Keller Independent School District

North Riverside Elementary School

Accountability Rating: A

Distinction Designation:
Top 25 Percent: Comparative Academic Growth, Top 25 Percent: Comparative Closing the Gaps

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
September 02, 2026 at 04:45 PM

Mission Statement

At North Riverside, we work together to **ENSURE** that every student and every staff member experience **SUCCESS**.

Vision

North Riverside will become an **ELITE** School in Keller ISD.

Value Statement

E.L.I.T.E.

Excellence, Leadership, Integrity, Teamwork, and Effort.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Needs Assessment Overview 5

Demographics 7

Student Learning 10

School Processes & Programs 15

Perceptions 20

Priority Problem Statements 24

Data Documentation for CNA 27

Improvement Planning Data 28

Accountability Data 28

Student Data: Assessments 28

Student Data: Student Groups 29

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 29

Employee Data 29

Parent/Community Data 30

Support Systems and Other Data 30

Goals 31

Goal 1 : Increase Student Achievement 32

Goal 2 : Overall Excellence in Student, Parent, and Community Relations 48

Goal 3 : Employee Excellence and Organizational Improvement 63

Funding Summary 75

211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg 76

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 77

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Needs Assessment Overview

Summary

As North Riverside closes the 2025–2026 school year and enters the development cycle for the 2026–2027 Comprehensive Needs Assessment, this overview reflects a campus that has moved from stabilization to intentional systems-building. Our work continues to be grounded in the school's mission—working together to ensure every student and every staff member experiences success—and in the ELITE vision and values that guide how we lead, teach, and serve our community. Behind every goal and problem statement in this CNA is a commitment to tell an honest story about where we are now, to honor the progress the campus has made, and to identify the next set of priorities that will move student outcomes forward with urgency and coherence.

This CNA process was designed to ensure that campus decisions are not made in isolation, but instead are shaped by multiple perspectives and evidence sources that reflect the real experiences of our stakeholders. In alignment with Plan4Learning expectations for comprehensive planning, North Riverside used a multi-measures approach that includes improvement planning structures, student and stakeholder feedback, and systems-level evidence. Throughout this cycle, the campus engaged staff, families, and students through structured opportunities for input, including surveys and feedback loops. The campus plan explicitly recognizes that stakeholders have been included through surveys, CNA committees, shared decision-making structures, and parent engagement events, while also acknowledging that strengthening consistent two-way communication remains an ongoing focus. This deliberate approach has ensured that the CNA is not simply a document, but a reflection of collective insight into what is working, what is uneven, and what must be strengthened next.

The journey from year one to the close of year two as principal has been defined by rebuilding stability, restoring predictability, and strengthening the systems that protect instruction and student well-being. In my first year, the campus confronted the realities of leadership transition, staffing instability, and the need to reestablish foundational expectations and trust. That year required re-centering the campus on culture, direction, and consistent adult actions. In year two of the current administration, the focus sharpened on building and tightening systems so that progress is not dependent on individual effort alone, but instead embedded in routines and structures that can be sustained across time. The 2025–2026 planning document reflects this shift by emphasizing clearer leadership coordination, stronger scheduling and campus routines, and intentional support systems aligned to student needs.

One of the clearest indicators of this progress has been the campus's improvement in learning conditions through strengthened behavior structures. The campus documented substantial reductions in PEIMS and non-PEIMS discipline incidents when compared to the prior year, attributing improvement to more systematic implementation of ClassDojo, clearer expectations, and increased consistency in reinforcing behavior and consequences. In addition to improving campus climate, this work matters because it protects instructional time and reduces disruptions that disproportionately affect students who already face academic gaps. Parallel to this improvement, the campus also documented gains in attendance trends, including increased annual attendance rates and decreased average daily absences compared to the previous year, supported by incentives, targeted conferences, and consistent family messaging. Together, these outcomes represent meaningful progress in two foundational levers—behavior and attendance—that directly influence learning time, engagement, and student readiness to succeed.

At the same time, the campus is intentionally using this CNA cycle to ensure that our focus expands beyond foundational stability into a deeper instructional and systems improvement phase. The 2025–2026 plan highlights the structures that have been established or strengthened—such as WIN time for targeted academic support, more deliberate progress monitoring, and increased alignment of instructional practices to campus priorities. It also makes clear that North Riverside is a campus serving significant student need, including a large proportion of students identified as at risk and a high volume of students receiving special education services, which requires strong Tier 1 instruction and reliable tiered support systems across all grade levels. As we enter the 26–27 CNA cycle, we are using these realities to sharpen not only what we believe needs to improve, but also why certain systems—such as coaching cycles, PLC effectiveness, and MTSS consistency—must become more coherent and more predictable for all teachers and students. Analysis of multiple data sources indicates that North Riverside's primary challenges stem from four interconnected system gaps:

1. Inconsistent Tier 1 instructional rigor and alignment,
2. Lack of a coherent adult learning system to improve instruction,
3. Fragmented campus systems that reduce clarity and consistency, and
4. Underdeveloped structures for student ownership and peer culture.

These system-level challenges collectively result in uneven student learning experiences and limit the campus's ability to ensure grade-level outcomes for all students. In addition, stakeholder input during 2025–2026 identified a need to strengthen clarity and alignment of recognition systems, as overlapping tools contributed to inconsistent staff execution and uneven student motivation. This CNA documents the need as it existed during the current year, including the role of Class Dojo as part of the campus experience and feedback. Looking ahead to 2026–2027, the campus is transitioning to a single, unified motivation and recognition platform (LiveSchool) to reduce system overlap and increase consistency; the effectiveness of this transition will be monitored through implementation evidence, student/staff perception data, and discipline and engagement indicators collected throughout the year.

Ultimately, this Needs Assessment Overview represents both a reflection and a commitment: a reflection of the measurable progress the campus has achieved through clearer systems, strengthened culture, and improved learning conditions; and a commitment to use stakeholder voice and system evidence to define the next stage of improvement with precision. The campus has moved from a period of recovery and stabilization into a phase where we are building the instructional and organizational engine needed to accelerate achievement for all learners. This CNA exists to document that story honestly, celebrating momentum, naming persistent gaps, and aligning our next priorities to the evidence and experiences of the North Riverside community.

Demographics

Summary

North Riverside Elementary is a traditional neighborhood campus serving a diverse community of families and learners. This Demographics narrative is built from multiple stakeholder inputs and campus evidence sources to describe who the campus serves and how those demographics shape planning. During the 2025–2026 year, North Riverside intentionally included stakeholders as contributing partners in the needs assessment process by collecting and analyzing staff, student, and parent survey data (Staff Survey n=38; Student Survey n=256; Parent Survey n=42), and by incorporating findings from the ESF Diagnostic site review conducted on December 9, 2025 to ensure the CNA reflects both lived experience and systems evidence.

A defining demographic consideration at North Riverside is the range of student learning and language needs that require specialized programming and coherent service delivery systems. The ESF Diagnostic highlights that the campus is supporting special population needs through established practices such as attention to EB and IEP goals in meetings and ongoing discussions of student needs, alongside the use of high-quality instructional materials designed to meet the needs of all students, including special populations. At the same time, the Diagnostic identifies demographic-linked capacity challenges that impact implementation—most notably that bilingual staff report planning burdens due to double-translation of resources and that leadership time is frequently pulled into behavior and operations, constraining instructional leadership presence. These findings matter for Demographics because they clarify that student needs are not only reflected in program placement, but also in the campus's ability to consistently deliver appropriate services and supports at scale.

Parent and student perception data reinforce strengths tied to demographic access and belonging: parents report that school communication is accessible in a language they understand (100% "Always"), and large majorities report feeling welcomed (90.5% "Always") and perceiving their child as safe at school (90.5% "Always"), which are important indicators that diverse families can engage as partners without language acting as a barrier. Students similarly report strong belonging indicators, with 78.9% responding that they feel like they belong at school "Most Days/Every Day," suggesting that key climate conditions supporting participation and engagement are present for many learners.

Staff demographics and capacity are also central to the campus story because student needs require adult skills to align to programming demands. Staff survey results indicate that the faculty includes a strong base of experienced educators: 68.4% of respondents report 6–15 years of experience (26.3% in the 6–10 range and 31.6% in the 11–15 range), alongside a smaller but important group of early-career teachers (approximately 18% in years 0–5), which reinforces the need for stable systems plus structured support for newer staff. Class size context further informs demographic planning and instructional supports, with staff reporting an average class size of 20.2 students (median 20; range 10–30), which directly affects differentiation capacity and intervention logistics within classrooms. Staff perceptions also suggest strong organizational conditions that support serving a diverse community, including high agreement that administrative roles are clear (94.7% favorable), families and stakeholders feel welcomed (97.4% favorable), arrival/dismissal procedures are safe and efficient (92.1% favorable), and the community actively supports the school (86.8% favorable).

Collectively, these demographic factors indicate that North Riverside must operate with a high level of instructional coherence and staff capacity alignment in order to meet student needs effectively. The combination of diverse language needs, a significant proportion of students requiring specialized services, and varying levels of student readiness requires systems that reduce variability in planning, ensure consistent access to grade-level instruction, and provide targeted support without overextending teacher capacity. Without this level of coherence, the complexity of student needs risks overwhelming systems and leading to inconsistent implementation across classrooms.

Consistent with the goal that demographic narratives include monitoring of trend indicators, the campus acknowledges that certain year-end demographic measures (such as finalized attendance patterns, mobility, and retention rates) will be confirmed after the current school year closes; however, current-year stakeholder inputs and the ESF Diagnostic evidence already provide a clear demographic storyline focused on access, staffing alignment, and system capacity to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Strengths

1. **Strong language accessibility for families**
    - Strength: Families report they receive information in a language they understand (100% "Always").

- Source(s): Parent Survey

2. **Clear administrative team roles and responsibilities (supports staffing structure)**
    - Strength: Staff report the campus has clear roles and responsibilities for the administrative team (~94.7% favorable).
    - Source(s): Staff Survey
3. **Collaborative recruitment, hiring, onboarding and retention practices are established**
    - Strength: The campus uses collaborative hiring, team involvement in selection/onboarding, and deliberate recognition/retention efforts (e.g., appreciation practices, autonomy/trust).
    - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic
4. **Teacher leadership development structures exist (pipeline support)**
    - Strength: The campus conducts a Teacher Leadership Retreat and identifies teacher leaders using observation and growth/impact indicators.
    - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The campus does not consistently ensure a pipeline of highly qualified educators because recruitment and hiring practices are not yet fully proactive or performance-based.	The root cause is that while collaborative hiring practices exist, systems for proactive recruitment, performance-based selection (such as demonstration lessons), and long-term talent pipeline development are not fully established. [ESF Diagnostic]

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

North Riverside Elementary uses multiple sources of current-year evidence to describe student learning, including the ESF Diagnostic, staff, student, and parent perception data, MAP achievement and growth results, MAP-to-STAAR projections, and finalized Spring 2026 STAAR achievement outcomes in Reading Language Arts and Mathematics. Taken together, these data provide a comprehensive picture of how student learning is being experienced, monitored, and demonstrated across the campus. This summary focuses on student achievement and current learning conditions; student growth and subgroup analyses are addressed in separate reviews within the broader CNA process.

Current-year systems evidence indicates that North Riverside has established reliable structures for monitoring learning and responding to student performance. The ESF Diagnostic notes that the campus administers multiple assessments, including MAP, district summatives, and interim measures, and that PLCs regularly analyze assessment results. This reflects an established routine for using data to guide instruction and monitor progress throughout the year. At the same time, the Diagnostic identifies a constraint related to the depth and consistency of instructional support: instructional coaching capacity is described as limited and often delivered through brief interactions rather than sustained coaching cycles with modeling, practice, and follow-up. Leaders also report that time is frequently redirected toward behavior and operational demands. Together, these conditions describe a campus with consistent assessment and data routines, but with variability in the degree to which those routines are translated into consistently strong Tier 1 instructional delivery across classrooms.

Stakeholder perception data provides additional context regarding how student learning is currently experienced. Staff responses indicate a significant concern regarding student readiness for grade-level rigor and expectations, with only 34.2% favorable agreement and 55.3% unfavorable responses on the item related to whether students are arriving at their current grade prepared for the level of rigor required. This suggests that current student performance must be interpreted in light of unfinished learning, prerequisite skill gaps, and variation in readiness across classrooms and grade levels. At the same time, staff report strong confidence in the value of feedback for improving instruction, with 97.4% favorable agreement that instructional feedback improves instructional quality. This indicates that adults experience the campus as one where professional feedback is present and viewed as useful for improving practice.

Student survey data further clarify the day-to-day learning experience. Students report very high exposure to structured academic discourse routines such as “agree or disagree” in the morning instructional block, with 90.6% reporting these routines occur Most Days/Every Day. Students reported lower consistency for other academic engagement routines, including turn-and-talk in afternoon classes, with 59.6% reporting those structures occur Most Days/Every Day. These results suggest that student-centered engagement practices are present and visible to students, although the consistency of these instructional routines varies across settings, blocks, or classrooms.

Family-facing indicators provide another important part of the student learning picture. Parents report that the school provides materials to support learning at home (76.2% Always) and that school communication helps them understand how to support their child academically at home (73.8% Always), indicating that many families experience the campus as supportive of learning beyond the school day. At the same time, 57.1% of parents report that they are aware of the curriculum their child is learning Always, and 71.4% report that they understand how student progress is monitored and shared Always. These data indicate that, while strong family support structures are present, the degree of family visibility into curriculum and academic progress is not uniform across all families.

The ESF Diagnostic also provides additional context related to student access and learning conditions for special populations. The Diagnostic notes that IEP and EB goals are discussed in meetings and that instructional materials are intended to meet the needs of all learners, including special populations. It also identifies barriers such as burdensome planning demands for bilingual staff and the need for stronger support for lesson internalization. These conditions are relevant to the student learning narrative because they describe the context in which students access instruction and academic supports across the campus.

