demonstrate effective instructional practices that can be modeled across other levels.

5th grade students show a wide range of English language development. About **13%** of students are at the **Beginning level**, meaning they are still learning basic English skills and need focused language instruction and regular support. Around **30%** are at the **Intermediate level**, showing growing proficiency and benefiting from lessons that build academic vocabulary and understanding.

A larger group—**31%**—have reached the **Advanced level**, demonstrating strong English skills and readiness for more challenging academic work. Finally, **11%** of students are at the **Advanced High level**, indicating full proficiency and minimal need for language support.

STAAR 2024-2025 State testing results:

Reading/Language Arts (RLA)

Across grade levels, student performance in RLA showed consistent strengths. Most students demonstrated foundational understanding, with a notable portion reaching proficiency and mastery.

- **68%** of students scored at *Approaches Grade Level or Above*
- **41%** met the *Meets Grade Level* standard
- **15%** achieved *Masters Grade Level*

Mathematics

Mathematics performance was similar to RLA in terms of mastery, but slightly lower in overall proficiency.

- **Overall results:**
 - **63%** of students scored at *Approaches Grade Level or Above*
 - **38%** met the *Meets Grade Level* standard
 - **15%** achieved *Masters Grade Level*

Science

Science results revealed the greatest need for instructional support.

- **Overall results:**
 - Only **45%** of students reached *Approaches Grade Level or Above*
 - **14%** met the *Meets Grade Level* standard
 - Just **6%** achieved *Masters Grade Level*

Mathematics (Grades K–5)

- **Kindergarten** students showed solid growth, with an average gain of **18 RIT points**, slightly above the projected growth. **52%** met their growth goals.
- **1st Grade** had the **highest growth**, with an average gain of **21 RIT points** and **64%** of students meeting their growth targets.
- **2nd and 3rd Grades** showed moderate growth (**16 and 15 RIT points**, respectively), with just over **50%** meeting growth goals.
- **4th Grade** had the **lowest percentage** of students meeting growth (**31%**), with only **10 RIT points** of observed growth.
- **5th Grade** rebounded slightly with **11 RIT points** of growth and **51%** meeting their targets.

*Growth was strongest in early grades (K–2), with a dip in upper elementary, particularly in 4th grade.

Reading (English, Grades 1–5)

- **1st Grade** students made **16 RIT points** of growth, with **63%** meeting their targets.
- **2nd Grade** showed **11 points** of growth, with **53%** meeting expectations.

- **3rd Grade** had **13 points** of growth and **62%** met their goals.
- **4th and 5th Grades** showed **lower growth** (4–5 RIT points), with only **40–53%** of students meeting their targets.

*Reading growth was strongest in **1st and 3rd grades**, while **4th grade** again showed a significant drop in performance.

Reading (Spanish, Grades 1–3)

- **1st Grade** students grew **16 RIT points**, but only **30%** met their growth goals.
- **2nd and 3rd Grades** showed **18 and 12 RIT points** of growth, respectively, with **62–75%** of students meeting their targets.

*Spanish reading growth was strong in 2nd and 3rd grades, with high percentages of students meeting expectations.

Science (Grades 3–5)

- **3rd Grade** students grew **7 RIT points**, with **44%** meeting growth goals.
- **4th Grade** showed the **highest science growth** (9 RIT points), with **65%** meeting their targets.
- **5th Grade** had **7 RIT points** of growth and **51%** of students meeting expectations.

*Science growth was **strongest in 4th grade**, contrasting with its lower performance in Math and Reading.

Summary Insights

- **Early grades (K–2)** are showing strong growth in both Math and Reading.
- **4th Grade** consistently underperformed across subjects, especially in Reading and Math.
- **Science** showed promising growth in upper grades, particularly in 4th grade.
- **Growth goal attainment** hovered around **50–65%** for most grades, with standout performance in **1st and 3rd grades**.

Student Learning Strengths

Goodman Elementary continues to demonstrate a strong commitment to growth and improvement, particularly in the areas of teacher development, student support, and community engagement. While comprehensive data from STAAR, MAP, and TELPAS assessments is pending, early indicators and campus practices reflect a positive trajectory.

One of the campus’s key strengths is its investment in professional development. Teachers are provided with ongoing, targeted training that equips them with actionable strategies to improve instruction and address both academic and behavioral needs. Staff members actively participate in these sessions, fostering a collaborative culture focused on continuous learning.

