Plano Independent School District



Carlisle Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:26 PM

Mission Statement

The mission for Carlisle students is that students develop a sense of self-worth, a desire to help others and a strong academic foundation from which to continue a lifelong pursuit of learning.

Vision

Carlisle Elementary is a safe, caring and united community that fosters high expectations and meets the needs of all learners while building relationships and promoting responsibility.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 9

Perceptions 11

Priority Problem Statements 13

Priorities 15

Priority 1 : Pillar 1.2 Develop and deliver systems for learning that articulate expect... 16

Priority 2 : Pillar 2.3 Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CC... 18

Priority 3 : Pillar 4.2 Implement interventions and systems of support to ensure a s... 20

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Carlisle is a diverse school with an approximate enrollment of 423 students, comprising 38% White, 29% Asian, 17% Hispanic, and 9% African American. For the 25-26 school year, 33% of students are Economically Disadvantaged, 39% are At-Risk, 24% are Emergent Bilingual (EB), 12% receive ESL services, 5% are serve under Section 504, and 5% receive Gifted and Talented (GT) services. Special education (Sped) serves 14% of students, which consists of 37% Learning Disabled (LD), 33% Autism, 16% Speech-Language Pathology (SLP), and 8 self-contained students. Attendance was maintained at an overall average of 95%, peaking at 97% during the 1st 9 weeks and dipping to a low of 94.5% in the final 9 weeks. Discipline incidents were highest in the 3rd and 5th 9-week periods, reaching 95% and 96.1%, respectively. For the 24-25 school year, we had 28.9% Economically Disadvantaged (32.6% for 23-24 school year), 6.2% served in 504 (6.4% in 23-24), 22.7% Emergent Bilingual (22.6% in 23-24), and 15.4% of students served in special education (12.5% for 23-24 school year as well). Students receiving gifted and talented services increased slightly from 6.7% in the 23-24 school year to 6.9% for the 24-25 school year.

Strengths

We serve a diverse population. Positive behavior achievements accounted for 53% of our behavior reporting in Review360 for the 24-25 school year.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Some subgroups are currently not achieving the "Approaches Grade Level" standard across all state assessments.	A lack of collaborative planning and explicit scheduling prevents full participation in planning meetings.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

- **Math:** Overall MAP growth was strong in Kindergarten, 4th, and 5th grades (with all quintiles ending above 120% annual growth). However, 2nd-grade Quintile 5 students struggled to meet expected MAP growth targets, contributing to a broader disconnect between campus MAP growth trends and upper-grade STAAR outcomes.
- **Reading:** Quintile 4 students in 3rd and 4th grades performed below 100% expected growth from fall to spring—a gap driven in part by a need for more coordinated small-group planning across grade-level teams—causing STAAR results to fall short of MAP projections.
- **Science:** While all students achieved over 120% growth on MAP overall, growth was lowest among 4th and 5th grade Quintile 4 students and 3rd grade Quintile 5 students, signaling a need for focused intervention in these foundational years. Official 5th-grade STAAR Science scores remain pending.

STAAR Reading 2026:

3rd Grade: 81% Approaches, 59% Meets, 27% Masters

4th Grade: 76% Approaches, 51% Meets, 15% Masters

5th Grade: 81% Approaches, 57% Meets, 45% Masters

STAAR Math 2026:

3rd Grade: 77% Approaches, 43% Meets, 20% Masters

4th Grade: 70% Approaches, 57% Meets, 24% Masters

5th Grade: 87% Approaches, 66% Meets, 37% Masters

STAAR Science 2026:

5th Grade: Scores not available yet.

Strengths

A wide range of student data is analyzed regularly by the Carlisle leadership team and collaborative teams on campus. Projected growth reports show grade 5 science as a strength.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus STAAR outcomes failed to match projected MAP growth trends.	Preplanning routines lacked focus on instructional rigor and higher-order questioning, which hindered teachers from fully leveraging curriculum resources and engaging all students during core instruction.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Students who progressed to *Approaches Grade Level* require continued targeted interventions in the upcoming school year to advance to *Meets Grade Level*, while students who reached *Meets Grade Level* should receive ongoing support to achieve *Masters Grade Level.*

Strengths

Surveys show that faculty and staff view our campus as a safe and orderly learning environment. Staff are actively involved in tracking and achieving our Campus Improvement Plan goals, and we consistently utilize district-provided resources to deliver targeted interventions for our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Student growth across grade levels is inconsistent.	Inconsistent discussion and delivery of small group instruction, limited time for peer observation, and inconsistent frequency of reviewing SSP student progress

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Survey feedback indicates that parents view the campus as a safe and orderly learning environment, while expressing a strong desire for more opportunities to provide input. Additionally, teachers highlighted a need for structured time to conduct peer classroom observations to support professional growth

Strengths

Stakeholders—including parents, staff, and students—perceive Carlisle as a safe and orderly learning environment, supported by the consistent implementation of Review360 as our campus behavior management system