MAP Mathematics data across the 2024–2025 and 2025–2026 school years reflect strong overall growth, with several grade levels demonstrating substantial increases in both achievement and growth percentiles. At the grade level, Kindergarten demonstrated strong foundational development, increasing achievement from the 40th percentile to the 66th percentile and maintaining high growth at the 75th percentile, indicating strong early numeracy development. Grade 2 showed consistent improvement in both achievement and growth, reaching the 63rd percentile in end-of-year achievement and the 72nd percentile

in growth, reflecting stable instructional impact over time. The most significant gains occurred in Grades 4 and 5, where achievement reached the 78th percentile in both grades and was paired with exceptional growth percentiles of 85 and 84, respectively. Grade 5, in particular, showed dramatic improvement, rising from the 37th percentile at the beginning of the prior year to the 78th percentile at the end of the current year, while growth increased from the 49th percentile to the 84th percentile. Grade 4 followed a similar pattern, recovering from lower initial performance and demonstrating substantial acceleration across the year. Grade 3 showed improvement in achievement from the 45th percentile to the 61st percentile and growth from the 44th percentile to the 55th percentile, indicating positive movement while remaining closer to the national average than upper grades. Grade 1 exhibited more limited gains, with achievement increasing modestly to the 56th percentile and growth remaining relatively flat in the mid-50th percentile range.

Spring 2026 MAP-to-STAAR projections in Mathematics further illustrate these patterns. Across Grades 3–5, 52% of students were projected to perform at the Meets or Masters levels, with 29% projected at the Masters level. Grade 5 demonstrated the highest projected readiness, with 68% of students projected at Meets or Masters and 37% at Masters, aligning to its strong achievement and growth profile. Grade 4 also showed strong projected performance, with 56% projected at Meets or Masters and a resulting impact score of 52. In contrast, Grade 3 showed lower projected readiness, with only 30% projected at Meets or Masters and a higher concentration of students projected at the Approaches level. The overall campus mathematics impact score of 50 reflected strong readiness in the upper grades and a broader distribution of performance levels in grade 3.

MAP Reading data across the 2024–2025 and 2025–2026 school years reflect gradual improvement at the campus level, with continued variability in performance across grade levels when considering achievement, growth, and projected STAAR outcomes. Overall reading achievement at North Riverside increased slightly across all testing windows, moving from the 44th percentile in Fall 2024 to the 49th percentile in Fall 2025, from the 51st percentile to the 53rd percentile at midyear, and from the 50th percentile to the 53rd percentile by Spring. These results indicate a steady upward trend, with overall performance remaining near the national average. Reading growth data show a similar pattern, with campus growth increasing from the 57th percentile in Fall-to-Spring 2025 to the 60th percentile in Fall-to-Spring 2026, reflecting slightly above-average progress overall.

At the grade level, reading results show a mixed but generally positive pattern. Kindergarten ended the year at the 53rd percentile in achievement and demonstrated above-average growth at the 61st percentile, reflecting strengthening early literacy development. Grade 2 exhibited consistent upward movement across both years, improving from the 34th percentile at the beginning of the prior year to the 57th percentile by Spring 2026, supported by above-average growth. Grade 5 demonstrated one of the strongest upward trends, increasing to the 61st percentile in achievement and the 67th percentile in growth, indicating improved upper-elementary reading performance and readiness. Grade 4 maintained relatively stable reading performance, ending at the 59th percentile in achievement with consistent growth at the 65th percentile. Grade 3 showed moderate improvement, increasing achievement from the 44th percentile to the 54th percentile and growth from the 50th percentile to the 55th percentile. In contrast, Grade 1 showed declining achievement and persistently below-average growth, with achievement decreasing from the 43rd percentile in Spring 2025 to the 35th percentile in Spring 2026, while growth increased only slightly from the 43rd percentile to the 45th percentile. These data show that reading outcomes improved overall, but the rate and strength of progress varied across grade levels.

Spring 2026 STAAR achievement data provide the current summative picture of performance in tested grades and subjects. According to the Texas Education Agency 2026 STAAR Performance Report, North Riverside Elementary recorded 472 STAAR assessments across Reading Language Arts, Mathematics, and Grade 5 Science. Across all tested subjects, 75% of assessments met the Approaches Grade Level standard or above, 47% met the Meets Grade Level standard or above, and 17% met the Masters Grade Level standard, resulting in an overall STAAR Performance component score of 46. These results represent the campus's summative achievement profile within the state accountability framework.

In Reading Language Arts, North Riverside recorded 205 assessments. Overall, 78% of Reading assessments met the Approaches Grade Level standard or above, 52% met the Meets Grade Level standard or above, and 20% met the Masters Grade Level standard. These results exceeded the campus's prior-year Reading performance, which was reported at 40% Meets Grade Level or Above in 2025. Reading outcomes were particularly notable in upper elementary grades, consistent with the positive achievement and growth trends observed in MAP Reading data.

In Mathematics, North Riverside recorded 200 assessments. Overall, 77% of Mathematics assessments met the Approaches Grade Level standard or above, 49% met the Meets Grade Level standard or above, and 16% met the Masters Grade Level standard. Mathematics performance also improved substantially from the prior year, when 35% of assessments met the Meets Grade Level standard or above. These results align with the strong achievement and growth trends observed in MAP Mathematics, particularly in grades 4 and 5.

Grade 5 Science results provide additional evidence of student achievement. Of 67 Science assessments administered, 57% met the Approaches Grade Level standard or above, 25% met the Meets Grade Level standard or above, and 12% met the Masters Grade Level standard. While Science results were lower than Reading and Mathematics overall, they contribute to the campus's overall STAAR Performance profile and provide an additional indicator of student mastery in tested content areas.

The relationship between MAP projections and actual STAAR outcomes shows meaningful alignment at the campus level. In Reading, MAP projected 49% of students in grades 3 through 5 would perform at the Meets or Masters levels, while actual STAAR Reading Language Arts results showed 52% performing at Meets Grade Level or Above. MAP projected 22% at Masters, while actual STAAR Reading results showed 20% at Masters. These results indicate that MAP projections closely approximated end-of-year Reading performance and correctly identified the relative strength of the campus's reading achievement profile.

In Mathematics, MAP projected 52% of students in grades 3 through 5 at Meets or Masters, while actual STAAR Mathematics performance resulted in 49% performing at Meets Grade Level or Above. MAP projected 29% of students at Masters, while actual Mathematics results showed 16% at Masters. As observed in prior analyses, MAP projections accurately reflected overall readiness patterns and relative grade-level performance but tended to overestimate the percentage of students ultimately achieving the Masters performance standard.

Additional accountability indicators provide important context for student achievement. North Riverside earned an Academic Growth score of 86, with an Annual Growth score of 81 and an Accelerated Learning score of 60, demonstrating strong evidence that students made academic progress over time. The campus also earned a Closing the Gaps score of 76, reflecting positive performance across multiple student groups and accountability indicators.

State accountability reports further indicate that North Riverside's student outcomes compare favorably to similar campuses. The campus earned a Relative Performance scaled score of 79 based on a STAAR Performance component score of 46 and an economically disadvantaged rate of 69.1%. In addition, North Riverside earned Distinction Designations for Top 25 Percent Comparative Academic Growth and Top 25 Percent Comparative Closing the Gaps, reflecting performance that ranked among the highest campuses within its comparison group on both measures.

Taken together, the student learning data describe a campus with established systems for monitoring achievement, positive conditions for adult learning and family support, and measurable academic progress across multiple grade levels, especially in upper elementary. The data continue to show that student performance is not uniform across grades or subjects. MAP achievement and growth trends indicate strong mathematics momentum in grades 4 and 5 and more gradual reading improvement across the campus, while 2026 STAAR results demonstrate that 52% of Reading assessments and 49% of Mathematics assessments achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, with overall STAAR Performance results producing a component score of 46. The comparison between MAP projections and final STAAR outcomes shows close alignment in Reading and generally accurate directional alignment in Mathematics. Academic Growth, Closing the Gaps, Relative Performance, and Distinction Designation results further reinforce evidence of strong student progress and favorable performance relative to comparable campuses. Overall, the evidence presents a clear and coherent student learning profile for North Riverside that is grounded in current-year academic performance, instructional conditions, student growth, and state accountability outcomes.

Strengths

1. **Strong teacher–student relationship indicators (students feel heard and encouraged)**
    - Strength: Students report high positive ratings that teachers listen to student ideas and encourage effort (e.g., ~92% “Most/Every Day” for afternoon teacher “listens”; ~88–89% “Most/Every Day” for “encourages me to try my best”).
    - Source(s): Student Survey
2. **High expectations and perseverance culture among staff**
    - Strength: Staff strongly agree that teachers do not let students give up when work becomes challenging (~94.7% favorable), indicating a strong “press for effort” learning norm.
    - Source(s): Staff Survey
3. **Engagement/discourse routines are viewed as valuable and are reinforced through expectations**
    - Strength: Students report very high positive ratings for classroom discourse routines like agree/disagree (morning teacher: ~91% “Most/Every Day”; afternoon teacher: ~86%).
    - Source(s): Student Survey
4. **Data practices support instructional responses and small group planning**
    - Strength: The campus has strong data structures: assessments are administered (MAP, district summatives/ interims) and PLCs regularly analyze results to plan re-teach and small group instruction.
    - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic
5. **Families generally perceive appropriate academic challenge and home learning support**
    - Strength: Parents report their child is appropriately challenged academically (~74% “Always”) and that the school provides materials to support learning at home (~76% “Always”).
    - Source(s): Parent Survey
6. **Families report strong understanding of how student performance is reported**
    - Strength: Parents report understanding how performance will be communicated (report cards/test scores) (~95%

"Yes").
    - Source(s): Parent Survey
7. **Upper-grade academic performance is a demonstrated strength in tested subjects**
    - Strength: Spring 2026 STAAR results show the strongest achievement outcomes in the upper elementary grades, particularly in Grade 5 Reading Language Arts and Grades 4 and 5 Mathematics. Grade 5 Reading Language Arts recorded 85.29% at Approaches or Above, 64.71% at Meets or Above, and 27.94% at Masters. In Mathematics, Grade 4 recorded 52.63% at Meets or Above and 21.05% at Masters, while Grade 5 recorded 89.71% at Approaches or Above and 52.94% at Meets or Above.
    - Source(s): Spring 2026 STAAR Data
8. **Reading achievement in Grade 5 has noticeable performance**
    - Strength: Grade 5 students demonstrated strong Reading Language Arts achievement on STAAR, with the highest reading performance among tested grades. Grade 5 students achieved 64.71% at Meets or Above and 27.94% at Masters, indicating strong performance at higher achievement standards.
    - Source(s): Spring 2026 STAAR Data
9. **Mathematics performance in Grades 4 and 5 reflects strong achievement outcomes**
    - Strength: STAAR Mathematics results show strong performance in Grades 4 and 5. Grade 4 students achieved 73.68% at Approaches or Above, 52.63% at Meets or Above, and 21.05% at Masters, while Grade 5 students achieved 89.71% at Approaches or Above and 52.94% at Meets or Above.
    - Source(s): Spring 2026 STAAR Data
10. **Reading performance shows steady overall improvement on MAP**
    - Strength: MAP Reading data show gradual campus-wide improvement across the 2024–2025 and 2025–2026 school years. Overall reading achievement increased from the 44th percentile to the 49th percentile in fall, from the 51st percentile to the 53rd percentile at midyear, and from the 50th percentile to the 53rd percentile by spring. Reading growth also increased from the 57th percentile to the 60th percentile.
    - Source(s): MAP Reading Data

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers do not consistently apply instructional strategies that effectively support students in special populations, including Emergent Bilinguals and students with IEPs, resulting in inconsistent differentiation and inclusive practices across classrooms.	The root cause is that while time is allocated to discuss compliance-related requirements and student needs, there is no structured professional development plan focused on evidence-based instructional strategies specifically designed for supporting special populations in daily instruction. [ESF Diagnostic]
2	Students do not consistently demonstrate ownership of their academic progress because individual growth tracking and goal-setting systems are not visible or embedded in every classroom.	The root cause is the absence of a unified, campus-wide expectation and structure for individual student data tracking that promotes regular reflection, goal setting, and student-led monitoring of progress. [ESF Diagnostic]
3 ★	A significant gap exists in student readiness for grade-level rigor, as only about 34% of teachers report that students come prepared for current grade expectations, indicating many students lack prerequisite skills. [Priority]	Inconsistent Tier I readiness-building practices and the absence of a vertically aligned progress monitoring system result in students advancing without demonstrating mastery of prerequisite standards. [Staff Survey]
4 ★	Instruction is not consistently rigorous or student-centered, as evidenced by uneven implementation of engagement and discourse routines, resulting in inconsistent opportunities for students to engage in cognitively demanding, grade-level tasks. [Priority]	Professional learning, coaching, and monitoring systems are not consistently aligned around clear instructional expectations (e.g., discourse, cognitive demand, student ownership), leading to variability in classroom implementation. [Student Survey] [ESF Diagnostic]
5	Although many parents feel supported, survey results show that access to take-home learning materials is not consistent (only 76.2% "Always," with 16.7% "Sometimes" and 7.1% "Never"), and open feedback requests more guidance on how to help students at home (e.g., reading supports, portal understanding).	The root cause is that "home learning support" is not standardized across the campus (common resources by grade level, consistent at-home practice guidance, and family training), resulting in variable implementation and uneven support experiences for families. [Parent Survey]

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

North Riverside's Processes & Programs narrative is anchored in current-year (2025–2026) evidence, including the ESF Diagnostic completed during the fall semester and stakeholder survey input gathered in spring 2026, to describe where campus systems are strong, where implementation is inconsistent, and how these realities shape the next cycle of improvement planning.