The campus has also made strides in supporting students through structured intervention systems. Literacy and math interventions are embedded into the school day, helping to close learning gaps and align instruction with grade-level TEKS. Science instruction emphasizes hands-on learning, which has increased student engagement and supported academic growth.

Behavioral supports, including mentoring programs and PBIS initiatives, have contributed to a more positive school climate. Students are motivated to make better choices, and discipline incidents have decreased as a result. Extracurricular programs and after-school supports further reinforce academic and behavioral expectations, while providing enrichment opportunities that promote student leadership and involvement.

Goodman Elementary’s efforts to build strong relationships with families and the community are also evident. The campus is working to expand access to parent training and engagement opportunities, particularly around positive behavior strategies and academic support.

Despite challenges in attendance, achievement, and discipline, the campus is making meaningful progress in building a supportive and effective learning environment. With continued focus on data-driven instruction, staff development, and student-centered practices, Goodman Elementary is well-positioned to accelerate growth and success.

MATH overall:

This indicates a solid foundation in math for most students, though targeted support may be needed to boost proficiency and mastery.

Science overall:

These results suggest that science instruction may benefit from enhanced resources, professional development, or curriculum adjustments to better support student learning.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1: The campus continues to face challenges in improving academic achievement in grades 2-5. (Domain 1)

Root Cause: The underlying cause of this challenge is consistency in using best practices in providing high-quality Tier 1 instruction.

Problem Statement 2: Teachers and instructional teams are not systematically analyzing assessment results to guide planning, differentiation, and intervention strategies, which limits the effectiveness of instruction and hinders academic growth across grade levels and in all content areas.

Root Cause: Teachers lack sufficient resources, training and support in implementing effective instructional strategies and using data to drive instruction.

Problem Statement 3: Teachers are not consistently implementing differentiated instruction tailored to the diverse academic needs of students, including enrichment and acceleration opportunities. This limits the effectiveness of instruction and contributes to gaps in student achievement across subgroups.

Root Cause: Teachers demonstrate limited knowledge and capacity in designing differentiated instructional practices - including enrichment and acceleration opportunities - tailored to the diverse needs of student subgroups in their classrooms.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

At Lula Belle Goodman Elementary, instruction is strategically aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and delivered through structured blocks dedicated to reading, math, science, STEM, and intervention. A clearly defined daily schedule ensures that academic and enrichment goals are met, with instructional time maximized for student learning.

Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) provide grade-level teams with opportunities to collaborate by content area, refine instructional practices, and make data-informed decisions. These meetings, along with Student Support Team (SST) sessions, foster a culture of shared leadership and collaborative problem-solving.

Professional development is focused on equipping teachers with high-quality instructional resources, data-driven strategies, and effective intervention practices. Instructional coaches play a key role in onboarding new staff and aligning them with campus expectations, ensuring consistency in instructional delivery.

Leadership is actively engaged in instructional improvement through regular classroom observations and campus walks conducted by the Instructional Leadership Team. Tools such as rubrics, checklists, and clearly defined learning intentions are used to promote student-centered learning and clarify success criteria.

Technology is integrated throughout the campus to support personalized learning and assessment. Platforms like NWEA MAP are used to monitor student progress, guide intervention planning, and maintain consistent communication about student needs.

Support services are robust, with a structured SST process that identifies and addresses student needs through tiered interventions informed by MAP data and other formative assessments. Extracurricular and cocurricular programs—including National Honor Society, Student Council, and enrichment opportunities in literacy, math, fine arts, and STEM—further enhance student engagement, leadership, and community involvement.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Goodman Elementary demonstrates efforts in improving instructional planning, professional development, and student support systems to support improved student achievement. The campus employs a structured daily schedule with dedicated instructional time for core subjects and targeted interventions. Instruction is aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and informed by campus data, to support academic rigor and relevance.

Professional learning communities (PLCs) meet weekly by content area, fostering collaborative planning and continuous improvement. Teachers utilize digital platforms such as NWEA MAP to identify students in need of tiered interventions, enabling a data-driven approach to instruction. The campus's Student Support Team (SST) process ensures timely and targeted support for students requiring additional resources.

Instructional leadership is a campus priority, with regular classroom observations and campus walks conducted to monitor and strengthen instructional practices. Tools such as rubrics, checklists, and student-centered learning intentions are used to promote clarity, self-directed learning, and success criteria.

Professional development is focused on high-quality instructional resources, data-informed teaching, and effective intervention strategies. New staff

receive coaching to ensure alignment with campus expectations and instructional norms.

