Plano Independent School District

Andrews Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:23 PM

Mission Statement

The Andrews community works in unity to ensure the development of responsible and successful students.

Vision

Committed to Excellence

Dedicated to Caring

Powered by Learning

Plano ISD Proud.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 9

Perceptions 11

Priority Problem Statements 13

Data Documentation for CNA 15

Improvement Planning Data 16

Accountability Data 16

Student Data: Assessments 16

Student Data: Student Groups 17

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 17

Employee Data 18

Parent/Community Data 18

Priorities 19

Priority 1 : 1.1 Improve, align and remove barriers for academic programs to ensure ... 20

Priority 2 : 2.3 Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR re... 26

Priority 3 : 4.4 Engage the community through timely, consistent and innovative co... 29

Priority 4 : 4.3 Create a culture of belonging for all members of the Plano ISD com... 32

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

The Andrews Elementary data highlights critical intersections where **Special Education students, males, and Kindergarteners** face disproportionate exclusionary discipline, with Special Education students representing **67% of all ISS placements** and specific multi-racial subgroups reaching risk ratios as high as 3.40. This behavioral disparity extends to ethnic demographics, where White students are significantly over-referred at a 2.57 risk ratio, whereas the majority Asian population remains underrepresented in disciplinary actions relative to their 53% enrollment footprint. Academically, the campus faces a unique challenge where **at-risk status (35.29%) is entirely decoupled from poverty** and instead driven by a 40% spike in immigrant enrollment and critical linguistic barriers, exemplified by the **0% speaking growth** observed in 2nd-grade Emergent Bilinguals. While high-performing groups like Gifted and Talented students (22.46%) maintain exceptional attendance and performance benchmarks, a **"widening academic gap"** persists for the lowest quintile of achievers (Quintile 5), who consistently fail to meet annual growth targets in both Math and Reading across nearly every grade level.

Strengths

Andrews Elementary leverages a high-performing demographic foundation, characterized by a uniquely large Gifted and Talented population (22.46%) that maintains exceptional 97.4% attendance. The campus's largest demographic, Asian students (54.28%), provides a pillar of stability with high college-readiness benchmarks—exceeding 89% in Reading and Math — and significantly lower disciplinary involvement relative to their enrollment footprint. Overall school engagement is bolstered by a 96.7% baseline attendance rate, led by a 99% rate among American Indian or Alaska Native students and supported by a fully slated PTA Board. Furthermore, the school successfully treats its multi-lingual diversity (nearly 28% Emergent Bilingual) as a cultural asset and has seen remarkable growth within its Hispanic subgroup, which reached 100% college readiness in Reading by the spring of 5th grade.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Enrollment data shows a diverse student population, with 22.46% identified as Gifted and Talented and 13.64% receiving Special Education services. These data highlight the need for instruction that supports a wide range of learning needs and academic abilities. Y -Pillar 1 Pillar 2.3	The Collaborative Team process at Andrews is not being used consistently to plan differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all learners, making it harder to identify students who need enrichment or intervention.
2	There is a significant disconnect between students labeled At-risk (35.29%) and those labeled Economically Disadvantaged (12.57%). N	
3	100% of all students placed in ISS during the 2025-26 school year were male. N	

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Andrews Elementary serves a high-achieving yet diverse student body where academic "At-risk" status (35.29%) is primarily driven by linguistic and learning gaps rather than socioeconomic factors, as only 12.57% of students are classified as Economically Disadvantaged. While overall performance is robust—highlighted by 71% of 5th graders reaching "Masters" level in Reading—the campus faces a "widening academic gap" because students in the lowest achievement quintile (Quintile 5) consistently fail to meet annual growth targets in both Math and Reading across nearly all grade levels. Furthermore, significant achievement disparities persist for Special Education students, with only 41.7% on track for college readiness in Math, while African American students remained stagnant at 50% readiness throughout the year. Although 5th-grade TELPAS growth was exceptional at 75%, critical deficiencies in early grades—such as 0% speaking growth for 2nd-grade Emergent Bilinguals—and a Science mastery rate (32%) that trails projections and other core subjects necessitate a strategic shift toward a school-wide, integrated language delivery model.