During the 2025–2026 school year, North Riverside strengthened internal organization and operational coherence through clearer leadership structures and routine-based coordination. The ESF Diagnostic describes leadership responsibilities as organized through well-defined "piece of the pie" roles, supported by weekly leadership PLCs and a shared schoolwide calendar used to coordinate priorities and ensure alignment, which reduces ambiguity and stabilizes implementation across the campus. Staff perceptions reinforce that organizational clarity is experienced as a strength in practice, with very high agreement that the school runs smoothly due to campus leadership (97.4% favorable) and that staff feel supported in discipline matters (97.4% favorable), indicating that foundational operating systems—such as decision-making routines, leadership coordination, and day-to-day campus functioning—are generally strong.

The campus also continues to operate with visible schoolwide systems designed to protect learning conditions through shared expectations, routines, and communication practices. The ESF Diagnostic notes that behavioral systems are consistently implemented campus-wide, including Rule #1, posted ELITE expectations, and schoolwide use of ClassDojo, which contribute to a more predictable environment for students and staff. Student survey results support that these systems are experienced regularly at the classroom level: students report that teachers use ClassDojo consistently across instructional blocks (77.7%–79.2% "Most Days/Every Day"), that teachers remind students about school rules (80.9% "Most Days/Every Day"), and that teachers help students solve problems with other students (82.4% "Most Days/Every Day"), indicating that conflict resolution support and rule reinforcement are present as routine practices rather than isolated interventions. Parent feedback aligns with these operational strengths as well, showing high confidence in safety (90.5% "Always") and strong perceptions of consistent multi-channel communication (95.2% "Always") and administrative responsiveness to concerns (83.3% "Always"), which are key indicators that campus processes support family access and trust.

While North Riverside has developed strong operational systems that create a stable and supportive environment, these structures have not yet translated into consistently high-impact instructional practices across classrooms. Current-year evidence indicates that several core instructional improvement systems—especially those tied to professional practice, the coaching/feedback cycle, and collaborative planning—are not yet producing consistent impact at the level needed to accelerate student outcomes. While the ESF Diagnostic highlights that data routines are established and that PLCs regularly analyze assessment results, it also identifies a persistent implementation gap: coaching often occurs as brief, on-the-spot feedback rather than sustained coaching cycles with deliberate modeling and follow-up, and observation/feedback systems lack fully formalized tracking that ensures timely debriefs and monitors adult learning impact over time. Staff perceptions reflect a similar pattern of "strong support, uneven instructional engine." Teachers overwhelmingly agree that instructional feedback helps improve their teaching (97.4% favorable), suggesting openness to coaching and a strong foundation for adult learning, yet only 50.0% agree that PLCs have been an effective use of time, indicating that the structure of collaborative work is not consistently functioning as a high-impact improvement cycle across teams. Additionally, while most staff believe the systems in place (coaching, PLCs, PD, feedback) effectively support new or struggling teachers (76.3% favorable), a meaningful minority still do not, signaling the need for greater consistency, clarity, and monitoring in how support systems are delivered and experienced.

Processes & Programs at North Riverside also include family engagement systems that are functioning as strengths but still show important accessibility gaps that matter for equitable participation. Parent survey results indicate that families generally participate in Parent & Family Engagement opportunities (69.0% attended an event) and report a foundation of compliance-related communication through Title I structures; however, participation and understanding are not universal. Only 59.5% report attending the Title I annual meeting, and a significant proportion report uncertainty about whether key documents were explained (28.6% "Not Sure" for the School-Parent Compact and 26.2% "Not Sure" for the Parent & Family Engagement Policy), suggesting that while documents may be distributed, consistent understanding and access to the meaning of those systems needs strengthening through repeated touchpoints and clearer communication routines.

The 2025–2026 evidence and data portrays North Riverside as a campus with improving organizational clarity, strong operational supports, and visible schoolwide routines that promote safety, communication, and behavioral consistency, while also showing that the next stage of improvement depends on strengthening the instructional improvement infrastructure—especially the

consistency and depth of coaching cycles, PLC effectiveness, and adult-data tracking that ensures professional learning translates into measurable classroom practice.

Strengths

1. **Strong leadership planning systems (roles + leadership PLC + shared calendar)**
    - Strength: Campus leadership has clear “piece of the pie” responsibilities, meets weekly in leadership PLCs, and uses a shared calendar to coordinate planning and alignment.
    - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic
2. **Instructional time is intentionally protected and maximized**
    - Strength: Staff describe consistent scheduling routines that protect learning time (co-curricular use, scheduling/ blocks/flex supports, routine and transition systems).
    - Source(s): Staff Survey (open responses)
3. **Campus behavior systems are “built” with common language and structures**
    - Strength: ESF Diagnostic notes schoolwide systems (Rule #1, ELITE visuals, ClassDojo use) are implemented campuswide and contribute to a productive environment.
    - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic
4. **Staff can clearly name discipline-referral reduction procedures (process clarity)**
    - Strength: Staff responses frequently cite defined steps like Build-a-Skill/reflection, parent communication prior to referral, and admin support/intervention as established procedures.
    - Source(s): Staff Survey (open responses)
5. **Strong safety systems and routines (drills, roles, and security presence)**
    - Strength: Staff consistently reference safety drill routines, training/protocol clarity, and the security presence as key campus systems.
    - Source(s): Staff Survey (open responses)
    - Strength (additional evidence): Parents report high confidence in student safety (~90% “Always”).
    - Source(s): Parent Survey
6. **Communication systems are multi-channel and perceived as strong**
    - Strength: Parents report the school uses a variety of ways to communicate (~95% “Always”).
    - Source(s): Parent Survey
7. **Instructional feedback and improvement supports are perceived positively by staff**
    - Strength: Staff report that instructional feedback helps them improve instruction (~97% favorable) and strongly endorse instructional improvement practices (e.g., wait time, turn-and-talk, positive narration).
    - Source(s): Staff Survey
8. **Family engagement and Title I document distribution are relatively strong (access to required resources)**
    - Strength: Parents report receiving Title I documents (Policy and Compact) (~81% “Yes”) and satisfaction with academic and family engagement events (~88–90% “Yes”).
    - Source(s): Parent Survey
9. **Structured student progress visibility exists campuswide (common trackers)**
    - Strength: ESF Diagnostic reports whole-class progress trackers and visible milestone recognition systems outside classrooms that support progress awareness.
    - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Instructional coaching lacks depth and consistency, with most support occurring through brief, informal interactions rather than sustained coaching cycles that include modeling, practice, and follow-up, resulting in uneven instructional improvement across classrooms. [Priority]	Coaching is not protected within the campus schedule, and there is no formalized system to ensure consistent, high-quality coaching cycles with fidelity. [ESF Diagnostic]
2 ★	Observation and feedback practices do not consistently lead to instructional growth, as debriefs are not consistently timely, action steps are not systematically followed up, and teacher progress is not tracked over time. [Priority]	The absence of a campus-wide system for tracking observation timelines, instructional goals, and teacher growth results in fragmented feedback and limited accountability for follow-through. [ESF Diagnostic]
3	School-wide behavior and incentive systems, including ELITE, the House system, and ClassDojo, are not implemented with consistent clarity and fidelity, leading to confusion among staff and students regarding expectations and rewards.	The root cause is that multiple behavior systems were introduced without clear alignment, training, and written implementation guidelines, causing overlapping structures and inconsistent execution across classrooms. [ESF Diagnostic]
4	Although student data is regularly analyzed, adult (teacher) data related to instructional practices, coaching trends, and professional learning impact is not consistently monitored or used to inform leadership decisions.	The root cause is that systems for collecting, analyzing, and acting on adult data are still in the planning stage and have not yet been institutionalized as part of the campus continuous improvement process. [ESF Diagnostic]
5	Staff open-ended responses repeatedly identify a need to strengthen MTSS/intervention structures, including clearer Tier I/Tier II expectations, progress monitoring/documentation, and stronger Tier III supports beyond tutoring for students performing significantly below grade level.	The root cause is a lack of a consistently implemented, campus-wide MTSS operating system (clear procedures, roles, documentation expectations, and intervention capacity), resulting in variable classroom implementation and inconsistent supports for students who require targeted interventions. [Staff Survey]

6 ★

PLCs are not consistently experienced as high-value and do not function as effective instructional improvement cycles, limiting their impact on daily classroom instruction. [Priority]

Collaborative time is not consistently structured around internalization, rehearsal, feedback, and follow-up, resulting in a focus on logistics rather than improving instructional practice. [Staff Survey]

7

Staff open-ended responses frequently identify meeting frequency/time demands as a barrier, with requests to reduce weekly meetings and reallocate time to planning, collaboration, and classroom preparation--suggesting current structures may unintentionally reduce teacher capacity for high-quality instructional planning.

The root cause is insufficient protection of teacher planning time in the campus operating calendar, including an overreliance on synchronous meetings for communication instead of streamlined systems (weekly briefs, predictable calendars, and differentiated/role-based communication). [Staff Survey]

8 ★

Student motivation and recognition systems (House system, ClassDojo, and Golden Panther awards) are not implemented with consistent clarity or alignment, resulting in uneven student motivation and inconsistent staff execution. [Priority]

Multiple systems lack a unified, campus-wide implementation model, including clear criteria, consistent reinforcement practices, and strong visibility for students. [Staff Survey]

9

Staff open-ended responses repeatedly request improved advance notice, clearer event/initiative calendars, and reduced duplicated communication, indicating that current communication rhythms may not consistently support teacher planning and smooth implementation of campus initiatives.

The root cause is the lack of a single predictable, campus-wide communication operating system (annual/quarterly calendar, defined "what goes where," and aligned timelines for initiatives/events), resulting in avoidable uncertainty and last-minute pivots. [Staff Survey]

10

Parents show inconsistent awareness of available student services such as counseling, speech, and other supports (only 64.3% "Always," with 28.6% "Sometimes" and 7.1% "Never"), indicating families may not know what resources exist or how to access them when needs arise.

The root cause is the absence of a widely communicated, easy-to-navigate "student support services pathway" (what supports exist, referral steps, points of contact, and when to seek assistance), resulting in uneven understanding and access. [Parent Survey]

11

Title I participation and understanding are inconsistent: only 59.5% of parents attended the Title I annual meeting, and among respondents, only 57.1% report the School-Parent Compact was explained (with 28.6% "Not Sure"), indicating uneven communication and understanding of Title I structures and family rights/responsibilities.

The root cause is that Title I family communication relies heavily on a single event/timepoint rather than multiple, accessible touchpoints (flexible meeting options, multilingual/recorded sessions, and follow-up distribution with verification), resulting in participation barriers and incomplete understanding. [Parent Survey]

12 A strong majority of parents (81.0%) indicate they would use a Family Resource Center if available, suggesting a gap in centralized supports for families (academic resources, community supports, navigation help, and training).

The root cause is that family supports and resources are not packaged into a single, visible, consistently promoted hub (physical or virtual), limiting families' ability to self-serve and connect quickly to needed tools and services. [Parent Survey]

13 Student perception data indicates that peer culture needs strengthening, with only about 46% of students reporting that students are kind to each other Most Days/Every Day, while a notable portion report kindness occurs Not Much/Never--suggesting inconsistent respectful peer-to-peer interactions.

The root cause is that expectations for respectful peer interaction (particularly during unstructured settings and minor conflicts) are not consistently taught, practiced, and reinforced through shared routines, restorative responses, and consistent adult supervision/feedback loops. [Student Survey]

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

North Riverside is intentionally centering current-year (2025–2026) evidence—including the ESF Diagnostic completed during the 2025 fall semester and the spring 2026 staff, student, and parent surveys—to describe the climate and culture conditions that influence engagement, trust, belonging, and learning readiness.

Across stakeholders, the strongest perceptions signal is that North Riverside is experienced by adults as a stable and supportive school environment. Staff perceptions are exceptionally positive regarding campus functioning and leadership support; nearly all staff agree that the school runs smoothly (97.4% favorable) and that they feel supported in student discipline matters (97.4% favorable), and staff also overwhelmingly believe families and stakeholders feel welcomed into the school (97.4% favorable). Parent feedback aligns closely with this adult-facing picture of welcome, safety, and responsiveness: families report feeling welcomed at the campus (90.5% "Always"), believing their child is safe at school (90.5% "Always"), experiencing communication as consistently multi-channel (95.2% "Always"), and perceiving administrators as supportive when concerns arise (83.3% "Always"). The ESF Diagnostic reinforces this theme by describing a strong staff-support culture in which administration is perceived as supportive, responsive, and nonjudgmental, and by noting that campus practices and messaging demonstrate high expectations and shared ownership for student success. Collectively, these indicators suggest that the campus has established important trust conditions among adults—conditions that support engagement, staff confidence, and the stability needed to sustain continuous improvement.

Student perceptions, however, add a critical layer of nuance by revealing a gap between adult confidence in campus culture and the consistency of student-to-student experience. Students report a strong sense of belonging overall, with 78.9% indicating they feel like they belong at school "Most Days/Every Day," reflecting that many students experience the campus as a place where they fit and are connected. At the same time, students report that peer-to-peer kindness is far less consistent: only 46.1% indicate that students are kind to each other "Most Days/Every Day," and 25.0% report that this occurs "Not Much/Never," signaling that relational culture among peers is a meaningful area for growth. Students also report stronger consistency in rule-following than in peer kindness (61.3% "Most Days/Every Day" for most students following Rule #1), which suggests that behavioral expectations are visible and reinforced, but that the deeper relational habits that sustain a respectful peer culture may not yet be fully internalized or consistently supported across settings. This distinction matters for the CNA because it indicates that while compliance structures are present, the student experience is still uneven in the areas most connected to belonging, emotional safety, and positive peer interactions. This contrast suggests that while adults perceive systems and expectations as effective, students experience variability in how those expectations are lived out in peer interactions, indicating a gap between intended culture and actual student experience.

