

Midland Independent School District
Yarbrough Elementary
2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan



Mission Statement

Yarbrough will prepare students for their future as graduates prepared and ready for college or career.

Vision

At Yarbrough Elementary, as a team, we will empower all students through intentional practices to ensure growth and success in a safe environment.

Value Statement

At Yarbrough, All students will graduate college, career or military ready. All means All.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Demographics	4
School Population	4
Student Programs	4
Student Indicators	5
Special Education Services	6
Staff Information	6
Student Learning	8
Priority Problem Statements	12
Goals	14
Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law. .	14
Goal 2: Board Goal B: The District and all Campuses maintaining a B or above in Domain I of the Texas A-F Accountability System.	44
Goal 3: Board Goal C: 100% of students graduating college-, career-, or military ready, as defined by the Texas A-F Accountability System, with a focus on SAT or ACT college-ready scores, ASVAB, and earning industry-based certifications.	47
Goal 4: Board Goal D: All students will be taught each day by a high-quality teacher who is rigorously coached and regularly evaluated specifically on meeting the Board's adopted Student Outcome Goals in BQ(LOCAL), and delivering instruction aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).	50
Campus Funding Summary	53
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements	54

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Student Demographics	Count	Percent
Gender		
Female	351	50.80%
Male	340	49.20%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic-Latino	375	54.27%
Race		
American Indian - Alaskan Native	2	0.29%
Asian	41	5.93%
Black - African American	67	9.70%
Native Hawaiian - Pacific Islander	0	0.00%
White	184	26.63%
Two-or-More	22	3.18%

School Population	Count	Percent
Student Total	691	100%
Early Education Grade	2	0.29%
Pre-Kindergarten Grade	28	4.05%
Kindergarten Grade	83	12.01%
1st Grade	93	13.46%
2nd Grade	87	12.59%
3rd Grade	100	14.47%
4th Grade	88	12.74%
5th Grade	120	17.37%
6th Grade	90	13.02%

Student Programs	Count	Percent
Dyslexia	47	6.80%
Full-Time Hybrid/Virtual Program	0	0.00%
Gifted and Talented	4	0.58%
MS Advanced Math Participation	31	4.49%

Student Programs	Count	Percent
Regional Day School Program for the Deaf	0	0.00%
Section 504	10	1.45%
Special Education (SPED)	155	22.43%
Emergent Bilingual		
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	111	16.06%
Bilingual	0	0.00%
English as a Second Language (ESL)	69	9.99%
Alternative Methods for Bilingual Education	0	0.00%
Alternative Methods for ESL	38	5.50%
Title I Part A		
Schoolwide Program	691	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 Indicators	Count	Percent
At-Risk	337	48.77%
Foster Care	0	0.00%
IEP Continuer	0	0.00%
Immigrant	38	5.50%
Intervention Indicator	53	7.67%
Migratory	0	0.00%
Military Connected	32	4.63%
Transfer In Students	1	0.1447%
Unschooling Asylee/Refugee	0	0%
Economic Disadvantage		
Economic Disadvantage Total	312	45.15%
Free Meals	262	37.92%
Reduced-Price Meals	50	7.24%
Other Economic Disadvantage	0	0.00%
Homeless and Unaccompanied Youth		
Homeless Status Total	4	0.58%
Shelter	0	0.00%
Doubled Up	4	0.58%
Unsheltered	0	0.00%
Hotel/Motel	0	0.00%
Not Unaccompanied Youth	3	0.43%
Is Unaccompanied Youth	1	0.14%

Special Education Services		Count	Percent
Primary Disabilities			
No Disability		0	0.00%
Orthopedic impairment		1	0.65%
Other health impairment		19	12.26%
Auditory impairment		0	0.00%
Visual impairment		3	1.94%
Deaf-Blind		0	0.00%
Intellectual disability		13	8.39%
Emotional disturbance		7	4.52%
Learning disability		46	29.68%
Speech impairment		37	23.87%
Autism		28	18.06%
Developmental delay		0	0.00%
Traumatic brain injury		0	0.00%
Noncategorical early childhood		1	0.65%
Instructional Settings			
Speech Therapy		37	23.87%
Homebound		0	0.00%
Hospital Class		0	0.00%
Mainstream		29	18.71%
Resource Room		62	40.00%
VAC		0	0.00%
Off Home Campus		0	0.00%
State School		0	0.00%
Residential Care		0	0.00%
Self Contained		27	17.42%
Full-Time Early Childhood		0	0.00%
Nonpublic Day School		0	0.00%
Staff Information		Count	Percent
Administrative Support		18	30.51%
Teacher		31	52.54%
Educational Aide		10	16.95%
Auxiliary		0	0.00%

Yarbrough Elementary had 56 disciplinary incidents during the 2025–2026 school year. When disaggregated by ethnicity, Hispanic students accounted for 31 disciplinary infractions, African American students accounted for 6 infractions, White students accounted for 8 infractions, and students identifying as Two or More Races accounted for 2 infractions. Special education students accounted for 11 total infractions, while general education students accounted for 45 infractions. Emergent bilingual students accounted for 9 disciplinary infractions, and students identified as economically disadvantaged accounted for 36 infractions.