Beyond academics, Goodman Elementary fosters student engagement through extracurricular programs such as National Honor Society and Student Council, which promote leadership and community involvement as well as opportunities for academic enrichment. The campus is committed to expanding enrichment opportunities in literacy, mathematics, fine arts, and STEM.

Technology integration supports personalized learning and instructional planning, with digital tools used to monitor progress and tailor instruction. These strengths collectively reflect a cohesive, intentional, and student-centered approach to school improvement.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1: Despite strong instructional structures, targeted interventions, and a commitment to professional development, Goodman continues to face challenges in translating these efforts into consistent academic and outcomes across all student groups. Achievement gaps, persist, indicating a need for deeper alignment between planning, implementation, and impact.

Root Cause: While structures like PLCs, SSTs, and instructional walks are in place, the depth and consistency of implementation varies across classrooms and grade levels. This has led to inconsistent instructional quality and limited effectiveness of interventions, especially for students who require differentiated support.

Problem Statement 2: Student achievement data indicates persistent gaps in mastery levels, particularly among sub pops. Current support structures are not sufficiently differentiated or intensive to build teacher capacity.

Root Cause: Teachers lack specialized training and support in areas such as second language acquisition, inclusive practices, and other adaptive instructional techniques. Without targeted professional development in the delivery of high-quality tier 1 instruction, staff struggle to implement high-impact strategies that accelerate learning for these subgroups.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Most parents (60%) and campus staff (59%) rated the overall school quality as Excellent or Good. In the academic support domain, parent agreement ranged from 40% to 52% across items related to instruction, feedback, and standards, while campus staff agreement ranged from 45% to 55%.

In the student support domain, 43% to 51% of parents agreed or strongly agreed that students receive individual support and have trusted adults at school. Campus staff responses were higher, ranging from 52% to 59%.

For school leadership, 39% to 52% of parents agreed or strongly agreed that leaders are responsive, fair, and communicate clearly. Campus staff agreement ranged from 45% to 57%.

In the safety and behavior domain, 34% to 54% of parents agreed or strongly agreed that safety procedures are in place and discipline is fair. Campus staff agreement ranged from 42% to 56%.

Regarding family involvement, 39% to 51% of parents agreed or strongly agreed that they feel welcome and informed. Campus staff agreement ranged from 45% to 53% that family input is valued and used.

Perceptions Strengths

At Lula Belle Goodman Elementary School, the Culture and Climate Survey results reveal several notable strengths in the perceptions of both parents and campus staff, painting a picture of a school community grounded in trust, support, and high expectations.

Parents and staff alike express confidence in the overall quality of the school, with a majority rating it as either *excellent* or *good*. This shared sentiment reflects a strong foundational belief in the school's mission and daily operations.

In the Academic Support domain, both groups recognize the school's commitment to rigorous instruction. There is widespread agreement that students are challenged to think critically, receive meaningful feedback, and are being well-prepared for future academic success. The curriculum is seen as relevant and engaging, and expectations for student achievement are consistently high.

The Student Support domain stands out as a major strength. Staff overwhelmingly agree that students have trusted adults to turn to, and that individualized support is provided to help students thrive. Parents echo this, noting that their children feel safe, respected, and excited to attend school—an indicator of a nurturing and inclusive environment.

Leadership at Goodman Elementary is also viewed positively. Both parents and staff report that school leaders are fair, responsive, and communicative, and that they genuinely care about the well-being of students and staff. This fosters a culture of transparency and shared purpose.

In terms of Safety and Behavior, the school is perceived as a secure and respectful place. Bullying is addressed appropriately, discipline is enforced fairly, and students are treated equitably. These perceptions contribute to a climate where students can focus on learning without fear or distraction.

Finally, Family Involvement is a clear strength. Parents feel welcomed and informed, and staff value family input in shaping school programs and decisions. Communication is frequent and two-way, reinforcing the partnership between home and school.

Overall, the survey results highlight Goodman Elementary as a school where academic rigor, emotional support, strong leadership, and family engagement come together to create a thriving educational environment.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: Inconsistent Perceptions of Academic Rigor and Communication: There is a noticeable gap in perceptions around communication of student progress and behavior.

Root Cause: A significant portion of parents report low agreement on being kept informed about their child's grades and behavior, which indicates a breakdown in home-school communication channels. Staff are not consistent in their use of a communication platform, and there is a historical perception that communication has been last-minute.