Parent perceptions further reinforce this need for greater consistency and transparency in the lived experience of behavior systems. While families express high overall confidence in safety and welcome, only 69.0% report that student behavior concerns are addressed fairly and consistently "Always" (with 31.0% selecting "Sometimes"), indicating that a significant portion of families experience variability in how behavior issues are handled or communicated. The ESF Diagnostic adds additional context by noting that while behavioral systems are consistently implemented campuswide (including posted expectations and ClassDojo use), the rollout of the House system created confusion among staff and students regarding how points are earned and how the system overlaps with ClassDojo, suggesting that inconsistency in implementation and system coherence may contribute to mixed perceptions among students and families. This lack of clarity may dilute the effectiveness of behavior systems by creating competing or unclear reinforcement structures for students and staff.

Overall, the current-year perceptions evidence presents North Riverside as a campus with strong adult trust, strong family welcome and communication structures, and visible schoolwide expectations, while also identifying a clear culture growth area: strengthening the consistency of the student-to-student experience so that kindness, peer respect, and confidence in fair responses become more predictable across classrooms and campus settings. This revised narrative reflects the intent of the Perceptions component by grounding conclusions in stakeholder data and diagnostic evidence from 2025–2026 while maintaining a clear line of sight to the conditions that influence learning and engagement heading into 2026–2027.

Strengths

1. **Staff feel supported in discipline matters and campus operations**

- Strength: Staff report feeling supported in student discipline matters (~97% favorable) and that the school runs smoothly (~97% favorable).
- Source(s): Staff Survey

2. **Parents feel welcomed and comfortable communicating with staff**
   - Strength: Parents feel welcomed (~90% “Always”), feel comfortable contacting teachers (~83% “Always”), and feel administrators support concerns (~83% “Always”).
   - Source(s): Parent Survey
3. **Students experience respectful treatment from teachers**
   - Strength: Students report high positive ratings that teachers speak respectfully and promote a supportive classroom environment (e.g., morning teacher “kind/respectful”: ~86% “Most/Every Day”).
   - Source(s): Student Survey
4. **House system appears to be motivating effort and supporting belonging for many students**
   - Strength: Students report the House system increases effort (try harder to earn points: ~82% “Most/Every Day”) and belonging (belong at school: ~79% “Most/Every Day”).
   - Source(s): Student Survey
   - Strength (staff alignment): Staff rate the creation of a Student Leadership team as highly positive (100% favorable), reinforcing a culture of belonging/identity building.
   - Source(s): Staff Survey
5. **Staff alignment to mission/vision/values is a major cultural strength**
   - Strength: Staff show very high alignment to campus mission/vision/values (multiple items ~92–97% favorable), suggesting shared identity and clarity of direction.
   - Source(s): Staff Survey
6. **ESF Diagnostic affirms a strong staff-support culture**
   - Strength: Diagnostic includes explicit strengths noting staff perceive leadership as supportive, responsive, and nonjudgmental, with appreciation practices and recognition systems contributing to retention and morale.
   - Source(s): ESF Diagnostic

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Student survey results show inconsistent classroom leadership/ownership structures, especially regarding classroom jobs: only ~44% report receiving classroom jobs Most Days/Every Day in the morning, and this drops to ~37% for afternoon classes, indicating uneven implementation of student responsibility routines across the day.	The root cause is the absence of a campus-wide expectation and consistent implementation support for student agency systems (jobs, leadership roles, classroom contributions) across all instructional blocks, leading to variability by teacher, schedule, or content area. [Student Survey]
2	Parent feedback indicates that families are not consistently aware of the curriculum their child is learning (only 57.1% "Always," with 38.1% "Sometimes" and 4.8% "Never"), which limits families' ability to reinforce learning and support academic growth at home.	The root cause is that "curriculum visibility" is not embedded as a consistent campus communication practice (e.g., predictable weekly learning targets, at-home reinforcement guidance, and clear co-curricular connections), leaving families dependent on homework alone or external sources to understand what is being taught. [Parent Survey]
3	Parents report uneven understanding of how student progress is monitored and shared (only 71.4% "Always," with 23.8% "Sometimes" and 4.8% "Never"), and open responses reflect confusion about grading/report cards and online access, creating gaps in family ability to respond early to academic concerns.	The root cause is that the campus lacks a consistent family-facing "assessment and reporting" communication system (clear timelines, where to find information, what it means, and who to contact), leading to inconsistent family access and understanding across grade levels. [Parent Survey]
4 ★	While many parents express satisfaction with events, participation data suggests access barriers: only 69.0% attended a family engagement event (with 23.8% "No"), and open feedback requests more parent involvement, better event timing for working parents, and a predictable calendar, indicating the current engagement model does not consistently reach all families.	The root cause is that family engagement opportunities are not consistently designed with accessibility in mind (time options, advanced notice, consistent calendar publication, and varied formats), which limits participation for families constrained by work schedules or communication gaps. [Parent Survey]

5 ★	Parent perceptions indicate the campus behavior system may not feel consistent for all families (only 69.0% "Always" that behavior concerns are addressed fairly/consistently, with 31.0% "Sometimes"), and open comments describe concerns about peer behaviors and negative student experiences, suggesting inconsistent confidence in behavior implementation and student culture.	The root cause is that consistent campus-wide behavior communication and implementation (clear expectations, consistent responses, proactive culture-building, and family-facing explanations of procedures) may not be fully aligned or visible to families, leading to variable perceptions and experiences. [Parent Survey]

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	A significant gap exists in student readiness for grade-level rigor, as only about 34% of teachers report that students come prepared for current grade expectations, indicating many students lack prerequisite skills. [Priority]	Inconsistent Tier I readiness-building practices and the absence of a vertically aligned progress monitoring system result in students advancing without demonstrating mastery of prerequisite standards. [Staff Survey]
2 ★	Instruction is not consistently rigorous or student-centered, as evidenced by uneven implementation of engagement and discourse routines, resulting in inconsistent opportunities for students to engage in cognitively demanding, grade-level tasks. [Priority]	Professional learning, coaching, and monitoring systems are not consistently aligned around clear instructional expectations (e.g., discourse, cognitive demand, student ownership), leading to variability in classroom implementation. [Student Survey] [ESF Diagnostic]
3 ★	Instructional coaching lacks depth and consistency, with most support occurring through brief, informal interactions rather than sustained coaching cycles that include modeling, practice, and follow-up, resulting in uneven instructional improvement across classrooms. [Priority]	Coaching is not protected within the campus schedule, and there is no formalized system to ensure consistent, high-quality coaching cycles with fidelity. [ESF Diagnostic]
4 ★	Observation and feedback practices do not consistently lead to instructional growth, as debriefs are not consistently timely, action steps are not systematically followed up, and teacher progress is not tracked over time. [Priority]	The absence of a campus-wide system for tracking observation timelines, instructional goals, and teacher growth results in fragmented feedback and limited accountability for follow-through. [ESF Diagnostic]
5 ★	PLCs are not consistently experienced as high-value and do not function as effective instructional improvement cycles, limiting their impact on daily classroom instruction. [Priority]	Collaborative time is not consistently structured around internalization, rehearsal, feedback, and follow-up, resulting in a focus on logistics rather than improving instructional practice. [Staff Survey]
6 ★	Student motivation and recognition systems (House system, ClassDojo, and Golden Panther awards) are not implemented with consistent clarity or alignment, resulting in uneven student motivation and inconsistent staff execution. [Priority]	Multiple systems lack a unified, campus-wide implementation model, including clear criteria, consistent reinforcement practices, and strong visibility for students. [Staff Survey]

7 ★

While many parents express satisfaction with events, participation data suggests access barriers: only 69.0% attended a family engagement event (with 23.8% "No"), and open feedback requests more parent involvement, better event timing for working parents, and a predictable calendar, indicating the current engagement model does not consistently reach all families.

The root cause is that family engagement opportunities are not consistently designed with accessibility in mind (time options, advanced notice, consistent calendar publication, and varied formats), which limits participation for families constrained by work schedules or communication gaps. [Parent Survey]

8 ★

Parent perceptions indicate the campus behavior system may not feel consistent for all families (only 69.0% "Always" that behavior concerns are addressed fairly/consistently, with 31.0% "Sometimes"), and open comments describe concerns about peer behaviors and negative student experiences, suggesting inconsistent confidence in behavior implementation and student culture.

The root cause is that consistent campus-wide behavior communication and implementation (clear expectations, consistent responses, proactive culture-building, and family-facing explanations of procedures) may not be fully aligned or visible to families, leading to variable perceptions and experiences. [Parent Survey]

★ = Priority

Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

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

Improvement Planning Data

- [x] **Campus goals**
- [x] **HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3**
- [x] **Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)**
- [x] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**
- [x] **Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data**
- [x] **State and federal planning requirements**

Accountability Data

- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Effective Schools Framework data**
- [x] **Accountability Distinction Designations**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**
- [x] **Local Accountability Systems (LAS) data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **STAAR released test questions**
- [x] **STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Student failure and/or retention rates**
- [x] **Local diagnostic reading assessment data**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**

- [x] **Observation Survey results**
- [x] **Other PreK - 2nd grade assessment data**

Student Data: Student Groups

- [x] **Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups**
- [x] **Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group**
- [x] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/ stability**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Student surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Class size averages by grade and subject**
- [x] **School safety data**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**
- [x] **School Behavioral Threat Assessment Data (Senate Bill 11)**

Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **State certified and high quality staff data**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data**

- [x] **Professional development needs assessment data**
- [x] **Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact**
- [x] **T-TESS data**
- [x] **Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data**
- [x] **Classroom and school walkthrough data**

Parent/Community Data

- [x] **Parent surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Parent engagement rate**
- [x] **Community surveys and/or other feedback**

Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation**
- [x] **Communications data**
- [x] **Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data**
- [x] **Study of best practices and high yield strategies**
- [x] **Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents**
- [x] **Focus Group(s) data**
- [x] **Other**

Effective Schools Framework Diagnostic

FLIPS Coaching and Milestones

Goals

Goal 1 Increase Student Achievement

Performance Objective 1

Increase the percentage of students performing at Meets Grade Level or above in each tested grade level and content on STAAR from 46.12% (Spring 2026) to 60% by May 2027.

Action Step 1

Establish consistent access to grade-level learning in reading and math through research-based Tier 1 instructional routines and structures (ELITE Level 1)

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of classrooms demonstrating consistent evidence that students begin work immediately after directions, transition with minimal loss of instructional time, follow directions the first time, and access materials and grade-level tasks without confusion.

2) Walkthrough data will show increased consistency in lesson-launch routines, student readiness to begin instruction, reduced downtime during reading and math blocks, and reduced teacher time spent re-directing behavior during core instruction.

3) Lesson plans and instructional slide decks will reflect clearly defined reading and math block components, aligned routines and procedures, teacher actions, student actions, and expectations for transitions and engagement.

4) PLC artifacts will demonstrate collaborative planning for the routines and structures necessary to ensure student access to reading and math instruction.

5) Student performance on formative assessments, campus common assessments, and MAP checkpoints will show improvement as access to instruction becomes more consistent.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Assistant Principal (PK-2 implementation), Literacy IC (ELA/SS), Math IC (Math/Science)

Key Contributors: ESL Specialist, Team Leads

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will develop and communicate campus-wide expectations for lesson-launch routines, transitions, materials readiness, student response expectations, and independent start procedures during reading and math instruction so that all classrooms begin the year with common structures that maximize access to learning.	Principal	July-Aug	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
2	Teachers will explicitly teach, model, practice, and refine classroom routines and procedures during the first weeks of school so students know how to transition, begin tasks, access materials, follow directions, and engage during reading and math instruction with consistency and independence.	Assistant Principal for grades PK-2 Principal for grades 3-5	Aug-Sept	
3	Teachers will align lesson plans and instructional slide decks to reading and math routines by including clear lesson objectives, the sequence of the instructional block, expected teacher actions, expected student actions, visual supports for routines and transitions, and procedures for beginning work and engaging in learning tasks.	Instructional Coaches	Daily	
4	PLCs will be used to collaboratively plan the instructional routines and structures needed to support access to grade-level reading and math instruction, including immediate task starts, smooth transitions, clear student directions, efficient material use, and active participation expectations so that students experience consistency across classrooms.	Team Leads	Weekly	
5	The principal, assistant principal, and instructional coaches will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs during reading and math instruction to monitor how quickly students begin work, how efficiently transitions occur, whether students follow directions the first time, whether students can access materials and tasks without confusion, and whether instructional minutes are protected from unnecessary loss.	Principal	Weekly	
6	Instructional coaches and campus administration will provide coaching, modeling, and feedback to teachers whose classrooms need additional support with routines, transitions, task launches, or structures that interfere with consistent access to grade-level reading and math instruction.	Instructional Coaches	Daily	
7	Walkthrough trends, PLC discussions, and coaching feedback will be used throughout the school year to ensure foundational instructional routines and structures remain strong beyond the opening weeks of school and continue to support increasingly rigorous instruction in reading and math.	Principal	Aug-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 6

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 2

Build safe, structured classrooms that support academic risk-taking and self-regulation in reading and math instruction (ELITE Level 2)

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of classrooms demonstrating consistent evidence that students self-correct behavior, use respectful language, and remain engaged in learning without frequent teacher redirection.

2) Walkthrough data will show increased consistency in calm, predictable classroom environments where students participate without fear of embarrassment and where behavior expectations are maintained with minimal disruption to instruction.

3) Lesson plans and instructional slide decks will reflect clear expectations for student behavior, participation routines, partner and group interactions, and procedures that support psychological safety and productive learning behaviors.

4) PLC artifacts will demonstrate collaborative planning for structures that support student self-regulation, positive peer interactions, and consistent classroom expectations during reading and math instruction.