Strengths

Andrews Elementary is anchored by several significant student learning strengths, most notably a uniquely high concentration of advanced learners with 22.46% of the student body qualifying for Gifted and Talented programs. The campus's majority Asian demographic (54.28%) provides a significant pillar of academic stability, with 91.3% of these students on track for college readiness in Reading and 89.1% in Math by the end of 5th grade. Overall academic mastery is particularly robust in the upper grades, where 71% of 5th graders achieved the "Masters" level in Reading and 57% reached "Masters" in Math on the 2026 STAAR. Furthermore, early literacy serves as a foundational asset, with over 66% of 1st and 2nd graders entering the year "Above Benchmark" on mCLASS assessments, while the Hispanic subgroup demonstrated exceptional targeted growth, reaching 100% college readiness in Reading by the spring term.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Students in Quintile 5 consistently fail to meet a full year's worth of growth (100% of projection) in both Math and Reading across almost all grade levels. Y - Pillar 1 Possible Pillar 1.1 or 1.2	Targeted planning, data-driven collaboration, and consistent implementation of small-group interventions and differentiated instruction were limited.
2	There is a significant lack of progress in Emergent Bilingual early grades; 2nd-grade students showed 0% growth in Speaking and only 11% Composite growth. 3rd-grade students also struggled with Writing (11% growth). N	
3	11% of 1st-grade students are performing "Well Below Benchmark" in early literacy as measured by mCLASS assessments N	
4	Projections for students requiring HB 1416 accelerated instruction in Reading show persistent achievement gaps, with 100% of the 5th-grade cohort and 50% of the 4th-grade cohort projected to "Does Not Meet" standards by the end of the spring term. *Systemic 1416 Learning Gaps: The 1416 cohort has a Performance Score of only 13, with 20 out of 23 tests earning no points. N	

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Andrews Elementary maintains a highly structured instructional environment characterized by weekly collaborative planning sessions and a robust Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) that utilizes dedicated WIN (What I Need) time and data-driven SST meetings held every 5–6 weeks. While the campus excels in retaining 100% of its brand-new teachers, a critical need exists to establish a systematic teacher tiering framework to provide differentiated, coaching-heavy support based on performance and student growth metrics. Furthermore, while the school successfully manages student transitions to middle school using MAP scores for advanced course identification, there is a recognized need to standardize placement recommendations to move beyond individual teacher discretion and ensure equitable access. Identified operational gaps include a lack of active Student Support Plans (SSPs) in the data dashboard despite a high at-risk population, and a plan to implement a staff-developed "Levels of Misbehavior and Menu of Corrective Actions" to foster more objective and culturally responsive classroom management.

Strengths

Andrews Elementary operates a highly structured instructional environment where Collaborative Teams meet weekly with administration to plan directly from the district's scope and sequence, guided by an established instructional framework. The campus's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is anchored by dedicated WIN (What I Need) time and data-driven Student Support Team (SST) meetings held every 5–6 weeks to adjust Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on MAP and mClass data. While the school successfully retained 100% of its brand-new teachers, a critical need exists to develop a systematic teacher tiering framework to provide differentiated, coaching-heavy support aligned with instructional growth goals. Furthermore, while MAP scores are used to identify candidates for middle school Honors courses, the campus recognizes the need to standardize placement recommendations to ensure equitable access beyond teacher discretion. Finally, operational takeaways include a total absence of active Student Support Plans (SSPs) in the digital dashboard despite a 35.29% at-risk population, and a priority to implement a staff-developed "Levels of Misbehavior and Menu of Corrective Actions" to foster objective and culturally responsive management.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	There are no formalized, systemic methods for parents and the community to provide input on school functions, as highlighted by a high level of disagreement on the HRS Level 1 survey. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.4	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.
2	There is a significant discrepancy (0.64 gap of means on HRS Indicator 2.5) regarding whether professional development is perceived as job-embedded or aligned with individual growth goals. N	
3	More consistent documentation in Review 360 N	