In terms of disciplinary consequences, in-school suspension (ISS) represented 5.58% of total consequences, DAEP placements accounted for 0.78%, and out-of-school suspension

(OSS) accounted for 0.13%. When broken down by ethnicity, Hispanic students received ISS at a rate of 4.96%, DAEP placements at 0.88%, and a total discipline rate of 5.49%. African American students received ISS at a rate of 10.87%, DAEP placements at 2.17%, and a total discipline rate of 13.04%. Students identifying as Two or More Races received ISS at a rate of 9.52%, which also reflects their total discipline rate of 9.52%. White students received ISS at a rate of 7.09%, with a total discipline rate of 7.69%.

Yarbrough Elementary's teacher years of experience for the 2025–2026 school year are as follows:

Beginning teachers (0–1 years) represent 4.17% of staff.

1–5 years of experience represent 25% of staff.

6–10 years of experience represent 25% of staff.

11–20 years of experience represent 29.17% of staff.

Over 20 years of experience represent 16.67% of staff

Yarbrough's yearly attendance for 2025-2026 was 94.21%. Our highest attendance rate occurred during the first six weeks with a rate of 96.3% and the second six weeks close behind at 95.1%; our lowest attendance rate was 92.9%, which occurred during the sixth six weeks.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: 2025-2026 Yarbrough PTA has slightly increased in membership yet continues to decline with parent volunteers; same few parents are volunteering for all events and stretched thin.

Root Cause: Membership reflects intent and support, while volunteer decline reflects capacity and structural barriers to participation rather than reduced parent engagement or interest. Volunteer roles may not be clearly defined or may feel overly time-intensive or inconsistent, leading to uncertainty about expectations and reducing follow-through. Communication trends from campus engagement feedback also su

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Yarbrough 2025-2026 Attendance rate of 94.21% was below the campus goal of 96%.

Root Cause: Yarbrough did not have an effective attendance incentive program and did not have clear systems for truancy tracking and parent notification/conferences. Systems for monitoring attendance need revision and implemented with fidelity along with better implementation of the Project Truancy program.

Problem Statement 3: Through School Quality K12 Insight Survey, concern was expressed that bullying was not addressed with students.

Root Cause: Yarbrough needs to reinforce and inform stakeholders with clear anti-bullying policies and proper systems and procedures of reporting as well as providing awareness and training for staff.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Students at Yarbrough Elementary take NWEA MAP assessment two times a year, at Fall and Spring, which is how growth data is measured. Our growth results indicate significant growth across multiple grade levels and content.

Our annual growth results (students who met or exceeded their growth goal) are as follows:

Mathematics:

Grade Level	% of students who met or exceeded growth goal
Kinder	78%
1st	46%
2nd	49%
K-2 Total Mathematics	58%
3rd	55%
4th	54%
5th	65%
6th	51%
3-6 Total Mathematics	56%

Reading

Grade Level	% of students who met or exceeded growth goal
Kinder	59%
1st	39%
2nd	53%
K-2 Total Reading	50%
3rd	54%
4th	49%
5th	50%
6th	49%
3-6 Total Reading	51%

Science

Grade Level	% of students who met or exceeded growth goal
3rd	53%
4th	44%
5th	77%
6th	52%
3-6 Total Science	57%

Yarbrough students are also given the iReady diagnostic three times a year at Fall, Winter, and Spring. Achievement data is collected on content specific domains in Reading, Math.

Yarbrough iReady achievement data is as follows with emphasis on lowest performing domain:

Reading

Grade Level	% of students early on grade level	% of students mid or above grade level	TOTAL % of students on or above grade level	Lowest Performing Domain
Kinder	34%	41%	75%	High Frequency Words
1st	11%	32%	43%	High Frequency Words
2nd	13%	28%	41%	Comprehension: Informational text
3rd	23%	39%	62%	Comprehension: Informational text
4th	12%	21%	33%	Comprehension: Informational text
5th	19%	17%	36%	Comprehension: Informational text
6th	7%	14%	21%	Comprehension: Informational text
Total Reading ON or ABOVE Grade Level			44%	

Mathematics

Grade Level	% of students early on grade level	% of students mid or above grade level	TOTAL % of students on or above grade level	Lowest Performing Domain
Kinder	10%	51%	61%	Measurement & Data
1st	17%	26%	43%	Measurement & Data
2nd	19%	18%	37%	Measurement & Data
3rd	14%	30%	44%	Measurement & Data

Grade Level	% of students early on grade level	% of students mid or above grade level	TOTAL % of students on or above grade level	Lowest Performing Domain
4th	19%	30%	49%	Measurement & Data
5th	25%	32%	57%	Measurement & Data
6th	20%	20%	40%	Geometry
Total Math ON or ABOVE Grade Level			47%	

Student Learning Strengths

At Yarbrough Elementary, NWEA MAP and i-Ready data are used to guide instructional decisions, identify student strengths and needs, and develop targeted interventions and enrichment during PLCs. End-of-year data reflects success across grade levels in both math and language instruction, with Number and Operations identified as a consistent strength across most grades, along with foundational areas such as Algebraic Thinking in 1st grade and Geometry in Kindergarten. i-Ready results show strong performance in high-frequency words across most grades, with Kindergarten and 1st grade showing different strengths, including literature comprehension in Kindergarten. Overall, Yarbrough has demonstrated growth across multiple assessment measures from 2024–2025 to 2025–2026, with continued focus on data-driven instruction supporting ongoing improvement.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1: A little more than 50% of students are meeting or exceeding growth goals in some grade levels, but growth is not consistent nor at the level needed.