5) Walkthrough trends and behavior data will show a decrease in behaviors that interrupt learning and an increase in classrooms where students repair, re-engage, and sustain participation during instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Assistant Principal

Implementation Leads: Counselor, Principal, coaches as support

Key Contributors: Team Leads, ESL Specialist

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The Assistant Principal will define and communicate campus-wide expectations for safe, structured classrooms, including respectful language, student self-correction, predictable participation routines, and calm responses to behavior that protect instructional time and promote academic risk-taking during reading and math instruction	Assistant Principal	July-Aug	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
2	Teachers will explicitly teach, model, practice, and reinforce classroom expectations and behavior routines during the beginning of the school year so students learn how to respond respectfully, repair behavior, participate safely, and re-engage in learning without disrupting instruction.	Instructional Coaches	Aug-Sept	
3	Teachers will incorporate daily routines and structures that support psychological safety and self-regulation, including clear participation expectations, respectful partner and group interaction routines, and procedures for responding to mistakes, correction, and redirection in ways that preserve student dignity and access to learning.	Instructional Coaches	Daily	
4	PLCs will be used to collaboratively plan the classroom structures, routines, and responses needed to support student self-regulation and academic risk-taking during reading and math instruction, including how students will participate, collaborate, repair behavior, and maintain a respectful learning environment across classrooms.	Team Leads	Weekly	
5	The assistant principal will conduct regular walkthroughs to monitor whether classrooms demonstrate calm, predictable behavior systems, respectful student interactions, self-correction, and emotionally safe participation during reading and math instruction, and whether these conditions are allowing students to remain engaged in learning.	Assistant Principal	Weekly	
6	Instructional coaches will provide targeted support, coaching, and feedback to teachers whose classrooms need additional support with classroom culture, self-regulation routines, repair structures, or participation systems that affect students' ability to take academic risks and remain engaged during instruction.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
7	Walkthrough trends, behavior data, PLC discussions, and coaching feedback will be used throughout the school year to refine classroom systems that promote respectful interactions, student ownership of behavior, and psychologically safe participation so that students are increasingly prepared to engage in deeper academic thinking and discourse.	Assistant Principal	Aug-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 8

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 3

Increase student thinking, academic discourse, and demonstration of understanding in reading and math instruction through structured participation routines and rigorous questioning (ELITE Level 3).

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of classrooms demonstrating consistent evidence that students prepare and share responses, explain their thinking using content-specific language, and respond to or build on the ideas of their peers during reading and math instruction.

2) Walkthrough data will show increased use of structured participation routines, including opportunities for all students to think before speaking, participate in partner or group discourse, and engage in discussion that reflects reasoning rather than guessing or compliance.

3) Lesson plans and instructional slide decks will reflect intentional opportunities for questioning, wait time, student discourse, whole-group checks for understanding, and prompts that require explanation, justification, or evidence-based responses.

4) PLC artifacts will demonstrate collaborative planning for reading and math lessons that include rigorous questions, anticipated misconceptions, discourse structures, and routines that ensure all students are expected to think, respond, and engage.

5) Student performance on formative assessments, campus common assessments, and MAP checkpoints will show improvement as students increasingly explain reasoning, surface misunderstandings, and engage with grade-level thinking during daily instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC (literacy/social studies), Math IC (math/science)

Key Contributors: ESL Specialist, Team Leads, Assistant Principal (PK-2 supervision)

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will define and communicate campus-wide expectations for student thinking and academic discourse in reading and math instruction, including the expectation that all students are prepared to think, respond, explain reasoning, and engage in structured discussion using grade-level content and academic language.	Principal	Oct	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
2	Teachers will implement structured participation routines that require every student to think before speaking, such as write-first opportunities, partner discussion, cold call, choral response, and other discussion structures that increase universal participation and reduce passive engagement during reading and math instruction during the Phase 2 instructional focus.	Instructional Coaches	Oct-Dec	
3	Teachers will intentionally plan and use questioning strategies, wait time, and discussion prompts that require students to explain, justify, compare, revise, and build on ideas so that classroom talk reflects thinking and understanding rather than short-answer compliance during the Level 3 implementation phase.	Instructional Coaches	Oct-Dec	
4	PLCs will be used to collaboratively plan reading and math lessons that include rigorous questions, anticipated student misunderstandings, discourse routines, checks for understanding, and opportunities for students to engage in meaningful peer discussion and visible thinking across the lesson.	Team Leads	Oct-Dec	
5	The principal, assistant principal, and instructional coaches will conduct regular walkthroughs during reading and math instruction to monitor whether students are preparing responses, explaining their thinking, responding to peers, using academic language, and demonstrating understanding through discussion and teacher checks for understanding, with walkthrough look-fors aligned to Level 3.	Principal	Oct-Dec	
6	Instructional coaches will provide modeling, coaching, and feedback to teachers needing additional support with questioning, academic discourse, participation routines, wait time, pacing, and checks for understanding so that student thinking becomes more visible and distributed across the classroom during the Level 3 implementation window.	Instructional Coaches	Oct-Dec	
7	Walkthrough trends, PLC discussions, student work, and formative assessment data will be used to refine instructional practices that increase student thinking, discourse, and demonstration of understanding during Phase 2 and to support sustained implementation after the initial Level 3 focus window.	Principal	Oct-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 4

Strengthen student ownership of quality, feedback, revision, and productive struggle in reading and math instruction (ELITE Level 4).

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of classrooms demonstrating consistent evidence that students use exemplars or success criteria to improve work quality, revise work after feedback, fix mistakes independently, and persist through challenging reading and math tasks.

2) Walkthrough data will show increased evidence that feedback results in visible revisions, students are expected to improve the quality of their work, and teachers maintain rigorous expectations by requiring students to act on feedback rather than simply complete tasks.

3) Lesson plans and instructional slide decks will reflect clear success criteria, exemplars, planned opportunities for feedback and revision, and structures that allow students to monitor quality and persist through productive struggle in reading and math instruction.

4) PLC artifacts will demonstrate collaborative planning for lessons that include exemplars, anticipated errors, feedback opportunities, revision routines, and strategies that encourage students to apply effort and use feedback to improve performance.

5) Student work samples, formative assessments, campus common assessments, and MAP checkpoints will show improvement as students increasingly revise, self-correct, and strengthen the quality of their responses during daily instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC, Math IC

Key Contributors: Team Leads, ESL Specialist

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will define and communicate campus-wide expectations for quality ownership and productive struggle in reading and math instruction, including the expectation that students use exemplars, respond to feedback, revise work, and persist through challenge.	Principal	Jan	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
2	Teachers will implement clear success criteria and exemplars in reading and math instruction so students understand what quality work looks like and can compare their own work to grade-level expectations.	Instructional Coaches	Jan-Feb	
3	Teachers will intentionally plan and provide opportunities for students to receive actionable feedback, revise their work, explain how they improved it, and persist through productive struggle without premature rescue so that students strengthen both accuracy and independence.	Instructional Coaches	Jan-Feb	
4	PLCs will be used to collaboratively plan reading and math lessons that include exemplars, anticipated misconceptions, feedback opportunities, revision routines, and structures that require students to improve work quality and apply effort during challenging tasks.	Team Leads	Jan-Feb	
5	The principal, assistant principal, and instructional coaches will conduct regular walkthroughs during reading and math instruction to monitor whether students are using exemplars, revising work after feedback, fixing errors independently, and persisting through rigorous tasks, with walkthrough look-fors aligned to Level 4.	Principal	Jan-Feb	
6	Instructional coaches will provide modeling, coaching, and feedback to teachers needing additional support with success criteria, exemplars, feedback loops, revision structures, aggressive monitoring, and productive struggle so that students increasingly take ownership of the quality of their work.	Instructional Coaches	Jan-Feb	
7	Walkthrough trends, PLC discussions, student work, and formative assessment data will be used to refine instructional practices that increase student ownership of quality, revision, and productive struggle during Phase 3 and to support sustained implementation as the campus moves toward collective ownership and sustained rigor in the spring semester.	Principal	Jan-May	
8	Teachers will support students in setting, tracking, and reflecting on individual academic growth goals using classroom data, formative performance, or MAP-aligned indicators so that student ownership extends to both work quality and academic progress.	Team Leads	Sept-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 5

Sustain rigorous, student-owned learning that leads to mastery and higher performance in reading and math instruction (ELITE Level 5).

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of classrooms demonstrating consistent evidence that students sustain focus and productivity during rigorous reading and math tasks, manage collaborative learning with minimal teacher intervention, and hold themselves and their peers accountable for learning and behavior.

2) Walkthrough data will show increased evidence that students explain conceptual understanding, challenge and refine one another's thinking, persist through complex tasks, and continue learning productively when the teacher steps back.

3) Lesson plans and instructional slide decks will reflect opportunities for student-led discussion, collaborative accountability, conceptual questioning, extension tasks, and structures that allow students to sustain rigorous learning with increasing independence.

4) PLC artifacts will demonstrate collaborative planning for reading and math lessons that include conceptual prompts, group accountability structures, peer-to-peer discourse, extension opportunities, and routines that support sustained rigor and collective ownership.

5) Student work samples, formative assessments, campus common assessments, and MAP checkpoints will show improvement as students increasingly demonstrate conceptual understanding, independence, and high-level performance on rigorous grade-level tasks.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC, Math IC

Key Contributors: Team Leads, ESL Specialist

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will define and communicate campus-wide expectations for sustained rigor and collective ownership in reading and math instruction, including the expectation that students manage collaborative learning, use academic language to deepen understanding, challenge and support peers respectfully, and sustain high-level learning with increasing independence.	Principal	Mar	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
2	Teachers will implement structures that support student-led rigor in reading and math instruction, including collaborative routines, peer accountability, conceptual discussion, and opportunities for students to monitor progress, sustain focus, and push one another's thinking during complex grade-level tasks.	Instructional Coaches	Mar	
3	Teachers will intentionally plan and use conceptual questions, extension opportunities, and strategic release of control so that students explain why ideas work, generate multiple approaches, build on peer thinking, and continue learning productively without constant teacher direction.	Instructional Coaches	Mar-Apr	
4	PLCs will be used to collaboratively plan reading and math lessons that include group accountability structures, conceptual questioning, peer discourse expectations, extension tasks, and opportunities for students to sustain rigorous learning and collective ownership.	Team Leads	Mar-Apr	
5	The principal, assistant principal, and instructional coaches will conduct regular walkthroughs during reading and math instruction to monitor whether groups sustain focus and rigor, whether students challenge and refine peer thinking, whether conceptual understanding is visible in student responses, and whether learning continues at a high level when the teacher steps back, with walkthrough look-fors aligned to ELITE Level 5.	Principal	Mar-Apr	
6	Instructional coaches will provide modeling, coaching, and feedback to teachers needing additional support with group accountability systems, conceptual questioning, peer-to-peer discourse, extension design, and strategic release so that students increasingly take collective ownership of rigorous learning.	Instructional Coaches	Mar-Apr	
7	Walkthrough trends, PLC discussions, student work, and formative assessment data will be used to refine instructional practices that increase sustained rigor and collective ownership, and to support end-of-year reflection, celebration, and planning for long-term sustainability.	Principal	Mar-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 6

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 6

Provide targeted intervention, acceleration, and tutoring in reading and math based on student need and ongoing progress monitoring.

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of students identified for intervention or tutoring who meet or exceed projected growth on MAP and demonstrate improvement on formative assessments, campus common assessments, and other progress-monitoring measures in reading and math.

2) Student intervention and tutoring rosters will reflect data-based identification of students needing additional support or acceleration in reading and math based on multiple data sources, including classroom performance, common assessments, and MAP results.

3) Progress-monitoring data will show that students receiving intervention or tutoring demonstrate growth in targeted skill areas and increased success in grade-level reading and math tasks over time.

4) PLC artifacts and intervention planning documents will demonstrate that teachers and leaders use student data to identify needs, group students strategically, monitor progress, and adjust supports in response to student performance.

5) Tutoring and intervention implementation records will show consistent delivery of supplemental academic support aligned to identified student needs in reading and math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Assistant Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC, Math IC, Intervention Staff

Key Contributors: ESL Specialist, Team Leads, Principal

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The Assistant Principal will establish a system for identifying students who need targeted intervention, acceleration, or tutoring in reading and math using multiple data points, including MAP results, classroom performance, formative assessment data, common assessments, and teacher input, so that support decisions are timely and responsive to student need.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
2	Teachers, team leads, and instructional support staff will use student data during PLCs and data review meetings to group students strategically for intervention, acceleration, or tutoring in reading and math and to identify the specific skills and standards that need to be addressed through supplemental support.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
3	The campus will provide targeted intervention and Title I-funded tutoring opportunities for students needing additional support in reading and math, with services aligned to identified gaps, grade-level standards, and priority academic needs so that students receive focused support beyond initial core instruction.	Assistant Principal	Sept-May	
4	Teachers and staff providing intervention or tutoring will use aligned instructional materials, targeted practice, and progress-monitoring tools to deliver supplemental reading and math support that responds to student performance and reinforces grade-level success.	Instructional Coaches and ESL Specialist	Sept-May	
5	Campus leadership and instructional staff will monitor student progress regularly to determine whether intervention, acceleration, or tutoring is producing the intended academic growth and will adjust groupings, supports, or instructional focus when student data indicates the need for a different level or type of support.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
6	PLCs and campus data discussions will be used to review the effectiveness of intervention and tutoring efforts, identify students who are ready to exit support or need intensified support, and ensure that supplemental services remain aligned to student need and classroom expectations in reading and math.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
7	Campus leadership will evaluate the overall impact of intervention, acceleration, and tutoring through student growth data, assessment results, implementation records, and teacher feedback in order to refine services and strengthen academic support systems throughout the school year.	Assistant Principal	Oct-May	
8	The campus will implement a consistent intervention review protocol for MTSS/SIT meetings and progress-monitoring cycles that clarifies student entry/exit expectations, documentation, and next instructional steps for students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 support.	Assistant Principal	Oct-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Funding Sources: IXL Intervention & Lead4Ward Tutoring Resources 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg, 2117-11-639600-SW-111-30-945, $4,327

Title I: 2.5.1

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

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 7

Strengthen family partnership to support academic achievement through academic engagement, communication, and learning opportunities.