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

The Andrews Elementary Comprehensive Needs Analysis highlights a high-performing campus with robust instructional frameworks and 100% retention of brand-new teachers, yet it faces critical challenges in closing a "widening academic gap" for students in the lowest achievement quintile. While overall 5th-grade STAAR performance is strong, persistent growth failures in Math and Reading for underperforming groups and 0% speaking growth among 2nd-grade Emergent Bilinguals necessitate a shift toward an integrated language delivery model. Demographic data reveals that student risk is primarily driven by academic and linguistic factors rather than socioeconomics, evidenced by a 40% spike in the immigrant population and high density of both Gifted and Talented (22.46%) and Special Education (13.64%) students. Disciplinary patterns indicate a need for standardized, culturally responsive management to address significant disproportionalities, such as White students having a 2.57 risk ratio and 100% of ISS placements involving males. Finally, while students feel overwhelmingly safe, the campus must address a significant mid-year attendance decline (dropping to 95.3% in the winter) and a critical lack of formalized feedback channels for parents and staff to participate in school decision-making.

Strengths

Andrews Elementary demonstrates significant perception strengths, particularly regarding its school climate and leadership clarity. An overwhelming 92% to 96% of students perceive the school as a safe and orderly environment, with 97% stating they clearly understand the school’s rules and procedures. Faculty and staff echo this sentiment, reporting a very high perception of safety with a mean score of 4.61. Additionally, there is "exceptional clarity" in instructional leadership, as evidenced by a mean score of 4.54 regarding the leader's ability to communicate a unified vision for teaching and learning. These strengths are further bolstered by a highly collaborative staff culture (mean score of 4.54) and a proactive parent-community infrastructure, highlighted by a fully slated PTA Board for the upcoming school year.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Small Sample Size: Only 16 parents participated in the HRS Level 1 survey, making it difficult to claim the results are representative of the entire community. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.3	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.
2	Attendance Trends: While cumulative attendance is high (96.7%), there is a significant mid-year decline, dropping from a peak of 98.1% in the fall to a low of 95.3% in the winter. N	

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Enrollment data shows a diverse student population, with 22.46% identified as Gifted and Talented and 13.64% receiving Special Education services. These data highlight the need for instruction that supports a wide range of learning needs and academic abilities. Y -Pillar 1 Pillar 2.3	The Collaborative Team process at Andrews is not being used consistently to plan differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all learners, making it harder to identify students who need enrichment or intervention.
2 ★	Students in Quintile 5 consistently fail to meet a full year's worth of growth (100% of projection) in both Math and Reading across almost all grade levels. Y - Pillar 1 Possible Pillar 1.1 or 1.2	Targeted planning, data-driven collaboration, and consistent implementation of small-group interventions and differentiated instruction were limited.
3 ★	Small Sample Size: Only 16 parents participated in the HRS Level 1 survey, making it difficult to claim the results are representative of the entire community. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.3	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.
4 ★	There are no formalized, systemic methods for parents and the community to provide input on school functions, as highlighted by a high level of disagreement on the HRS Level 1 survey. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.4	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.

★ = 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] **District goals**
- [x] **Campus goals**
- [x] **HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3**
- [x] **HB3 CCMR goals**
- [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] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Effective Schools Framework data**
- [x] **Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data**
- [x] **Accountability Distinction Designations**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **State and federally required assessment information**
- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **STAAR End-of-Course 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**

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] **Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility/ stability**
- [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**
- [x] **Section 504 data**
- [x] **Homeless data**
- [x] **Gifted and talented data**
- [x] **Dyslexia data**
- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**
- [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] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**
- [x] **Safe and Supportive School Program Team and/or Crisis Team data (Senate Bill 11)**
- [x] **School Behavioral Threat Assessment Data (Senate Bill 11)**

Employee Data

- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **T-TESS data**
- [x] **T-PESS 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**

Priorities

Priority 1

1.1
Improve, align and remove barriers for academic programs to ensure they are accessible to and differentiated for all students to achieve high levels of learning.

Goal 1

Math Goal - PreK-12: Math Goal: By the end of 2027 MAP assessment window, the percentage of Quintile 5 students that do not make one year's progress of MAP growth in Math will decrease from 100% to 50%

Performance Target: 50% of HB1416 students will increase 50% Math MAP growth of one year's progress.