Root Cause: Lack of effective Tier 1 instruction and systems to support effective intervention/enrichment for students; with weak alignment between Tier 1 instruction and MAP-aligned skills progression. A need for refinement of data-driven instruction and plans to change student outcomes. Instructional practices that are working have not been fully identified, shared and replicated across all grades.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers.

Root Cause: Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing.

Root Cause: Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 4: Despite measurable growth in MAP and iReady, there is a persistent gap between growth (MAP) and proficiency (iReady), indicating students are improving but not yet reaching grade-level mastery at scale.

Root Cause: Misalignment between growth-focused instruction and grade-level rigor expectations, along with variability in Tier 1 instructional fidelity and limited vertical alignment of standards and instructional progression (K-6), limits overall instructional coherence. Inconsistent use of data to make actionable instructional adjustments and intervention systems that do not fully close foundational gaps.

Problem Statement 5: On the STAAR Extended Constructive Responses with a possible score of 10, Yarbrough students scored considerably lower than district and state average when gaining all 10 points.

Root Cause: Yarbrough needs retraining on the creation of Extended Constructed Responses and to utilize the rubric so students can analyze their own writings.

Problem Statement 6: Yarbrough serves 169 students in special education services; making Yarbrough the top elementary school in the district serving special education students.

Root Cause: Yarbrough need to improve and implement a stronger Response to Intervention system with an established committee in place.

Problem Statement 7 (Prioritized): TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels.

Root Cause: Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8 (Prioritized): Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels.

Root Cause: Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

Problem Statement 9: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment.

Root Cause: Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Yarbrough 2025-2026 Attendance rate of 94.21% was below the campus goal of 96%.

Root Cause 1: Yarbrough did not have an effective attendance incentive program and did not have clear systems for truancy tracking and parent notification/conferences. Systems for monitoring attendance need revision and implemented with fidelity along with better implementation of the Project Truancy program.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers.

Root Cause 2: Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing.

Root Cause 3: Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels.

Root Cause 4: Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels.

Root Cause 5: Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met.

Root Cause 6: Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment.

Root Cause 7: Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Goals

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of Pre-Kindergarten students who perform at or above grade level in ELAR will be maintained at or higher than 85% by June 2027. The percentage of Pre-Kindergarten students performing at grade level in Math will maintain at or higher than 93% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: CLI Engage--CIRCLE Progress Monitoring System Assessment; Six-week assessment monitoring

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: PreKindergarten teachers will consistently use an engaging framework for student instruction in a variety of content-rich, complex, and meaningful texts/tasks, that contain high-leverage practices. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Pre-K students will demonstrate positive student growth from the BOY, to MOY, to EOY CLI (Circle Monitoring System). Following the Pre-K instruction alignment will ensure students make progress on Pre-K skills of reading and writing. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Pre-K Teachers, Administration TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: PreK teachers will use action planning based on data, both individually and through PLCs, to analyze student work, identify trends in student misconceptions, determine any root cause(s) as to why students may not have learned the concept, and create purposeful action plans to implement in order to determine instructional adjustments. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Following the Pre-K instruction alignment will ensure students make progress on Pre-K skills of reading, writing and math, in an effort to increase student performance. Staff and student accountability will increase, while monitoring will be assessed on a regular basis. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PreK Director and leads, Administration, PreK Teachers TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Pre-K teachers will attend district PreKindergarten PL and implement the effective instructional strategies, adjustment to instructional delivery and intervention. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: PreKindergarten teachers will stay up to date with current effective strategies and collaborate effective ways to implement and deliver these tools in everyday instruction and intervention. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Pre Kindergarten District Leads and Teachers	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 2: The percentage of Kindergarten students who perform at or above grade level in ELAR will increase from 78% to 85% by 2027 (mClass).

The percentage of Kindergarten students performing at grade in ELAR will be maintained at or higher than 93% by June 2027. (iREADY)

The percentage of Kindergarten students performing at grade level in Math will increase from 73% to 80% by June 2027. (iREADY)

Evaluation Data Sources: mClass assessment, iReady, six-week progress monitoring and CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Kindergarten teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, and administrators will engage in structured PLC cycles to analyze mClass, formative assessment, CFU, and student-work data; identify misconceptions and students not on track; and develop measurable reteach, intervention, enrichment, and student goal-setting actions. Progress will be reviewed at least every six weeks. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using the mClass Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Kindergarten teachers will internalize and implement HQIM aligned to the district Instructional Framework and grade-level standards, ensuring daily instruction includes rigorous learner outcomes, purposeful CFUs, student discourse, differentiation, and appropriate supports for students with special needs and Emergent Bilingual students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Kindergarten lesson plans will be more intentional and standards-driven, resulting in clearer learning targets and developmentally appropriate critical thinking opportunities. Students will engage in high-quality, grade-level literacy instruction that supports early reading mastery. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MCLs, MTRTs Teachers, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Teachers will receive targeted coaching and professional learning based on walkthrough, student achievement, and Teacher Development Cycle trends. Support will focus on strengthening Tier 1 instruction and ensuring students requiring additional support receive documented Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions that are monitored for effectiveness. Kindergarten teachers will be supported in planning structured engagement opportunities, including purposeful talk and hands-on academic activities tailored to early learners. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Young learners will strengthen oral language development, vocabulary acquisition, and comprehension. Purposeful talk routines will build a strong foundation for future writing and reading fluency. Students will build math vocabulary, improve verbal reasoning, and deepen their understanding through purposeful conversation and manipulatives. This will lead to stronger comprehension of key math concepts and better transfer of learning across instructional settings. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, and Administration. Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 3: The percentage of 1st grade students who perform at or above grade level will increase from 58% to 68% by 2027 (mClass).
 The percentage of 1st grade students performing at grade in ELAR will increase from 49% to 60% by June 2027. (iREADY)
 The percentage of 1st grade students performing at grade level in Math will increase from 49% to 60% by June 2027. (iREADY)