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of families participating in academic engagement opportunities focused on reading, math, and science, including family nights, parent workshops, academic conferences, and home-learning support events.

2) Family engagement records, sign-in sheets, and event participation data will show increased family involvement in activities designed to support student learning in reading and math.

3) Communication artifacts will reflect consistent sharing of student progress, grade-level expectations, and strategies families can use to support reading, math, and science learning at home.

4) Teachers and campus staff will provide families with academic resources, tools, and guidance that build understanding of grade-level expectations and strengthen home-school connections.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC (literacy/social studies events), Math IC (math/science events)

Key Contributors: Counselor, ESL Specialist, AP, Team Leads

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Campus leadership will develop and communicate a year-long plan for academic family engagement that includes opportunities for families to learn about grade-level expectations, reading, science, and math learning goals, student progress, and practical ways to support academic success at home.	Principal	Aug-Sept	
2	Teachers and campus staff will provide families with clear and consistent communication about student performance in reading and math, including strengths, needs, progress toward goals, and recommended strategies or resources that families can use at home to reinforce learning.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
3	The campus will host academic family engagement events, such as literacy nights, math nights, parent workshops, and curriculum information sessions, that help families understand grade-level expectations, instructional routines, and ways to support learning beyond the school day.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
4	Teachers and campus staff will provide take-home academic resources, learning activities, and family-friendly guidance aligned to reading and math standards so that families can support student learning with greater confidence and consistency.	Instructional Coaches and ESL Specialist	Ongoing	
5	Parent-teacher conferences, academic progress meetings, and family communication structures will be used to strengthen collaboration around student learning goals, provide updates on academic growth, and connect families to supports that can improve performance in reading and math.	Teachers	Ongoing	
6	Campus leadership will monitor participation in family engagement opportunities and use family feedback, attendance trends, and communication data to refine academic engagement efforts so that opportunities remain accessible, relevant, and responsive to family needs.	Principal	Ongoing	
7	The campus will review student achievement data, family participation data, and feedback from academic engagement activities to evaluate the effectiveness of family partnership efforts and strengthen support for reading and math achievement over time.	Principal	Oct-May	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - Perceptions 4

Funding Sources: Extra Duty Pay For teachers supporting Title I Nights & Parental Involvement Events 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg, 2117-11-611800-02-111-30-945, $7,089, Title I Academic Nights: Contracted Services 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg, 2117-61-62990-00-111-30-945, $3,500

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	A significant gap exists in student readiness for grade-level rigor, as only about 34% of teachers report that students come prepared for current grade expectations, indicating many students lack prerequisite skills. [Priority]	Inconsistent Tier I readiness-building practices and the absence of a vertically aligned progress monitoring system result in students advancing without demonstrating mastery of prerequisite standards. [Staff Survey]
4	Instruction is not consistently rigorous or student-centered, as evidenced by uneven implementation of engagement and discourse routines, resulting in inconsistent opportunities for students to engage in cognitively demanding, grade-level tasks. [Priority]	Professional learning, coaching, and monitoring systems are not consistently aligned around clear instructional expectations (e.g., discourse, cognitive demand, student ownership), leading to variability in classroom implementation. [Student Survey] [ESF Diagnostic]

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Instructional coaching lacks depth and consistency, with most support occurring through brief, informal interactions rather than sustained coaching cycles that include modeling, practice, and follow-up, resulting in uneven instructional improvement across classrooms. [Priority]	Coaching is not protected within the campus schedule, and there is no formalized system to ensure consistent, high-quality coaching cycles with fidelity. [ESF Diagnostic]

2	Observation and feedback practices do not consistently lead to instructional growth, as debriefs are not consistently timely, action steps are not systematically followed up, and teacher progress is not tracked over time. [Priority]	The absence of a campus-wide system for tracking observation timelines, instructional goals, and teacher growth results in fragmented feedback and limited accountability for follow-through. [ESF Diagnostic]
6	PLCs are not consistently experienced as high-value and do not function as effective instructional improvement cycles, limiting their impact on daily classroom instruction. [Priority]	Collaborative time is not consistently structured around internalization, rehearsal, feedback, and follow-up, resulting in a focus on logistics rather than improving instructional practice. [Staff Survey]
8	Student motivation and recognition systems (House system, ClassDojo, and Golden Panther awards) are not implemented with consistent clarity or alignment, resulting in uneven student motivation and inconsistent staff execution. [Priority]	Multiple systems lack a unified, campus-wide implementation model, including clear criteria, consistent reinforcement practices, and strong visibility for students. [Staff Survey]

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	While many parents express satisfaction with events, participation data suggests access barriers: only 69.0% attended a family engagement event (with 23.8% "No"), and open feedback requests more parent involvement, better event timing for working parents, and a predictable calendar, indicating the current engagement model does not consistently reach all families.	The root cause is that family engagement opportunities are not consistently designed with accessibility in mind (time options, advanced notice, consistent calendar publication, and varied formats), which limits participation for families constrained by work schedules or communication gaps. [Parent Survey]

Goal 2 Overall Excellence in Student, Parent, and Community Relations

Performance Objective 1

Increase Average Daily Attendance (ADA) from 94.46% (2025-26) to 95% by May 2027, as measured through PEIMS data.

Action Step 1

Implement classroom and campus attendance recognition systems that positively reinforce student attendance, engagement, and participation in school.

Measures: 1) Increase the percentage of students and classes participating in attendance recognition systems, including class attendance challenges such as Mr. Potato Head, perfect attendance celebrations, and schoolwide attendance acknowledgments, as measured by campus participation records.

2) Attendance records will show improved monthly and nine-weeks attendance trends for students and classes participating in attendance recognition and engagement systems.

3) Campus implementation records will show consistent use of classroom and schoolwide attendance incentives, celebrations, and House-connected recognition structures designed to encourage student attendance and engagement.

4) Attendance review data will show increased consistency in class-based attendance motivation systems and schoolwide recognition practices across the campus throughout the 2026-2027 school year.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Counselor

Implementation Leads: Teachers

Key Contributors: Principal, AP

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The counselor will develop and communicate a campus-wide attendance recognition plan that includes classroom challenges, schoolwide celebrations, criteria for perfect attendance recognition, and visible systems for motivating student attendance and participation throughout the school year.	Counselor	Jul-Aug	
2	Teachers will implement classroom-based attendance incentive systems, including class attendance challenges and visual trackers, to encourage students to attend school consistently and build excitement around strong attendance as a shared class goal. This action may include continuation or refinement of existing attendance structures such as class-based reward systems	Teachers	Aug-May	
3	The campus will recognize students and classes for strong or improved attendance through recurring celebrations, awards, public acknowledgments, and House-connected incentives so that attendance is reinforced as both an individual and collective point of pride.	Counselor	Ongoing	
4	The counselor will review attendance data regularly to identify students, classes, and grade levels needing additional motivation or support and will adjust attendance engagement efforts to ensure recognition systems remain meaningful, visible, and responsive to campus needs.	Counselor	Monthly	
5	Campus leadership will monitor implementation of attendance recognition systems, review student and class participation in celebrations, and refine incentives and recognition practices to ensure they continue to encourage student attendance, school engagement, and positive campus participation throughout the year.	Counselor	Ongoing	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 8

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 2

Use the House System to strengthen student pride, belonging, aspiration, and school connectedness as supports for improved attendance and engagement.

Measures: 1) Increase student participation in House-related events, recognition opportunities, and schoolwide celebrations, including House rallies, House color days, House spirit activities, and House-based recognition systems, as measured by campus participation records and event documentation.

2) Student perception data will show increased evidence that students feel pride in their House, experience a greater sense of belonging at school, and view House-based traditions and celebrations as meaningful parts of the North Riverside experience.

3) Campus implementation records will show consistent use of House visuals, House language, House celebrations, House recognition systems, and House-branded events across the school, including visible alignment to the five core values and five Houses.

4) Family-facing communication and event participation records will show increased family awareness of House identity, House celebrations, and campus culture-building opportunities that reinforce school connectedness and student pride.

5) Attendance trends will show improvement in student attendance and engagement as House-based motivation, belonging, and school identity structures become more visible and meaningful across the campus.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Counselor

Implementation Leads: Counselor + Principal (for Golden Panther / signature culture architecture)

Key Contributors: AP, Co-Curr Team, Teachers, Team Leads

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The counselor will develop and communicate a year-long House System implementation plan that defines key celebrations, House pride events, recognition opportunities, visual expectations, and House-based traditions so that the House System operates as a consistent campus-wide identity structure rather than as a collection of isolated activities.	Counselor	Jul-Aug	
2	The campus will implement visible House System traditions and identity markers, including House chants, cheers, totem poles, House hand signals, House rallies, House color days, and other recurring experiences that help students identify with their House and experience belonging, pride, and excitement as part of daily school life.	Counselor	Aug-May	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
3	Campus leadership and staff will strengthen House visibility through intentional branding and environmental design, including the consistent use of House colors, crests, posters, flags, merchandise, shirts, and student-facing visuals so that the campus environment clearly reflects the ELITE House identity and reinforces student pride and school connectedness.	Principal	Aug-May	
4	The campus will redesign and elevate student recognition through the House System by aligning recognition practices to the five core values and by strengthening the meaning, visibility, and selection process of honors such as Golden Panther so that recognition becomes more aspirational, values-based, and celebrated by the school community.	Principal	Aug-Jan	
5	The campus will implement a year-long ELITE House recognition and celebration series aligned to the five Houses and five core values in order to build aspiration, motivation, and student connection to school through meaningful House-based events and invitations.	Counselor	Aug-May	
6	Staff will intentionally connect House identity and core values to student life across the school by incorporating Houses into guidance lessons, schoolwide celebrations, student leadership opportunities, visual recognition, staff participation, and special-campus events so that students experience ELITE values as central to the culture of North Riverside.	Counselor	Ongoing	
7	Campus leadership will review participation data, attendance trends, student perception feedback, and implementation evidence throughout the school year to refine House System practices and ensure that House events, recognition, branding, and traditions are positively contributing to student belonging, school pride, motivation, and attendance.	Counselor	Ongoing	
8	The counselor will administer and review student perception data at least twice during the school year to evaluate whether House traditions, recognition systems, and schoolwide celebrations are increasing student pride, belonging, and excitement, and House practices will be adjusted accordingly.	Counselor	Dec and Apr	

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 8

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 3

Strengthen attendance support, family connection, and family participation in order to improve student attendance and school connectedness.

Measures: 1) Attendance intervention records will show consistent implementation of student attendance monitoring, attendance conferences, and responsive supports for students with attendance concerns throughout the 2026-2027 school year.

2) Family participation records will show increased attendance at campus events, conferences, and connection opportunities that support school connectedness, student engagement, and attendance awareness.

3) Communication artifacts will reflect consistent outreach to families regarding attendance expectations, attendance concerns, school events, and campus connection opportunities designed to strengthen student engagement and school-home partnership.

4) Campus monitoring records will show that students with attendance concerns receive timely follow-up, family contact, and appropriate counselor- or campus-led support designed to strengthen attendance and reconnect students to the school community.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Counselor

Implementation Leads: Counselor

Key Contributors: Teachers, Principal, AP

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The counselor will develop and communicate an attendance support plan that identifies how the school will monitor student attendance, respond to emerging attendance concerns, conduct attendance conferences, and provide timely support for students and families needing additional intervention or connection to campus resources.	Counselor	Jul-Aug	
2	The counselor, teachers, and campus staff will identify students with attendance concerns through regular attendance reviews and will provide responsive support that may include student check-ins, problem-solving conversations, attendance contracts or goals, and coordinated family outreach designed to remove barriers and improve student attendance.	Counselor	Ongoing	
3	The campus will strengthen family connection to school by ensuring families are informed about attendance expectations, attendance incentives, student recognition opportunities, House celebrations, and other campus events that help students feel proud, connected, and motivated to attend school regularly.	Counselor	Ongoing	
4	The campus will use family conferences, parent-teacher meetings, attendance communication systems, and schoolwide event invitations to strengthen collaboration with families around attendance, school engagement, and student connection to campus life so that attendance support is experienced as relational and proactive rather than only corrective.	Counselor	Ongoing	
5	The counselor and campus leadership will regularly review attendance data, intervention records, and family participation trends to determine whether students and families are responding positively to attendance supports and connection efforts, and the campus will refine strategies as needed to ensure support remains visible, timely, and effective throughout the school year.	Counselor	Monthly	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - Perceptions 4

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2

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

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	A significant gap exists in student readiness for grade-level rigor, as only about 34% of teachers report that students come prepared for current grade expectations, indicating many students lack prerequisite skills. [Priority]	Inconsistent Tier I readiness-building practices and the absence of a vertically aligned progress monitoring system result in students advancing without demonstrating mastery of prerequisite standards. [Staff Survey]

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
8	Student motivation and recognition systems (House system, ClassDojo, and Golden Panther awards) are not implemented with consistent clarity or alignment, resulting in uneven student motivation and inconsistent staff execution. [Priority]	Multiple systems lack a unified, campus-wide implementation model, including clear criteria, consistent reinforcement practices, and strong visibility for students. [Staff Survey]

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	While many parents express satisfaction with events, participation data suggests access barriers: only 69.0% attended a family engagement event (with 23.8% "No"), and open feedback requests more parent involvement, better event timing for working parents, and a predictable calendar, indicating the current engagement model does not consistently reach all families.	The root cause is that family engagement opportunities are not consistently designed with accessibility in mind (time options, advanced notice, consistent calendar publication, and varied formats), which limits participation for families constrained by work schedules or communication gaps. [Parent Survey]

Performance Objective 2

Reduce total student discipline incidents (PEIMS and non-PEIMS) by 15% from the 2025-2026 baseline by

May 2027, as measured through campus discipline records.