Expected Result: HB1416 students will be comparable to non HB1416 students in Math MAP Growth

Strategy 1

WIN Time: Daily 8:00-8:30 targeted small-group math instruction based on student data.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

AI & SSP: Restructured targeted small-group instruction using MAP and STAAR data to provide more frequent differentiated instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS and teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Collaborative Planning: Staff trained on the new curriculum and collaborative team planning template to identify the most important concepts and plan effective instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Instructional Support: Administrators and instructional specialists attend math planning to align instruction with district and campus goals.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, team leads

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Depth & Complexity: Ongoing PLC professional development focused on increasing rigor and promoting deeper student thinking.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, Instructional Specialist

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Enrollment data shows a diverse student population, with 22.46% identified as Gifted and Talented and 13.64% receiving Special Education services. These data highlight the need for instruction that supports a wide range of learning needs and academic abilities. Y -Pillar 1 Pillar 2.3	The Collaborative Team process at Andrews is not being used consistently to plan differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all learners, making it harder to identify students who need enrichment or intervention.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Students in Quintile 5 consistently fail to meet a full year's worth of growth (100% of projection) in both Math and Reading across almost all grade levels. Y - Pillar 1 Possible Pillar 1.1 or 1.2	Targeted planning, data-driven collaboration, and consistent implementation of small-group interventions and differentiated instruction were limited.

Goal 2

Reading Goal - PreK-12: Reading Goal: By the end of 2027 MAP assessment window, the percentage of Quintile 5 students that do not make one year's progress of MAP growth in Reading will decrease from 100% to 50%

Performance Target: 50% of HB1416 students will increase 50% Reading MAP growth of one year's progress.

Expected Result: HB1416 students will be comparable to non HB1416 students in Reading MAP Growth

Strategy 1

AI & SSP: Restructured targeted small-group instruction using MAP and STAAR data to provide more frequent differentiated instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration, Instructional Specialist, Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

WIN Time: Daily 8:00-8:30 targeted small-group reading instruction based on student data.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, Instructional Specialist, Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Collaborative Planning: Staff trained on the new curriculum and collaborative team planning template to identify the most important concepts and plan effective instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, team leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Instructional Support: Administrators and instructional specialists attend reading planning to align instruction with district and campus goals.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, Team Leads

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

LIFT Grant Coaching: Teachers receive in-class coaching using the HMH curriculum and research-based instructional strategies.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Lift Consultant, District Representative, Admin

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Depth & Complexity: Ongoing PLC professional development focused on increasing rigor and promoting deeper student thinking.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, Team Leads, Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Enrollment data shows a diverse student population, with 22.46% identified as Gifted and Talented and 13.64% receiving Special Education services. These data highlight the need for instruction that supports a wide range of learning needs and academic abilities. Y -Pillar 1 Pillar 2.3	The Collaborative Team process at Andrews is not being used consistently to plan differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all learners, making it harder to identify students who need enrichment or intervention.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Students in Quintile 5 consistently fail to meet a full year's worth of growth (100% of projection) in both Math and Reading across almost all grade levels. Y - Pillar 1 Possible Pillar 1.1 or 1.2	Targeted planning, data-driven collaboration, and consistent implementation of small-group interventions and differentiated instruction were limited.

Priority 2

2.3
Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR readiness status (Pre-K through 12th grade system).

Goal 1

By the end of the 2027 MAP assessment window, the percentage of Special Education and Gifted and Talented students who increase one or more achievement levels ("hoppers") on the MAP assessment will increase by 6 percentage points through the consistent implementation of the Collaborative Team Process, including differentiated planning, targeted instruction, and formative assessment.

Performance Target: By the end of the 2027 MAP assessment window, the percentage of Special Education and Gifted and Talented students demonstrating growth of at least one achievement level on the MAP assessment will increase by 6 percentage points from the 2026 baseline.

Expected Result: Increase the percentage of Special Education and Gifted and Talented MAP "hoppers" by 6 percentage points by the end of the 2027 MAP assessment window.