Evaluation Data Sources: mClass assessment, iReady, six-week progress monitoring and CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: The ILT will support first-grade teachers in unpacking foundational ELAR standards, drafting clear daily lesson objectives and lesson frames, and planning scaffolded comprehension and phonics-based critical thinking questions aligned. First-grade PLCs will routinely analyze mClass, iReady, formative assessment, CFU, and student-work data to identify skill gaps and misconceptions and determine specific reteach, intervention, enrichment, and student goal-setting actions. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: First-grade teachers will create more intentional and standards-aligned lessons, resulting in clearer learning targets, improved reading comprehension, and consistent exposure to grade-appropriate phonics, literacy tasks, and math foundational skills. This will drive stronger instructional delivery and increased proficiency. Using Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title I	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: First-grade teachers will consistently internalize and implement HQIM aligned to grade-level standards and the district Instructional Framework, emphasizing foundational literacy, comprehension, student discourse, written response, CFUs, and differentiated supports for all learners. These high-quality instructional materials' lessons will be internalized and taught with fidelity in order to meet the needs of all students including students with special needs and EB (Emergent Bilingual) students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will strengthen their vocabulary, listening, and speaking skills through structured academic discussions, which will support overall reading development and improve performance in oral reading fluency and comprehension on assessments. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated. The results will be well developed through planning containing aligned objectives, activities, CFUs and exit tickets. Each student will set goals and work to reach their goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MCLs, MTRTs Teachers, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Teachers will receive targeted coaching and professional learning based on student achievement and observation trends. 3: The ILT will support 1st-grade reading and math instruction by guiding teachers in unpacking TEKS-aligned essential reading/math standards, drafting developmentally appropriate lesson frames, and planning scaffolded critical thinking questions to support conceptual understanding. Students below grade level or not demonstrating expected growth will receive documented, skill-specific Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions with regular progress monitoring. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By utilizing the Teach Like a Champion strategies, effective and high quality instruction will take place in all classrooms to improve student outcomes, including our high focus identified students. Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. 1st-grade teachers will create more focused, intentional reading and math lessons aligned to essential standards. Students will benefit from clear learning targets, increased exposure to problem-solving and reasoning tasks, and consistent opportunities to think critically--laying a strong foundation Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, and Administration. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: ILT will help 1st-grade teachers incorporate engagement strategies that promote purposeful student talk and structured academic discussion during reading and math instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will improve their reading and math communication skills through academic conversations, partner talks, and shared problem-solving. This will support deeper mathematical reasoning, vocabulary development, and transfer of learning across tasks and settings. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT, administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 4: The percentage of 2nd grade students who perform at or above grade level will increase from 44% to 60% by 2027. (mClass)
 The percentage of 2nd grade students performing at grade in ELAR will increase from 50% to 70% by June 2027. (iREADY)
 The percentage of 2nd students performing at grade level in Math will increase from 46% to 65% by June 2027. (iREADY)

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: mClass and iReady assessment, six-week progress monitoring and CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: PLCs, Data Analysis & Responsive Instruction Second-grade PLCs will analyze mClass, formative assessment, CFU, and student-work data to identify individual and grade-level trends, determine root causes for learning gaps, and implement measurable reteach, intervention, enrichment, and student goal-setting plans. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using the mClass and iReady Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration 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 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1, - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Rigorous Tier 1 Literacy Instruction Second-grade teachers will internalize and implement HQIM aligned to grade-level standards, emphasizing foundational literacy, comprehension of increasingly complex text, student discourse, written response, CFUs, and differentiated support. These high-quality instructional materials' lessons will be internalized and taught with fidelity in order to meet the needs of all students including students with special needs and EB (Emergent Bilingual) students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Second-grade teachers will design lessons that are tightly aligned to ELAR and Math standards and the Science of Reading framework. This will result in clearer instructional focus, stronger foundational skill development, and improved student mastery. The results will be well developed through planning containing aligned objectives, activities, CFUs and exit tickets. Each student will receive high quality instruction and demonstrate growth on the EOY mClass test from the BOY. Each student will set goals and work to reach their goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MCLs, MTRTs Teachers, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Targeted Intervention & Teacher Development Teachers will receive targeted coaching and professional learning based on identified instructional needs. Students below grade level or not making expected progress will receive skill-specific Tier 2/Tier 3 intervention with documented progress monitoring and timely instructional adjustments. The ILT will support second-grade reading and math instruction by guiding teachers in unpacking priority TEKS, drafting clear and concise lesson frames, and planning scaffolded critical thinking questions appropriate for young learners. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Second-grade teachers will design more focused lessons aligned to the most critical math and reading standards. As a result, students will benefit from clearer learning targets, more age-appropriate critical thinking opportunities, and consistent exposure to rigorous Tier 1 instruction, leading to improved math and reading outcomes. By utilizing the Teach Like a Champion strategies, effective and high quality instruction will take place in all classrooms to improve student outcomes, including our high focus identified students. Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, TLAC Team, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title I	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. Root Cause: Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps. Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. Root Cause: Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 5: The percentage of 3rd-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading Language Arts STAAR assessment will increase from 49% to 75% by 2027.