Action Step 1

Implement a unified behavior and recognition system through LiveSchool and the House System to strengthen clarity, consistency, and student accountability across the campus.

Measures: 1) Campus implementation records will show consistent use of LiveSchool across classrooms and common areas to recognize ELITE-aligned behaviors, reinforce House-based accountability, and support a unified behavior and motivation system.

2) Walkthrough and monitoring data will show increased consistency in how staff reinforce behavior expectations, award recognition, use House-linked motivation systems, and communicate student accountability across classrooms and campus settings.

3) Student and family communication artifacts will reflect clearer understanding of how behavior expectations, House points, and student recognition are connected through one campus-wide system.

4) Campus trend data will show increased alignment between student recognition, House-based celebrations, and behavior expectations as LiveSchool implementation becomes more visible, consistent, and meaningful across the school.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Assistant Principal

Implementation Leads: Assistant Principal + Counselor

Key Contributors: Principal, Teachers

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Campus leadership will define and communicate a unified campus-wide behavior and recognition model that clarifies how LiveSchool, House points, ELITE core values, behavior expectations, and student recognition work together so that staff, students, and families experience one coherent system rather than multiple overlapping systems.	Assistant Principal	Jul-Aug	
2	The campus will implement LiveSchool as the primary schoolwide platform for recognizing ELITE-aligned student behaviors, tracking House-related points, and reinforcing clear expectations for accountability, motivation, and school culture so that student recognition is tied to the five core values and visible student behaviors.	Counselor	Aug-May	
3	Campus leadership will provide training and clear implementation expectations for staff on how to award points, reinforce expectations, communicate behavior standards, connect recognition to House identity, and use the system consistently across classrooms, common areas, and schoolwide events so that students experience predictable and meaningful reinforcement of ELITE values.	Counselor	Aug-Sept	
4	The campus will align student recognition structures, including House celebrations and honors such as Golden Panther, to the unified behavior and recognition system so that recognition reflects clearly defined ELITE values, shared campus expectations, and consistent adult understanding of what is being celebrated and why.	Principal	Aug-Jan	
5	The assistant principal, counselor, and campus leadership team will monitor implementation of the unified behavior and recognition system through walkthroughs, behavior data reviews, LiveSchool participation trends, and staff feedback in order to identify inconsistencies, strengthen campus-wide calibration, and refine the system so that it supports both student accountability and positive school culture.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 8 - Perceptions 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 2

Implement tiered behavior supports, peer culture systems, and student support structures to strengthen self-regulation, respectful interactions, and positive student behavior across the campus.

Measures: 1) Campus behavior data will show a decrease in repeated behavior concerns, disruptive incidents, and patterns of peer conflict that interfere with learning and school climate.

2) Walkthrough and monitoring data will show increased evidence that students self-correct behavior, use respectful language, participate safely, and re-engage in learning with less frequent disruption and less need for repeated adult correction.

3) Student support records will show consistent implementation of tiered behavior supports, including proactive interventions, student check-ins, reteach or repair opportunities, and behavior aide support for students needing additional assistance.

4) Family communication and support records will reflect improved contact with families regarding student behavior, support pathways, and campus expectations so that families experience greater clarity, consistency, and trust in the school's behavior systems.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Assistant Principal

Implementation Leads: Behavior Aide + Counselor for student support pieces

Key Contributors: Principal, Teachers

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Campus leadership will define and communicate a tiered student behavior support model that clarifies campus-wide expectations for proactive behavior support, self-regulation routines, student repair or reteach processes, behavior intervention pathways, and staff responses to student behavior concerns so that students experience more consistent and supportive behavior systems across the campus.	Assistant Principal	Jul-Aug	
2	The campus will utilize behavior aide support, counselor support, and campus intervention systems to provide targeted assistance for students with repeated behavior concerns, self-regulation needs, or challenges that interfere with learning, with the goal of reducing disciplinary incidents while increasing access to instruction and school connectedness.	Assistant Principal	Aug-May	
3	Teachers and campus staff will explicitly teach, model, practice, and reinforce routines for respectful interactions, peer collaboration, repair, re-entry, and student self-correction so that students learn how to manage behavior, restore relationships, and return to productive learning without unnecessary escalation.	Assistant Principal	Aug-May	
4	The campus will implement structures and supports that intentionally strengthen peer culture, including expectations for respectful language, peer kindness, collaborative responsibility, and positive interaction during instructional and non-instructional settings, so that students experience a more respectful and encouraging school environment.	Counselor	Aug-May	
5	The assistant principal and campus leadership team will regularly review discipline data, student support records, behavior trends, and family communication patterns to identify students or settings needing additional support, monitor the effectiveness of interventions, and refine campus behavior systems so that student discipline, peer culture, and student support structures improve over time.	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 8 - Perceptions 5

Funding Sources: Behavior Aide 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg, 2117-11-611900-46-111-30-945, $32,102

Title I: 2.5.1

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 3

Implement a campus-wide ELITE Recognition Wall System that publicly celebrates growth, achievement, attendance, integrity, teamwork, and leadership through visible recognition structures in the main hallway and key campus spaces.

Measures: 1) Campus implementation records will show consistent use of a schoolwide ELITE Recognition Board System that includes visible boards or displays for academic growth, academic achievement, attendance, integrity/LiveSchool recognition, co-curricular teamwork, and a selective leadership or Principal's Circle honor space.

2) Board update cycles will reflect regular use of district formative assessment data, attendance data, LiveSchool data, and other approved campus indicators to recognize students and classes through multiple pathways aligned to campus priorities.

3) Student, staff, and family communication artifacts will reflect increased clarity about what is recognized, why it is recognized, and how growth, achievement, attendance, and integrity connect to the ELITE values and House system.

4) Student perception, attendance, and behavior trend data will show increased evidence of motivation, belonging, and school connectedness as recognition systems become more visible, prestigious, and aligned across the campus.

5) Campus recognition structures will reflect fair and differentiated comparison groups so that growth, grade-level achievement, attendance, and integrity are celebrated in ways that increase motivation without creating confusion or inequitable comparisons.

6) Campus implementation records and student participation data will show visible House-based recognition of teamwork, co-curricular contribution, and shared success through celebrations and honors in non-academic spaces across the school.

7) Campus recognition records will show visible and recurring recognition of student leadership through honors that celebrate initiative, responsibility, service, and positive influence as part of the ELITE Recognition Wall System.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Counselor, Assistant Principal, and Instructional Coaches

Key Contributors: Co-Curr Teachers, Team Leads

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal, with support from school leadership, will establish and communicate a unified six-board ELITE recognition architecture that makes student success visible across the school and connects House identity, schoolwide motivation, and public honor. This structure will include House of Ember for academic growth, House of Eureka for academic achievement, a schoolwide attendance board, House of Iveron for integrity and LiveSchool recognition, House of Terra for teamwork and co-curricular contribution, and a Lumos-aligned leadership recognition space so that students experience multiple prestigious pathways to belonging, aspiration, contribution, and excellence within our ELITE culture.	Leadership Team	Jul-Aug	
2	The principal will ensure that the recognition wall system reflects fair and differentiated comparison structures, including Ember-aligned growth recognition and Eureka-aligned achievement recognition, and will determine whether advanced classes such as Hybrid Math are recognized through separate divisions or alternative honors so that public comparisons remain motivating and equitable.	Principal	Aug-Sept	
3	The counselor and assistant principal will coordinate monthly or assessment-cycle updates to the attendance board, Iveron-aligned LiveSchool behavior recognition, and other House-connected recognition boards so that students and families see consistent reinforcement of attendance, character, belonging, and ELITE-aligned behaviors.	Counselor and Assistant Principal	Monthly	
4	The campus will establish Terra-centered recognition in the co-curricular area, including recurring honors connected to teamwork, contribution, collaboration, and shared success in music, art, theatre, PE, and other group-based settings so that students experience House of Terra as a visible and prestigious pathway to belonging and non-academic excellence.	Co-Curr Team	Monthly	
5	The campus will include a Lumos-aligned leadership recognition space within the ELITE Recognition Wall System to honor students who demonstrate leadership, initiative, responsibility, and positive influence in classrooms, student organizations, House events, and campus life so that leadership is publicly elevated as a valued pathway within the ELITE culture.	Principal, Team Leads	Monthly	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
6	Instructional coaches and campus leadership will use district formative data, progress-monitoring data, and other approved academic indicators to update the growth and achievement recognition boards in alignment with campus academic goals and current instructional priorities.	Instructional Coaches	Monthly	
7	Campus leadership will review student perception, attendance, behavior, and participation data throughout the year to determine whether the recognition wall system is increasing motivation, belonging, and school connectedness, and the system will be refined as needed.	Leadership Team	Ongoing	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 8 - Perceptions 5

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.3

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

Progress Reviews

December **February** **June**

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	A significant gap exists in student readiness for grade-level rigor, as only about 34% of teachers report that students come prepared for current grade expectations, indicating many students lack prerequisite skills. [Priority]	Inconsistent Tier I readiness-building practices and the absence of a vertically aligned progress monitoring system result in students advancing without demonstrating mastery of prerequisite standards. [Staff Survey]

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
8	Student motivation and recognition systems (House system, ClassDojo, and Golden Panther awards) are not implemented with consistent clarity or alignment, resulting in uneven student motivation and inconsistent staff execution. [Priority]	Multiple systems lack a unified, campus-wide implementation model, including clear criteria, consistent reinforcement practices, and strong visibility for students. [Staff Survey]

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
5	Parent perceptions indicate the campus behavior system may not feel consistent for all families (only 69.0% "Always" that behavior concerns are addressed fairly/ consistently, with 31.0% "Sometimes"), and open comments describe concerns about peer behaviors and negative student experiences, suggesting inconsistent confidence in behavior implementation and student culture.	The root cause is that consistent campus-wide behavior communication and implementation (clear expectations, consistent responses, proactive culture-building, and family-facing explanations of procedures) may not be fully aligned or visible to families, leading to variable perceptions and experiences. [Parent Survey]

Goal 3 Employee Excellence and Organizational Improvement

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

Increase the percentage of teachers whose students demonstrate high-impact academic growth in all tested subjects, as measured by MAP Growth, from 42% (Spring 2026) to 80% by Spring 2027.

Action Step 1

Implement ELITE-aligned PLCs that connect TEKS, task design, and student-observable evidence to strengthen Domain 1 planning and improve teacher practice.

Measures: 1) PLC agendas and artifacts consistently show alignment to priority TEKS, task design, anticipated student evidence, and instructional systems connected to the ELITE Waterfall.

2) Lesson plans reflect PLC decisions and include clear standards alignment, instructional sequencing, and checks for understanding, consistent with T-TESS Domain 1 planning expectations.

3) Walkthrough data shows increased consistency in the use of aligned instructional systems across classrooms and evidence of the current ELITE phase of implementation.

4) Grade-level teams use student data and classroom evidence to identify the smallest missing instructional system rather than treating PLCs as general meetings or PD sessions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC + Math IC

Key Contributors: AP, ESL Specialist, Team Leads

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will conduct a Summer Team Leader Retreat prior to the start of school to launch the Team Leader Academy, align leaders to the annual focus, clarify expectations for PLC leadership and team outcomes, and build shared understanding of the ELITE implementation arc.	Principal	Aug	
2	The principal will implement a Team Leader Academy to train team leads in PLC facilitation, team outcome ownership, ELITE adult behaviors, and leadership practices that strengthen instructional alignment, accountability, and support across grade levels and departments.	Principal	Monthly	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
3	The principal will develop and communicate a clear campus definition of PLCs as collaborative planning structures where teams connect TEKS, task design, student evidence, and the ELITE Waterfall to make instructional decisions. PLCs will be used to produce shared priorities and shared systems, not whole-group PD or general announcements.	Principal	Jul - Aug	
4	The principal will create and require use of a PLC protocol that includes: 1) Identify the priority TEKS and intended rigor 2) Determine the task and instructional activity aligned to the standard 3) Identify the ELITE student-observable behavior(s) expected during the lesson 4) Anticipate misconceptions and barriers to student ownership 5) Determine the teacher system(s) needed to produce the student evidence 6) Align checks for understanding and next instructional steps	Principal	Jul-Sept	
5	The Instructional Coaches will provide training and ongoing support for team leads to facilitate PLCs that focus on: 1) standards alignment, 2) sequencing of activities and materials, 3) checks for understanding, 4) connections between lesson design and expected student evidence, and 5) alignment to the current ELITE Waterfall phase.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
6	The Instructional Coaches will use the campus PD scope and sequence to focus PLCs on the current ELITE phase: August-September: Level 1-2 systems October-December: Level 3 systems January-February: Level 4 systems March-April: Level 5 systems	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
7	The Instructional Coaches will provide feedback to team leads so PLCs remain focused on planning and instructional alignment rather than drifting into compliance tasks or generalized discussion. They will also review PLC agendas, notes, and lesson-planning artifacts to ensure teams are planning for: - TEKS alignment - rigorous and sequenced tasks, - clear student evidence, - checks for understanding, and - instructional systems that match the team's Waterfall needs.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
8	The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to determine whether the instructional systems planned in PLCs are visible in classrooms through student-observable ELITE evidence, including routines, discourse, revision, self-regulation, and collective ownership based on the current phase of implementation. Then use walkthrough findings to refine future PLC focus and coaching support.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Instructional Coaches	Weekly	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 6

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2

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

Progress Reviews

December **February** **June**

Action Step 2

Implement a campus-wide lesson planning framework aligned to the ELITE Operating System, the District's Framework, and T-TESS Domain 1 to ensure instruction is sequenced, rigorous, and designed to produce student-observable evidence under the motto "Proper Planning Prevents Poor Performance."

Measures: 1) Lesson plans consistently include TEKS-aligned objectives, logical sequencing, checks for understanding, and activities/materials aligned to instructional purpose and diverse learner needs, consistent with T-TESS Domain 1 Distinguished anchors.