Problem Statement 2: Concerns Around Safety and Discipline Fairness: Although safety is generally viewed positively, only about half of parents agree or strongly agree that discipline is enforced fairly and that bullying is adequately addressed.

Root Cause: There is a lack of transparency and consistency in behavior management practices.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy.

Root Cause 1: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices.

Root Cause 2: Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data

Accountability Data

- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data

Student Data: Student Groups

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

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Discipline records

Employee Data

- Professional development needs assessment data

Support Systems and Other Data

- Action research results

Goals

Goal 1: Priority 1: Increase successful student outcomes through enhanced learning opportunities





Performance Objective 1: By June 2026, 65% of LGE students in Kinder through 5th grade will grow at least one and a half years in reading as indicated by NWEA Map Growth Measures.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Students will engage in rigorous, differentiated tasks aligned to their RIT scores to promote productive struggle and growth.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will utilize checklists and rubrics to manage their learning. Teachers will progress monitor and provide effective feedback. Students will show higher levels of mastery on various assessments.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Teachers will engage in data driven planning practices to design and implement tiered, differentiated, and rigorous activities that promote productive struggle.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will show evidence of effective analyzation of the data and implement instructional strategies. Teachers will use MAP Growth RIT data to group students by instructional need. Teachers and students will engage in reading and writing teacher-led small group.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Administrators, Interventionists</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

 No Progress
 Accomplished
 Continue/Modify
 Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. Root Cause: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.</p>

Goal 1: Priority 1: Increase successful student outcomes through enhanced learning opportunities





Performance Objective 2: By June 2026, 60% of LGE students in Kinder through 5th grade will grow at least one and a half years in math as indicated by NWEA Map Growth Measures.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Students will engage in rigorous, differentiated math tasks aligned to their RIT scores to promote productive struggle and growth.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Use MAP Growth data to identify each students' current level then align DreamBox lessons to fill gaps for extended learning. Teachers effectively planning for and using the CRA model. Teachers and students engaging in teacher-led small group instruction. Students will show higher levels of mastery on varying assessments.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
	Empty review cells			

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Teachers will engage in data driven planning practices to design and implement tiered, differentiated, and rigorous math activities that promote productive struggle.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will show evidence of effective analyzation of the data and implement instructional strategies. Teachers will use MAP Growth RIT data to group students by instructional need. Teachers and students will engage in math teacher-led small group.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, administrators, interventionists, district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. Root Cause: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. Root Cause: Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.</p>





Goal 1: Priority 1: Increase successful student outcomes through enhanced learning opportunities

Performance Objective 3: By May 2026, LGE will increase the percentage of students scoring at meets/or above in reading from 41% to 51% and master's from 15% to 25%, as measured by STAAR 2026.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Spring STAAR 2026
CFAs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: LGE teachers will participate in PLTs to plan and implement daily interventions and enrichment lessons designed to close gaps and accelerate learning for our GT, SpEd, EB and 504 students.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will gain explicit knowledge of how all students are performing. Evidence of intentional planning and progress monitoring. Students will engage in differentiated learner experiences. Evidence of ECRs and the use of the Gradual Release Model.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Administrators and coaches will conduct campus walks to monitor small group instruction and ensure students engage in writing tasks (SCR, ECR) aligned to the ELAR instructional model to support learning for all.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Evidence of walk-through forms, feedback conversations, and next steps. Follow up on Learning Walks feedback and action steps. Use feedback to build teacher capacity in the effective implementation of teacher-led small groups.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, coaches, administration, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: LGE will collaborate with district's departments to offer ongoing, job-embedded professional developments focused on effective reading Tier 1 learner experiences such as ELAR instructional strategies, Gradual Release, SCR/ECR Writing, academic vocabulary development, and increasing the rigor of application methods to align with STAAR expectations.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Build content knowledge and teacher capacity. To promote student growth and academic discourse. Reduction in achievement gaps.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. **Root Cause:** Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.

Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. **Root Cause:** Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.