The percentage of 3rd-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 43% to 70% by 2027.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Assessment, six-week monitoring, CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Rigorous, STAAR-Aligned Tier 1 Instruction Third-grade teachers will internalize and implement HQIM at the depth and rigor of the TEKS and STAAR, with emphasis on complex text, comprehension, text evidence, student discourse, constructed response, purposeful CFUs, and independent application. Teachers will use exemplars and STAAR rubrics to establish clear expectations for mastery. Instructional support offered by guiding teachers in unpacking essential TEKS, drafting effective lesson frames, and planning scaffolded critical thinking questions aligned to grade-level expectations. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Teachers will develop more intentional lesson plans that align with key standards. Students will benefit from clear learning goals, richer opportunities for critical thinking, and consistent exposure to rigorous instruction--driving gains in reading comprehension writing proficiency, and math foundations and skills. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, Mentors, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title I	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: PLC/Data Cycles & Daily Mastery Monitoring Third-grade PLCs will use STAAR, MAP, formative assessment, exit-ticket, student-work, and daily mastery tracker data to identify TEKS below mastery, misconceptions, and students not on track for Meets/Masters or expected growth. Teams will implement measurable reteach, intervention, enrichment, and reassessment plans and review progress in recurring data cycles. PLC time has been built into the weekly schedule for grade level planning as well as new implementation of vertical team planning for the purpose of analyzing and using data to inform effective strategies in the delivery of instruction and intervention to meet student needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Results and impact include well internalized lesson, practice role play with implementation of lesson and data analysis all in an effort to meet student needs. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Targeted Intervention, Special Populations & Teacher Development Students not demonstrating mastery--including students with IEPs and other identified high-focus students--will receive targeted, documented intervention and appropriate accommodations. Teachers will receive targeted coaching and professional learning in Tier 1 instruction, TLAC strategies, constructed response, Monitor and Adjust, and other areas identified through student data and observation trends. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Special Education students will show growth moving them closer to grade level achievement. Close instructional gaps and accelerate student growth in targeted TEKS. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, and Administration. Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title I	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Students will participate in a daily TNT (Tigers in Training) time focused on targeted intervention and enrichment, using ongoing data to address specific gaps and extend learning for advanced students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive individualized support that meets their needs, helping close foundational gaps and reinforce instructional strategies. Over time, this will lead to higher performance on formative assessments and increased proficiency on STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT and administration 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 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 6: The percentage of 4th-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading Language Arts STAAR assessment will increase from 60% to 80% by 2027.

The percentage of 4th-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 60% to 75% by 2027.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Assessment, two-three week monitoring, CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Rigorous STAAR-Aligned Tier 1 Instruction Fourth-grade teachers will internalize and implement HQIM aligned to the rigor of the TEKS and STAAR, emphasizing complex text, comprehension, text evidence, student discourse, constructed response, independent application, and consistent use of exemplars and STAAR rubrics to establish clear expectations for mastery. Instructional support offered by guiding teachers in unpacking essential TEKS, drafting effective lesson frames, and planning scaffolded critical thinking questions aligned to grade-level expectations. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Teachers will develop more intentional lesson plans that align with key standards. Students will benefit from clear learning goals, richer opportunities for critical thinking, and consistent exposure to rigorous instruction--driving gains in reading comprehension writing proficiency, and math foundations and skills. Results will be well developed through planning containing aligned objectives, activities, CFUs and exit tickets. Each student will receive high quality instruction and demonstrate growth. Each student will set goals and work to reach their goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, Mentors, Administration Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: PLC/Data Cycles & Progress Monitoring Fourth-grade PLCs will use STAAR, MAP, formative assessment, exit-ticket, student-work, and daily mastery tracker data to identify TEKS below mastery, misconceptions, and students not on track for Meets/Masters or expected growth. Teams will implement measurable reteach, intervention, enrichment, and reassessment plans and review progress in recurring data cycles. PLC time has been built into the weekly schedule for grade level planning as well as new implementation of vertical team planning for the purpose of analyzing and using data to inform effective strategies in the delivery of instruction and intervention to meet student needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Results and impact include well internalized lesson, practice role play with implementation of lesson and data analysis all in an effort to meet student needs. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Targeted Intervention & Teacher Development Students requiring additional support, including students with IEPs and identified high-focus students, will receive targeted intervention and accommodations. Teachers will receive ongoing coaching and professional learning based on student data and observation trends, including constructed response, student discourse, Monitor and Adjust, and rigorous Tier 1 instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By utilizing the Teach Like a Champion strategies, effective and high quality instruction will take place in all classrooms to improve student outcomes, including our high focus identified students. Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Special Education students will show growth moving them closer to grade level achievement. Close instructional gaps and accelerate student growth in targeted TEKS. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, TLAC Team, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Students will participate in a daily TNT (Tigers in Training) time focused on targeted intervention and enrichment, using ongoing data to address specific gaps and extend learning for advanced students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive individualized support that meets their needs, helping close foundational gaps and reinforce instructional strategies. Over time, this will lead to higher performance on formative assessments and increased proficiency on STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT and administration 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: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:**Student Learning**

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 7: The percentage of 5th-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading Language Arts STAAR assessment will increase from 48% to 75% by 2027.