2) Lesson plans identify the student-observable ELITE behaviors expected during each lesson or lesson component (e.g., starting work right away, explaining thinking clearly, revising work after feedback, helping a classmate learn).

3) Walkthrough data shows increased alignment between lesson plans and classroom execution, including evidence that teachers are planning for the current ELITE Waterfall phase and the instructional systems required to produce that evidence.

4) PLC artifacts and lesson plans show increasing alignment between TEKS - task - ELITE behavior - checks for understanding, as required by the campus weekly structure.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC + Math IC

Key Contributors: ESL Specialist, Team Leads, AP

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Create and require a campus-wide lesson planning template aligned to the master schedule that includes: - priority TEKS and measurable objective, - lesson sequencing, - task design aligned to rigor, - checks for understanding, - anticipated student evidence, - instructional systems connected to the ELITE Waterfall, and - differentiation/supports for diverse learners.	Instructional Coaches	Jul-Aug	✓
2	Establish campus-wide planning expectations for literacy and math instruction so that each lesson component reflects: - TEKS alignment, - the intended cognitive demand of the task, - planned discourse/check-for-understanding opportunities, - opportunities for student ownership, revision, and feedback when appropriate, and - alignment to the current ELITE Waterfall phase.	Instructional Coaches	Aug	
3	Require teachers to identify in lesson plans the ELITE student behaviors they expect to see during instruction, such as immediate task start, self-correction, explaining thinking, revising work, productive struggle, and peer-supported learning.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
4	Use PLCs to collaboratively plan lessons by connecting: - the TEKS, - the instructional task, - the planned student evidence, - likely misconceptions or barriers, and - the teacher system(s) needed to produce the desired student outcomes.	Team Leads	Ongoing	
5	Ensure lesson planning reflects the current campus implementation phase: - August-September: routines, transitions, self-regulation, and psychological safety (Levels 1-2), - October-December: student talk and thinking (Level 3), - January-February: quality ownership, revision, and feedback systems (Level 4), - March-April: collective ownership, independence, and sustained rigor (Level 5).	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
6	Review lesson plans regularly to determine whether planning is likely to produce the intended ELITE student evidence. Provide targeted feedback on: - clarity of standards alignment, - rigor of tasks, - sequencing and pacing, - checks for understanding, - discourse opportunities, - feedback/revision structures, and - alignment to the team's Waterfall needs.	Instructional Coaches	Bi-weekly	
7	Conduct walkthroughs to determine whether the systems named in lesson plans are visible in classrooms through student-observable evidence and use findings to refine future planning expectations and support.	Instructional Coaches	Weekly	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 6

Title I: 2.5.1

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

Progress Reviews

December **February** **June**

Action Step 3

Implement ELITE blueprint-aligned instructional coaching cycles that use student-observable evidence, ELITE Waterfall placement, and T-TESS planning/execution connections to strengthen Tier 1 instruction.

Measures: 1) Coaching logs and artifacts consistently show use of the North Riverside Coaching Cycle: student evidence, Waterfall placement, missing system, planning check, practice focus, and follow-up observation.

2) Walkthrough and observation data show increased alignment between coaching feedback and visible student evidence connected to the current ELITE Waterfall phase.

3) Teachers demonstrate increased implementation of targeted instructional systems such as routines, discourse structures, feedback loops, strategic struggle, and student ownership based on identified needs.

4) Team leads show increased capacity to facilitate PLCs and connect planning to student evidence through ongoing coaching and calibration.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Literacy IC + Math IC

Key Contributors: AP, ESL Specialist

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Define and communicate that instructional coaching at North Riverside will follow the ELITE coaching cycle: 1) collect student-observable evidence, 2) place the classroom in the Waterfall, 3) identify the smallest missing instructional system, 4) check T-TESS Domain 1 planning, 5) practice one system to mastery, and 6) re-observe for student evidence within 48-72 hours.	Principal	Jul-Aug	
2	Clarify that instructional coaches will operate in one of two roles depending on classroom Waterfall level: 1) Instructional Systems Leader for Levels 1-3, focusing on routines, self-regulation, discourse, participation, and feedback systems, and 2) Curriculum Interpreter/Strategist for Levels 4-5, focusing on TEKS clarity, task rigor, misconceptions, conceptual understanding, exemplars, and extensions.	Principal	Aug	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
3	Conduct coaching cycles that prioritize one instructional system at a time, aligned to the annual ELITE implementation arc: August-September: Level 1-2 systems (routines, access, self-regulation, psychological safety), October-December: Level 3 systems (student talk, student thinking, questioning, discourse), January-February: Level 4 systems (feedback, revision, exemplars, strategic struggle), and March-April: Level 5 systems (collective ownership, group accountability, sustained rigor).	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
4	1) Provide coaching feedback that names: - the student evidence currently observed, - the missing or incomplete system, and - the next teacher micro-practice needed to produce stronger evidence. 2) Feedback will remain tied to the Waterfall and to the principle that student evidence--not teacher effort--is the indicator of whether the system is working. 3) Provide feedback to teachers outside of designated planning time using on-the-spot coaching and structured windows (before school, after school, or other non-instructional times)	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
5	During coaching cycles, review lesson plans, TEKS alignment, task design, and checks for understanding to determine whether observed execution challenges are rooted in planning gaps, and adjust coaching accordingly.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
6	Log each observation, feedback, and coaching cycle on the "Coaching Feedback Tracker"	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
7	Provide ongoing support to team leads so they can facilitate PLCs, analyze student evidence, connect TEKS to instructional systems, and maintain grade-level alignment around ELITE expectations and current implementation phases. This aligns with Adult ELITE expectations that teachers and leaders lift peers, align through PLCs, and build collective efficacy through shared systems and priorities.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	
8	Use follow-up observations, coaching artifacts, and leadership calibration meetings to determine whether coached systems are producing increased student evidence across the majority of students and adjust support as needed.	Instructional Coaches	Ongoing	

Problem Statements: Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2

Funding Sources: Campus Instructional Coaches 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg, 2117-13-611900-46-111-30-945, $169,613

Title I: 2.5.1

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 5: Effective Instruction

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Action Step 4

Protect instructional time, planning time, and phased implementation conditions to ensure consistent execution of the ELITE Operating System and strengthen employee support and retention across the campus.

Measures: 1) The master schedule provides teachers with consistent daily planning time, including time for ELITE-aligned PLC planning and instructional preparation.

2) Campus calendars, meeting schedules, and leadership routines reflect the annual ELITE implementation arc rather than disconnected initiatives or competing priorities.

3) Walkthrough data shows increasing consistency in implementation of the current Waterfall phase across classrooms, indicating that campus time and support structures are aligned to one priority at a time.

4) Monitoring tools show that planning time is primarily used for lesson planning, PLC collaboration, and instructional preparation, rather than whole-group PD or unrelated administrative tasks. This aligns to the operating system's emphasis on using shared systems and planning to reduce instructional load over time.

5) Leadership calibration meetings, coaching artifacts, and walkthrough trends demonstrate that campus leaders are using a common evidence base and coaching sequence to monitor implementation fidelity.

6) Staff retention data, staff feedback, and end-of-year perception data will show improved teacher satisfaction with planning time, clarity of campus systems, and implementation support as the campus strengthens predictable structures that support employee effectiveness and retention.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Owner: Principal

Implementation Leads: Principal, Assistant Principal

Key Contributors: Instructional Coaches

Actions for Implementation

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will conduct a Summer Leadership Retreat for the cabinet team to align the annual campus focus, clarify implementation expectations, define monitoring responsibilities, and train leaders on the ELITE phase sequence, instructional priorities, and campus systems that will guide the year.	Principal	Jul	
2	Develop and maintain a master schedule that protects daily teacher planning time, preserves uninterrupted instructional blocks, and embeds ELITE-aligned PLC structures within the school day so planning, coaching, and instruction remain connected but do not compete with one another. This supports the operating system's expectation that planning, execution, and coaching function as one coherent system.	Principal	Jul	
3	1) Define and communicate that teacher planning time will be used for ELITE-aligned lesson planning, PLC collaboration around TEKS, task design, and student evidence, and instructional preparation connected to the current Waterfall phase. 2) Communicate that planning time will not be routinely used for whole-group PD, generalized announcements, or unrelated compliance tasks, ensuring that Adult ELITE expectations for shared priorities and precision remain protected.	Principal	Aug	
4	Use the campus PD plan and Waterfall scope-and-sequence to ensure that after-school meetings, coaching priorities, walkthrough focus, and leadership calibration remain aligned to the current phase of implementation; August-September: Levels 1-2, October-December: Level 3, January-February: Level 4, March-April: Level 5, and May: refinement and sustainability. This will prevent initiative overload and ensure the campus works one level at a time, as intended by the ELITE framework.	Principal	Ongoing	
5	Intentionally leverage additional planning minutes (beyond required minimums) to absorb the impact of unavoidable meetings (e.g., ARDs), ensuring teachers maintain adequate planning time overall	Assistant Principal	Ongoing	

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
6	Establish clear campus expectations that instructional coaching conversations, feedback loops, and follow-up conferences will occur in designated non-planning time (e.g., before school, after school, or designated windows) whenever possible so that teacher planning remains focused on preparation and PLC work. This aligns with the ELITE coaching framework, which requires short, repeated cycles of observation, feedback, and re-observation without collapsing planning time into meeting time.	Principal	Ongoing	
7	Conduct regular leadership calibration meetings using walkthrough evidence, Waterfall placement, ELITE look-fors, and coaching artifacts to determine whether campus implementation is consistent, which systems need reinforcement, and whether classrooms are ready to progress to the next level of the Waterfall. The ELITE operating system explicitly calls for calibration, evidence-based placement, and coaching the system--not the symptom.	Principal	Ongoing	
8	Use walkthroughs, planning artifacts, coaching notes, and team-level trends to determine whether the current ELITE systems are being implemented consistently across classrooms and whether support structures need to be adjusted. Campus leadership will use this data to prevent drift, reinforce non-negotiables, and ensure every classroom reflects the same core expectations and student evidence standards.	Principal	Ongoing	
9	Campus leadership will monitor staff feedback, implementation demands, planning-time protections, and support systems throughout the school year and will refine campus structures, communication rhythms, and staff support practices to strengthen teacher satisfaction, reduce avoidable frustration, and improve employee retention.	Principal	Ongoing	
10	Campus leadership will provide structured onboarding, mentoring, and support routines for new teachers so that early-career staff receive consistent guidance, feedback, and system clarity during their first year on campus.	Principal	Ongoing	

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 6

Funding Sources: Title I Stipends 211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg, 2117-23-611700-46-111-30-945, $15,962

Title I: 2.5.1

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 5: Effective Instruction

Progress Reviews

December	February	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	A significant gap exists in student readiness for grade-level rigor, as only about 34% of teachers report that students come prepared for current grade expectations, indicating many students lack prerequisite skills. [Priority]	Inconsistent Tier I readiness-building practices and the absence of a vertically aligned progress monitoring system result in students advancing without demonstrating mastery of prerequisite standards. [Staff Survey]
4	Instruction is not consistently rigorous or student-centered, as evidenced by uneven implementation of engagement and discourse routines, resulting in inconsistent opportunities for students to engage in cognitively demanding, grade-level tasks. [Priority]	Professional learning, coaching, and monitoring systems are not consistently aligned around clear instructional expectations (e.g., discourse, cognitive demand, student ownership), leading to variability in classroom implementation. [Student Survey] [ESF Diagnostic]

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Instructional coaching lacks depth and consistency, with most support occurring through brief, informal interactions rather than sustained coaching cycles that include modeling, practice, and follow-up, resulting in uneven instructional improvement across classrooms. [Priority]	Coaching is not protected within the campus schedule, and there is no formalized system to ensure consistent, high-quality coaching cycles with fidelity. [ESF Diagnostic]
2	Observation and feedback practices do not consistently lead to instructional growth, as debriefs are not consistently timely, action steps are not systematically followed up, and teacher progress is not tracked over time. [Priority]	The absence of a campus-wide system for tracking observation timelines, instructional goals, and teacher growth results in fragmented feedback and limited accountability for follow-through. [ESF Diagnostic]

6	PLCs are not consistently experienced as high-value and do not function as effective instructional improvement cycles, limiting their impact on daily classroom instruction. [Priority]	Collaborative time is not consistently structured around internalization, rehearsal, feedback, and follow-up, resulting in a focus on logistics rather than improving instructional practice. [Staff Survey]

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I Pt A Impr BSC Prg

Goal	Performance Objective	Action Step	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	6	IXL Intervention & Lead4Ward Tutoring Resources	2117-11-639600-SW-111-30-945	$4,327.00
1	1	7	Extra Duty Pay For teachers supporting Title I Nights & Parental Involvement Events	2117-11-611800-02-111-30-945	$7,089.00
1	1	7	Title I Academic Nights: Contracted Services	2117-61-62990-00-111-30-945	$3,500.00
2	2	2	Behavior Aide	2117-11-611900-46-111-30-945	$32,102.00
3	1	3	Campus Instructional Coaches	2117-13-611900-46-111-30-945	$169,613.00
3	1	4	Title I Stipends	2117-23-611700-46-111-30-945	$15,962.00
				Sub-Total	$232,593.00

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

Title	Person Responsible	Review Date	Addressed By	Addressed On
Bullying Prevention	Director of Counselng	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Coordinated Health Program	Director of Nursing	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	Executive Director of Student Services	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Dropout Prevention	Director of Counseling	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Dyslexia Treatment Program	Executive Director of Special Education	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Title I, Part C Migrant	Director of Language Programs	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Pregnancy Related Services	Director of Counseling	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Post-Secondary Preparedness	Director of Counseling	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Recruiting Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Chief Human Resources Officer	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Student Welfare: Crisis Intervention Programs and Training	Director of Counseling	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026
Technology Integration	--	--	Jennifer Price	8/31/2026