Goal 1: Priority 1: Increase successful student outcomes through enhanced learning opportunities

Performance Objective 4: By May 2026, LGE will increase the percentage of students scoring at meets/or above in math from 38% to 48% and master's from 15% to 25%, as measured by STAAR 2026.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Spring STAAR 2026
CFAs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: LGE teachers will participate in PLTs to plan and implement daily interventions and enrichment lessons designed to close gaps and accelerate learning for our GT, SpEd, EB and 504 students.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will gain explicit knowledge of how all students are performing. Evidence of intentional planning and progress monitoring. Students will engage in differentiated learner experiences. Evidence of the CRA Model and the use of math manipulatives</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coaches, Admin, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Administrators and instructional coaches will conduct campus walks to monitor the implementation of small group instruction and ensure students are using manipulatives effectively within the CRA (Concrete-Representational-Abstract) model to support learning for all.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Evidence of walk-through forms, feedback conversations, and next steps. Follow up on Learning Walks feedback and action steps. Use feedback to build teacher capacity in the effective implementation of teacher-led small groups.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, coaches, administration, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: LGE will collaborate with district's departments to offer ongoing, job-embedded professional developments focused on effective reading Tier 1 learner experiences such as ELAR instructional strategies, Gradual Release, SCR/ECR Writing, academic vocabulary development, and increasing the rigor of application methods to align with STAAR expectations.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Build content knowledge and teacher capacity. To promote student growth and academic discourse. Reduction in achievement gaps.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. **Root Cause:** Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.

Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. **Root Cause:** Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.





Goal 1: Priority 1: Increase successful student outcomes through enhanced learning opportunities

Performance Objective 5: By June 2026, LGE will increase the percentage of students performing at Meets Grade Level and Above on the STAAR Science assessment from ___% to ___%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Spring STAAR 2026
CFAs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Teachers will implement the science curriculum during scheduled instructional time, ensuring all student subgroups have equitable access to grade-level hands-on lab experiences that support engagement and mastery.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students engaged in lab work and writing. Teachers effectively planning for lab experiments. High student engagement Real world connections and problem solving through application opportunities</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, coaches, admin, district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Administrators and instructional coaches will conduct campus walks to monitor the implementation of the science curriculum during scheduled instructional time. This ensures all student subgroups receive consistent Tier 1 instruction with access to hands-on learning experiences aligned to grade-level expectations.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Evidence of walk-through forms, feedback conversations, and next steps. Follow up on Learning Walks feedback and action steps. Use feedback to build teacher capacity in the effective implementation of teacher-led small groups.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, coaches, administration, and district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: LGE will collaborate with district's departments to offer ongoing, job-embedded professional developments focused on effective reading Tier 1 learner experiences such as the 5E model, academic vocabulary development, and increasing the rigor of application methods to align with STAAR expectations.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Build content knowledge and teacher capacity. To promote student growth and academic discourse. Reduction in achievement gaps.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Coaches, Admin, district staff</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. **Root Cause:** Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.

Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. **Root Cause:** Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.

Goal 2: Priority 2: Create and sustain a culture and climate of professionalism, accountability, and communication (PAC) where stakeholders (student, parents, and staff) are valued, inspired, and engaged.





Performance Objective 1: By June 2026, LGE will increase stakeholder (student, parent, and staff) satisfaction and engagement by at least 20% across key Culture and Climate domains through an organizational focus on the principles of the PAC as measured by the district's culture and climate survey.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Parent pulse surveys will be sent out in October, January and April to gauge progress.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Parents will be offered multiple opportunities to engage in academic activities on campus.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Curriculum Nights (STEM and Literacy) Multi-Lingual Showcase Lattes with Lauren</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration</p> <p>Title I: 2.52</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Regularly share updates with students, parents, and staff about school initiatives, achievements, and changes aligned to PAC principles.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase consistent communication with all stakeholders Create collaborative opportunities for students, staff, parents and community leaders to discuss and plan for campus needs</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration</p> <p>Title I: 2.52</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Involve students, parents, and staff in decision-making through committees, focus groups, and surveys.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase participation in PTO Increase participation in CPAC</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration</p> <p>Title I: 2.52</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. Root Cause: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.</p>

Goal 2: Priority 2: Create and sustain a culture and climate of professionalism, accountability, and communication (PAC) where stakeholders (student, parents, and staff) are valued, inspired, and engaged.


Performance Objective 2: By June 2026, 100% of LGE classrooms will increase student attendance and social emotional learning with implementation of PBIS behavior framework and attendance incentives as evidenced by frequency of practice.