The percentage of 5th-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 50% to 75% by 2027.

The percentage of 5th -grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Science STAAR assessment will increase from 63% to 85% by 2027.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Assessment, six-week monitoring, CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Rigorous Tier 1 RLA Instruction Fifth-grade teachers will internalize and implement HQIM at STAAR-level rigor, emphasizing comprehension of complex text, inferencing, text evidence, structured student discourse, constructed response, independent application, and consistent use of exemplars and STAAR rubrics. Teachers consistently engage students with High Quality Instructional Materials with key ideas, essential questions, and content relevant and responsive to students' background (when applicable) in each content area. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Close instructional gaps and accelerate student growth in targeted TEKS. The results will be well developed through planning containing aligned objectives, activities, CFUs and exit tickets. Each student will receive high quality instruction and demonstrate growth on the EOY mClass test from the BOY. Each student will set goals and work to reach their goals. Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Teachers will develop more intentional lesson plans that align with key standards. Students will benefit from clear learning goals, richer opportunities for critical thinking, and consistent exposure to rigorous instruction--driving gains in reading comprehension writing proficiency, and math foundations and skills. Results will be well developed through planning containing aligned objectives, activities, CFUs and exit tickets. Each student will receive high quality instruction and demonstrate growth. Each student will set goals and work to reach their goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, Mentors, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: PLC/Data Cycles & Progress Monitoring Fifth-grade PLCs will use STAAR, formative assessment, exit-ticket, student-work, and daily mastery tracker data to identify TEKS below mastery, misconceptions, and students not on track for Meets/Masters or expected growth. Teams will implement measurable reteach, intervention, enrichment, and reassessment plans and review progress in recurring data cycles. PLC time has been built into the weekly schedule for grade level planning as well as new implementation of vertical team planning for the purpose of analyzing and using data to inform effective strategies in the delivery of instruction and intervention to meet student needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Results and impact include well internalized lesson, practice role play with implementation of lesson and data analysis all in an effort to meet student needs. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Targeted Intervention & Teacher Development Students requiring additional support, including students with IEPs and high-focus students, will receive targeted interventions and accommodations with documented progress monitoring. Teachers will receive coaching and professional learning in constructed response, rigorous questioning, student discourse, Monitor and Adjust, and other identified instructional needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By utilizing the Teach Like a Champion strategies, effective and high quality instruction will take place in all classrooms to improves student outcomes, including our high focus identified students. Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Special Education students will show growth moving them closer to grade level achievement. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, TLAC Team, Administration Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Students will participate in a daily TNT (Tigers in Training) time focused on targeted intervention and enrichment,using ongoing data to address specific gaps and extend learning for advanced students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive individualized support that meets their needs, helping close foundational gaps and reinforce instructional strategies. Over time, this will lead to higher performance on formative assessments and increased proficiency on STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT and administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - 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: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 7 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 1: Board Goal A: All students, and Dyslexia students, performing at or above grade level on STAAR assessments from third grade through graduation or on equivalent end-of-year assessment in grades pre-kindergarten through second grade in accordance BQ(LOCAL). Student data shall be disaggregated as required by state or federal law.

Performance Objective 8: The percentage of 6th-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Reading Language Arts STAAR assessment will increase from 58% to 75% by 2027.

