



School Action Plan

SECTION 1: THE BACKGROUND

School Name: Woodmoor Elementary

Year: 2026-27

The Central Vision: (North Star): We envision a school where every student receives high-quality, grade-level instruction every day, in every classroom — instruction so strong that intervention becomes the exception, not the norm. Our teachers collaborate as trusted professionals within Professional Learning Communities, using shared data and common practices to continuously refine their craft and respond to student needs in real time. Through this culture of collective ownership, calibration, and data-informed reflection, we ensure that a student's success is never dependent on which classroom they walk into, but is the guaranteed result of a strong, unified instructional foundation across our school.

Focus Population: Hispanic/Latino students and students on IEPs

Learning Problem: (Big Picture) How do we: Our students on IEPs and our Hispanic/Latino students are not showing the same amount of growth in math and reading compared to other students.

SECTION 2: THE SYSTEMIC NARRATIVE

ROOT CAUSE

The central node or pattern that connects your academic, behavioral, and cultural challenges.

The Holistic Inquiry	Response
----------------------	----------

The Surface Symptoms <i>(What data points are flashing red?)</i>	Reading 44% of Hispanic/Latino students are reading at grade level compared to 74% of non-Hispanic/Latino students. 48% of students on an IEP are reading at grade level compared to 74% of students not on an IEP. 27% of Hispanic/Latino students met stretch goal compared to 43% of non Hispanic/Latino students. 27% of students on an IEP met stretch goal compared to 44% of students not on an IEP Math 38% of Hispanic/Latino students are at grade level in math compared to 75% of non-Hispanic/Latino students. 45% of students on an IEP are at grade level in math compared to 75% of students not on an IEP. 29% of Hispanic/Latino students met stretch goal compared to 41% of non Hispanic/Latino students. 30% of students on an IEP met stretch goal compared to 41% of students not on an IEP
The Systemic Root <i>(What are the causes? Are they interconnected and how?)</i>	The school is currently in the process of formalizing a centralized framework for core instruction to better align Tier 1 teaching, data discussion protocols, and formative assessment methods. Training and instructional practices have been managed at the individual classroom and grade-level team layers. While this approach has allowed for teacher autonomy, it has also introduced variability in instructional delivery across classrooms. Moving forward, the focus will center on establishing school-wide structures and leadership-supported accountability mechanisms to ensure a more standardized, consistent

experience for all students.

SECTION 3: THE INTERCONNECTED ACTION MAP

THEORY OF ACTION

This section asks you to view your strategy through three multidimensional systems (Instruction, Culture, Structure) to ensure it is holistic. I share

SYSTEMIC GOAL:

(e.g., Increase Student Agency to drive Academic Mastery)

Multidimensional Systems	Strategic Activities (The "Work")	Resource Inputs (The "Fuel")
Instruction <i>(Instructional & Academic)</i>	Activities: - Work with vertical team to co-construct high-yield strategies and support school-wide implementation - Incorporate small-group instruction within Tier 1 based on data driven discussions - Use GLAD strategies in Tier 1 instruction - Formative assessments that direct instructional decisions	Resources: - PD around Core Instruction - Review of GLAD strategies - Structure for vertical team meetings
Culture <i>(Cultural & Emotional)</i>	Activity: Frame growth data and subgroup gaps as shared school responsibility, Celebrate growth — not just proficiency Provide opportunities for peer observation as growth-oriented, not evaluative	Resources: Celebration time at staff meetings Classroom coverage
Structure <i>(Structural & Policy)</i>	Activity: - consistent data meetings - common assessments to discuss student growth and what changes need to be made	Resources: Implementing consistent, school-wide protocols for assessment/student progress discussions to drive instructional decisions.

SECTION 4: THE RIPPLE EFFECT SCAN

SYSTEMS THINKING

Holistic leaders anticipate consequences. Before acting, scan for how this plan might unintentionally hurt another part of the system.

Potential Negative Ripple	The Mitigation Strategy	Cross-System Connection
SPED and ELD teachers work with students who are often furthest from grade level growth. Sharing data can feel disheartening or lead to a lacking sense of collective efficacy. This is when collaboration on a schoolwide level is most critical so that we don't further widen gaps for the students we are serving from these populations.	Present the data as whole school data- not divided by grade, teacher or classroom, ELD or IEP related	a culture problem (feeling blamed) becomes a structure problem (weaker PLCs) becomes an instruction problem (less effective Tier 1 calibration) — which then shows up again in the data as continued subgroup gaps, restarting the cycle.
Tier 1 curriculum (HMH) is still relatively new, has a lot of components to it, and as such, can be difficult to determine how to vary whole group and small group instruction.	Prioritize key HMH curricular components and commit to implementation with fidelity. Gradually introduce small group instruction across applicable components.	an instruction constraint (curriculum doesn't flex) becomes a structure problem (PLC data cycle stalls at the "response" step) becomes a culture problem (trust in the process erodes) — which then shows up again as inconsistent Tier 1 instruction, the very root cause the plan is meant to fix
Shared understanding of best instructional strategies	Co-create the shared instructional look-fors/framework with a vertical team so it reflects collective expertise. Ground the framework in evidence and data.	a culture disagreement (differing views on best practice) becomes a structure problem (PLCs can't align on what to calibrate toward) becomes an instruction problem (Tier 1 stays inconsistent) — which resurfaces in the data and reopens the original disagreement.

SECTION 5: MONITORING THE WHOLE

LEAD INDICATORS

Don't just measure the test score (Lagging). Measure the health of the change (Leading).

Metric Type	Indicator Description	Frequency of Review
The Process Metric <i>(Are we doing it?)</i>	% of walkthroughs showing evidence of agreed upon instructional practices (Danielson) Frequency of small-group instruction occurring within core blocks % of teachers who've participated in a peer observation/instructional round % of PLCs that met on schedule, uninterrupted, each week	Every six weeks
The Experience Metric <i>(How does it feel?)</i>	Do teachers feel confident (not just compliant) delivering the agreed-upon Tier 1 strategies? Do students report that class feels challenging but doable — not too easy, not overwhelming? Do teachers value PLC time and find that it leads to improved instructional practices and student outcomes	Once a semester
The Outcome Metric <i>(Did it work?)</i>	% of Hispanic/Latino students meeting stretch growth targets % of SPED students meeting stretch growth targets % of Hispanic/Latino and Non-SPED students meeting stretch growth targets, to confirm the gap is narrowing rather than everyone moving equally Overall school-wide reading growth % compared to prior year	Three times a year (based on the three iReady diagnostics)

Summary of the Changes

(How has the work articulated in the SAP changed the learning experience for your focus population? What are the next logical steps to address your learning problem?)