High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Skyward Q
 Campus behavior tracker (Owl Tracker)
 Campus attendance trackers

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Incorporate a monthly incentive program that allows students to earn the opportunity to participate.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Manage student behavior on a campus-wide level Incorporate all staff members in participating to support student behaviors</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, staff, administration</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Incorporate a daily/weekly incentive program for classrooms to support teachers and students with managing behaviors.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All staff consistently and fairly implementing a system for earning points to be able to participate in the daily/weekly incentive. All staff have a tracking system for how points are earned.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff, administration</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Implement monthly awards, shout-outs, or highlight success stories in newsletters or assemblies.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff would highlight desired student behaviors on the Owl Tracker (campus behavior tracking system) Staff would use shout-out boards for students that consistently meet campus expectations</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Staff, administration</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 4: Implement a monthly system to motivate and encourage student attendance efforts to be consistent with meeting the district goals.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Attendance committee would determine a monthly incentive that can be used in classrooms. Attendance committee will track attendance data and goals to maintain the district goal.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principal, attendance committee</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
	 No Progress			

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:







Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. Root Cause: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. Root Cause: Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.</p>

Goal 2: Priority 2: Create and sustain a culture and climate of professionalism, accountability, and communication (PAC) where stakeholders (student, parents, and staff) are valued, inspired, and engaged.

Performance Objective 3: By June 2026, LGE will strengthen its culture of professionalism, accountability, and communication as evidenced by increased parent participation in campus events and student involvement in leadership activities by 20%,

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Agendas and sign-in sheets

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Implement a system for monitoring PLT and planning meetings on a weekly basis.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Create a template for professionalism, accountability and communication of possible PLT focuses to prepare members of the PLT before the interaction. Create a template for professionalism, accountability and communication of the planning agendas and minutes after the planning meeting has been held.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, coaches, specialists, teachers</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
	 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Implement a system for monitoring ILT meetings on a weekly basis.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Create a template for professionalism, accountability and communication of ILT focuses before the meeting and afterwards with the minutes. Each meeting will include a time for coaches to report on actions taken in coaching teachers to improved Tier 1 instruction.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, APs</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June
	 No 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 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. **Root Cause:** Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.

Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. **Root Cause:** Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.

Goal 3: Priority 3: Exhibit financial responsibility through transparent budgeting processes and effective management of resources aligned to the district strategic plan.





Performance Objective 1: By May 2026, LGE will demonstrate fiscal responsibility by implementing budgeting practices and ensuring 100% campuses expenditures align with the district's strategic plan and campus priorities.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Budget allocation review meetings with executive assistant

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Weekly check in meetings with executive assistant to ensure the purchasing of materials is aligned to CIP. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increases accountability for campus spending and resource management. Effectively and carefully utilize funds to make purchases for instructional resources. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive assistant and principal</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Collaborate with teachers to ensure a clear understanding of how campus funds are allocated.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Provide clarity on how and why financial decisions are made and reduce misconceptions about where money goes and build trust in leadership. Provide guidance on how to intentionally allocate and inventory materials to ensure they are available for later use to avoid unnecessary and overspending due to loss.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Assistant and Principal</p> <p>Title I: 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 1</p>	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Dec	Feb	June

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 1: 83% of students are economically disadvantaged, which creates increased at-risk factors and students are more likely to enter school lacking basic skills in literacy and numeracy. Root Cause: Limited access to high-quality early childhood education, home literacy resources, and enrichment opportunities results in many students entering school without foundational literacy and numeracy skills. Economic barriers reduce family capacity to provide structured academic support, contributing to early learning gaps that persist into the elementary grades.</p>
<p>Problem Statement 2: 16% of students receive special education services, with the majority served in resource or self-contained settings, and staff require ongoing support to implement inclusive and differentiated instructional practices. Root Cause: Limited training in co-teaching models, inclusive practices, and specially designed instruction has resulted in inconsistent implementation of strategies that support students with disabilities in accessing grade-level content. Collaboration time between general and special education teachers is limited, reducing opportunities for planning differentiated and inclusive instruction.</p>

Addendums

LOCATION	LOC_DESCR	DEPT_DESCR	POSN_DESCR	HEADCOUNT	LAST_NAME_SRCH	FIRST_NAME_SRCH	FTE	PROGRAM_CODE	DEPTID_CD	EMPL_STA	REPORTS_TO_DESCR
139 LULA BELLE GOODMAN	LULA BELLE (LULA BELLE (TEACHER MATH INTRVN ELEM T1	0.5	WASHINGTON	BERNICE	1 30	139	A	PRINCIPAL ELEM	
139 LULA BELLE GOODMAN	LULA BELLE (LULA BELLE (TEACHER LIT INTRVN	1	OTEKA	JOSEPHINE	1 30	139	A	PRINCIPAL ELEM	