The percentage of 6th-grade students who score Meets Grade Level Performance or above on the Math STAAR assessment will increase from 49% to 78% by 2027.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Assessment,two to three week monitoring, CFUs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Rigorous Tier 1 RLA Instruction Sixth-grade teachers will internalize and implement HQIM aligned to the rigor of the TEKS and STAAR, emphasizing complex text, comprehension, text evidence, student discourse, constructed response, independent application, and consistent use of exemplars and STAAR rubrics to establish clear expectations for mastery. Instructional support offered by guiding teachers in unpacking essential TEKS, drafting effective lesson frames, and planning scaffolded critical thinking questions aligned to grade-level expectations. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Teachers will develop more intentional lesson plans that align with key standards. Students will benefit from clear learning goals, richer opportunities for critical thinking, and consistent exposure to rigorous instruction--driving gains in reading comprehension writing proficiency, and math foundations and skills.Results will be well developed through planning containing aligned objectives, activities, CFUs and exit tickets. Each student will receive high quality instruction and demonstrate growth. Each student will set goals and work to reach their goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, Mentors, Administration 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: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: PLC/Data Cycles & Progress Monitoring Sixth-grade PLCs will use STAAR, formative assessment, exit-ticket, student-work, and daily mastery tracker data to identify TEKS below mastery, misconceptions, and students not on track for Meets/Masters or expected growth. Teams will implement measurable reteach, intervention, enrichment, and reassessment plans and review progress in recurring data cycles. PLC time has been built into the weekly schedule for grade level planning as well as new implementation of vertical team planning for the purpose of analyzing and using data to inform effective strategies in the delivery of instruction and intervention to meet student needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using Data Protocols for the improvement of lesson planning will lead to high percentages of students to meet or exceed their score. Results and impact include well internalized lesson, practice role play with implementation of lesson and data analysis all in an effort to meet student needs. Data results will be used to monitor student progress and make adjustments to the lesson plans for instruction and intervention as indicated Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLS, MTRTs, and Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Targeted Intervention & Teacher Development Students requiring additional support, including students with IEPs and high-focus students, will receive targeted intervention and accommodations with documented progress monitoring. Teachers will receive coaching and professional learning focused on constructed response, comprehension, student discourse, Monitor and Adjust, and rigorous Tier 1 instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By utilizing the Teach Like a Champion strategies, effective and high quality instruction will take place in all classrooms to improves student outcomes, including our high focus identified students. Through the Teacher Development Cycle, all Tier Instructional practices will improve which will greatly improve and impact Tier 1 student outcomes. Special Education students will show growth moving them closer to grade level achievement. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, MCLs, MTRTs, TLAC Team, Administration Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Students will participate in a daily TNT (Tigers in Training) time focused on targeted intervention and enrichment,using ongoing data to address specific gaps and extend learning for advanced students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive individualized support that meets their needs, helping close foundational gaps and reinforce instructional strategies. Over time, this will lead to higher performance on formative assessments and increased proficiency on STAAR. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT and administration 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: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 8 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 2: Board Goal B: The District and all Campuses maintaining a B or above in Domain I of the Texas A-F Accountability System.

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of campuses who score a B or higher in Domain 1 will increase from 83% to 88% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Accountability Report

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Yarbrough Elementary will strengthen campus systems through "One Team--Limitless Potential" by implementing consistent practices for safety, student well-being, violence prevention, and discipline to create a positive campus climate and strong instructional culture. Success will be measured through campus climate surveys, stakeholder feedback, discipline data, attendance trends, student engagement data, and achieving at least 85% favorable ratings from staff, students, and families regarding campus culture, safety, and leadership effectiveness. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A safe, supportive, and well-managed campus will enhance student and staff well-being, strengthen instructional focus, and increase community confidence in school leadership and culture. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT, Administrators, and staff Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: All Yarbrough students, under the guidance of their teachers, will set Reading and Math goals which will be monitored, celebrated, and adjusted after each formative and cumulative assessment, and attend intervention when indicated. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students setting their on goals will motivate them toward setting and mastering objectives in order to reach and surpass their BOY Goal Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Gen Ed Teachers, Resource teachers, OC Team, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Using Title I funds, the campus will invest in supplemental instructional resources to support high-quality teaching and accelerate student growth in reading, math, and science. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will be better equipped to deliver effective instruction, and students will have increased access to tools that support engagement, intervention, and enrichment--resulting in measurable gains across core content areas. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7 Funding Sources: - 211 Title 1	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Goal 3: Board Goal C: 100% of students graduating college-, career-, or military ready, as defined by the Texas A-F Accountability System, with a focus on SAT or ACT college-ready scores, ASVAB, and earning industry-based certifications.

Performance Objective 1: Increase family attendance in school activities and decision-making, empowering all parents to play an active role in holding students accountable and supporting their educational process.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Activity attendance sheets, survey results

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Purposeful Academic Family Engagement Yarborough will provide recurring academic family engagement opportunities--including curriculum nights, grade-level expectation meetings, parent training, conferences, student-led goal-setting conferences, Title I meetings, and academic family events--that equip families with specific strategies and resources to support learning at home. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parents will gain a better understanding of the expectations for student learning and be able to support their children. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Administrators, Counselor TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Parent Leadership, PTA & Volunteer Engagement Yarborough will partner with PTA and campus stakeholders to increase parent leadership, PTA participation, and meaningful volunteer opportunities. Participation will be monitored throughout the year to identify barriers and improve family involvement. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A PTA board will be established and membership will be increased. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration, MCCPTA ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Student & Family Connection Through Recognition and Campus Events The campus will strengthen school-family connections through student performances, UIL/Robotics events, academic celebrations, cultural events, and attendance/achievement recognition. Participation data and parent feedback will be used to evaluate engagement and improve future events. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Family activities will inform the parents about their students' learning environment and strategies to help their students be more successful and enjoy school. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, counselor, administrators ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Students will be celebrated at each six weeks awards ceremony, fall semester, and whole year for having perfect attendance. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By celebrating perfect attendance, the students will continue to try to obtain recognition and inspire others resulting in an improved attendance rate of 96%. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Administration, Attendance Clerk ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Goal 3: Board Goal C: 100% of students graduating college-, career-, or military ready, as defined by the Texas A-F Accountability System, with a focus on SAT or ACT college-ready scores, ASVAB, and earning industry-based certifications.