Strategy 1

WIN Time: Daily 8:00-8:30 targeted small-group math instruction based on student data.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

AI & SSP: Restructured targeted small-group instruction using MAP and STAAR data to provide more frequent differentiated instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS and teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Collaborative Planning: Staff trained on the new curriculum and collaborative team planning template to identify the most important concepts and plan effective instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Instructional Support: Administrators and instructional specialists attend math planning to align instruction with district and campus goals.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IS, team leads

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Enrollment data shows a diverse student population, with 22.46% identified as Gifted and Talented and 13.64% receiving Special Education services. These data highlight the need for instruction that supports a wide range of learning needs and academic abilities. Y -Pillar 1 Pillar 2.3	The Collaborative Team process at Andrews is not being used consistently to plan differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all learners, making it harder to identify students who need enrichment or intervention.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Students in Quintile 5 consistently fail to meet a full year's worth of growth (100% of projection) in both Math and Reading across almost all grade levels. Y - Pillar 1 Possible Pillar 1.1 or 1.2	Targeted planning, data-driven collaboration, and consistent implementation of small-group interventions and differentiated instruction were limited.

Priority 3

4.4
Engage the community through timely, consistent and innovative communication.

Goal 1

Behavior Goal: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, level 3 reported behaviors at the campus will decrease by 10% due to parent participation in campus surveys will increase from 16 respondents to at least 100 respondents through monthly family engagement surveys, targeted communication, and opportunities for parents to provide feedback and see how their input informs school decisions.

Performance Target: Increase parent participation in monthly campus surveys from 16 to 100 respondents, contributing to a reduction in Level 3 discipline incidents by 10%

Expected Result: Increased parent involvement and decrease by 10% of Level 3 Discipline Incidents

Strategy 1

STOIC Training: Staff participate in STOIC training to strengthen proactive behavior supports, consistent expectations, and positive student-staff interactions, helping reduce Level 3 behaviors.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, Counselor

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

PBIS Foundation Team: The PBIS Foundation Team regularly participates in campus and district meetings and provides staff training on common-area behavior expectations and guidelines. This promotes consistent implementation of behavior expectations across campus and helps reduce Level 3 behaviors.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, counselor, PBIS committee members

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

CARE Survey: A CARE survey is included in each parent Smore to provide families with an accessible opportunity to share feedback, strengthen school-family connections, and ensure parents have a voice in campus decisions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Monthly Family Survey: A monthly survey is included in the parent Smore to gather ongoing feedback, identify family needs, and demonstrate how parent input informs campus decisions and improvements.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There are no formalized, systemic methods for parents and the community to provide input on school functions, as highlighted by a high level of disagreement on the HRS Level 1 survey. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.4	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Small Sample Size: Only 16 parents participated in the HRS Level 1 survey, making it difficult to claim the results are representative of the entire community. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.3	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.

Priority 4

4.3
Create a culture of belonging for all members of the Plano ISD community.

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the campus will increase its cumulative average attendance rate from 96.0% to 96.5% by implementing a monthly parent survey to gather stakeholder feedback, identify and address barriers to regular attendance, and strengthen family engagement in support of improved student attendance.

Performance Target: Increase parent participation in monthly campus surveys from 16 to 100 respondents, contributing to a 0.5 percentage-point increase in student attendance from 96.0% to 96.5%.

Expected Result: Increase in parent involvement and student attendance

Strategy 1

Monthly Family Survey: Include a monthly attendance survey in the parent Smore to gather feedback, identify barriers to attendance, and provide families with a voice in campus decisions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

CARE Survey: Include the CARE survey in each parent Smore to strengthen family-school connections and identify areas where the campus can better support families and student attendance.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Student Advisory Group: Establish a student advisory group to provide students with opportunities to share their perspectives, identify barriers, and offer ideas that support improved attendance and engagement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, counselor

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

PTA Partnership: Partner with the PTA to strengthen family engagement through opportunities such as A-Team activities, Family Nights, picnics, and volunteer opportunities, helping build stronger connections between families and the campus.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There are no formalized, systemic methods for parents and the community to provide input on school functions, as highlighted by a high level of disagreement on the HRS Level 1 survey. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.4	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Small Sample Size: Only 16 parents participated in the HRS Level 1 survey, making it difficult to claim the results are representative of the entire community. Y - Pillar 4 Possible Pillar 4.3	low participation, limited awareness of engagement opportunities, and reduced confidence that stakeholder input impacts school decisions.