Performance Objective 2: The campus will host events where students will have the opportunity to learn about a wide range of post-graduation paths, including college, career/technical education, and military service.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Students will be implementing "I LEAD", a student led program for student character development. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate more positive behavior resulting in a safer learning environment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, teachers, administration. ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Every Friday students and staff are encouraged to wear a shirt that represents a college, career, or military branch. This could include local universities, trade schools, or family alma maters. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Consistent exposure to college and career imagery builds a future-focused mindset. Students will begin to associate school with long-term goals, and diverse representation helps all students see themselves as future graduates and professionals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Goal 4: Board Goal D: All students will be taught each day by a high-quality teacher who is rigorously coached and regularly evaluated specifically on meeting the Board's adopted Student Outcome Goals in BQ(LOCAL), and delivering instruction aligned with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

Performance Objective 1: Through Growing and Developing Staff we will build retention and recruitment practices to promote professional growth that yields and rewards high-impact staff, improving student outcomes. The percentage of students who are taught by a high-quality teacher who rigorously coached and evaluate on the Board's adopted Student Outcomes will increase from 88% to 95% by the end of June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: TAPR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will survey teachers to identify professional development needs and provide targeted PD in classroom management, student engagement, higher-order thinking, and effective lesson framing. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver more aligned and rigorous instruction that promotes active engagement and critical thinking. Staff will report increased satisfaction with PD, identifying it as relevant and impactful on the campus Leadership Effectiveness Survey. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Yarbrough teachers will receive district and campus training to reinforce implementation of High-Quality Instructional Materials and resources through district developed frameworks. The ILT will guide teachers in identifying and unpacking essential standards, drafting effective lesson frames, and planning engaging, student-centered learning experiences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Clear alignment to standards, intentional lesson framing, and increased student engagement will lead to more focused instruction, higher levels of student thinking, and improved mastery of grade-level content. Teachers will have a greater understanding of how and when to teach their materials like Amplify, StemScopes and Savvas Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, 100% of PLC teams will either achieve or maintain a "3-Refinement" or "4-Internalized" rating on the PLC implementation rubric, or demonstrate at least one level of growth in other rubric elements if not already at a 3 or 4. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Result/Impact: Improved PLC performance will enhance collaborative planning and data-driven instruction, equipping teachers to deliver more aligned, engaging, and rigorous lessons that support increased student achievement. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ILT, Administration Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 3, 7, 8 - School Processes & Programs 6, 7	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Reading achievement is not increasing at the intended rate to create strong readers. **Root Cause:** Weak foundational literacy skills that are not fully remediated in earlier grades are compounded by insufficient and inconsistently implemented intervention blocks and limited intervention intensity for below-grade-level students. In addition, inadequate vertical alignment of reading skills across grade levels further contributes to ongoing achievement gaps.

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement is not as strong as reading and gaps are increasing. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent mastery of prerequisite skills along with weak problem-solving instruction across grade levels, limits student achievement. These challenges are further compounded by limited use of manipulatives and concrete-representational learning pathways, insufficient differentiation during core instruction, and misalignment between instructional pacing and student readiness levels.

Problem Statement 7: TELPAS growth is heading in the right direction, but not at the desired rate and is uneven across grade levels. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent use of intentional language development strategies, academic discourse opportunities, and data-driven TELPAS goal monitoring across grade levels has limited the acceleration of Emergent Bilingual students' language growth.

Problem Statement 8: Students are showing growth, but the campus must increase Meets and Masters performance across all grade levels. **Root Cause:** Some instruction still depends too heavily on teacher explanation instead of students explaining, proving, writing, and applying independently.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Teaching rigor and the expectations needed to ensure student mastery at the appropriate level of rigor were not met. **Root Cause:** Teachers were not meeting expectation with lesson internalization, creating exemplars, modeling and practicing. Teachers often carry too much of the lesson and lead discussions through explanation, prompting and correction

Problem Statement 7: Monitor and Adjust is inconsistent across campus and is not always used to change instruction in the moment. **Root Cause:** Teachers often monitor for completion or accuracy, but need more practice using student work to provide group feedback, reteach, or extend learning.

Campus Funding Summary

211 Title 1					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	2	2			\$0.00
1	2	3			\$0.00
1	3	1			\$0.00
1	3	2			\$0.00
1	3	3			\$0.00
1	4	1			\$0.00
1	4	1			\$0.00
1	4	2			\$0.00
1	4	3			\$0.00
1	5	1			\$0.00
1	5	2			\$0.00
1	5	3			\$0.00
1	6	2			\$0.00
1	6	3			\$0.00
1	7	1			\$0.00
1	7	2			\$0.00
1	7	3			\$0.00
1	8	2			\$0.00
2	1	1			\$0.00
2	1	3			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$97,205.00
+/- Difference					\$97,205.00
Grand Total Budgeted					\$97,205.00
Grand Total Spent					\$0.00
+/- Difference					\$97,205.00

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

The following policies, procedures, and requirements are addressed in the District Improvement Plan. District addressed Policies, Procedures, and Requirements will print with the Improvement Plan:

Title	Person Responsible	Review Date	Addressed By	Addressed On
Bullying Prevention	Student Services- Geta Mitchell	3/19/2026	Erin Bueno	7/17/2025
Child Abuse and Neglect			Erin Bueno	7/17/2025
Coordinated Health Program	Seybert		Erin Bueno	7/17/2025