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Feedback from the HRS survey indicates that campus stakeholders rated Indicators 1.3 and 1.6 lower than all other indicators.	Language and cultural barriers, technology accessibility challenges, time, and current methods of collecting input may not be adequate
2 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, campus attendance fell below the district's 96.0% baseline in three out of six reporting cycles (dipping to 94.9% in the 4th six weeks with 604 total absentees), directly correlating with a 21.8% "Did Not Meet" rate on state academic assessments.	Attendance interventions are entirely reactive rather than proactive. The campus lacks an early warning protocol to identify students accumulating 2-3 unexcused absences before they reach chronic absenteeism thresholds.
3 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, Review 360 data indicated that Code of Conduct violations (23%) and physical aggression (14%) were the primary disciplinary incidents, while campus attendance declined from 97.2% to 94.9%. This double trend led to an estimated loss of over 1,200 Tier 1 instructional hours, disproportionately affecting student proficiency in STAAR tested grades.	Schoolwide and classroom PBIS routines are inconsistently enforced due to a lack of concrete behavioral expectations, clear Tier 1 escalation ladders, and standardized reporting calibration across grade-level teams.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Some subgroups are currently not achieving the "Approaches Grade Level" standard across all state assessments.	A lack of collaborative planning and explicit scheduling prevents full participation in planning meetings.
2 ★	Campus STAAR outcomes failed to match projected MAP growth trends.	Preplanning routines lacked focus on instructional rigor and higher-order questioning, which hindered teachers from fully leveraging curriculum resources and engaging all students during core instruction.
3 ★	Student growth across grade levels is inconsistent.	Inconsistent discussion and delivery of small group instruction, limited time for peer observation, and inconsistent frequency of reviewing SSP student progress
4 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, campus attendance fell below the district's 96.0% baseline in three out of six reporting cycles (dipping to 94.9% in the 4th six weeks with 604 total absentees), directly correlating with a 21.8% "Did Not Meet" rate on state academic assessments.	Attendance interventions are entirely reactive rather than proactive. The campus lacks an early warning protocol to identify students accumulating 2-3 unexcused absences before they reach chronic absenteeism thresholds.
5 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, Review 360 data indicated that Code of Conduct violations (23%) and physical aggression (14%) were the primary disciplinary incidents, while campus attendance declined from 97.2% to 94.9%. This double trend led to an estimated loss of over 1,200 Tier 1 instructional hours, disproportionately affecting student proficiency in STAAR tested grades.	Schoolwide and classroom PBIS routines are inconsistently enforced due to a lack of concrete behavioral expectations, clear Tier 1 escalation ladders, and standardized reporting calibration across grade-level teams.

★ = Priority

Priorities

Priority 1

Pillar 1.2 Develop and deliver systems for learning that articulate expectations and provide support for all staff, campus administrators and district office leaders to ensure engaging, high levels of learning for all students.

Goal 1

By Spring 2026, [?]90% of students in Grades 3-5 will achieve Approaches Grade Level or higher on STAAR Math, with at least 60% reaching Meets Grade Level and 30% reaching Masters Grade Level.

Strategy 1

Rigor-Aligned Planning PLC: Implement weekly PLC planning cycles focused on unpacking HPKS TEKS, deconstructing STAAR-formatted item types (including new item types), and embedding visual models (e.g., strip diagrams, number lines).

Language & Scaffold Integration: Systematically integrate structured sentence stems, math graphic organizers, and targeted vocabulary routines tailored for EB and SpEd, Eco Dis, and At Risk student populations.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Some subgroups are currently not achieving the "Approaches Grade Level" standard across all state assessments.	A lack of collaborative planning and explicit scheduling prevents full participation in planning meetings.

Goal 2

By Spring 2027, [?]90% of students in Grades 3-5 will achieve Approaches Grade Level or higher on STAAR RLA, with ECR/SCR

Strategy 1

Daily Text-Dependent Writing (15 Mins): Build daily SCR and weekly ECR routines into core instruction using standard 2-point and 5-point STAAR rubrics, providing weekly actionable student feedback.

Bi-Weekly Paired Text Analysis: Structure two-week instructional cycles explicitly dedicated to comparing paired fiction and informational texts, emphasizing main idea synthesis, author's purpose, and text evidence extraction.

Data-Driven Tier 2 Intervention & Accommodation Audits: Utilize bi-weekly formative check data to organize 20-minute targeted guided reading groups by TEKS strand. Conduct monthly IEP/504/EB accommodation audits to ensure full fidelity during daily Tier 1 instruction and district assessments.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Some subgroups are currently not achieving the "Approaches Grade Level" standard across all state assessments.	A lack of collaborative planning and explicit scheduling prevents full participation in planning meetings.

Priority 2

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

Goal 1

By EOY 2026, [?]85% of students will meet or exceed their individualized MAP growth projections, increasing Meets and Masters levels across all student groups on STAAR.

Strategy 1

Student-Led Data Tracking (K-5): Deploy digital/paper Student Data Portfolios. Conduct mandatory 1-on-1 student-teacher goal-setting conferences following BOY, MOY, and progress monitoring windows to set MAP RIT targets and link them to middle/high school pathways.

Targeted Tier 2/3 Small Groups: Mandate 4x/week 30-minute small-group acceleration blocks built around specific STAAR performance levels, prioritizing At-Risk, EB, Economically disadvantaged, and SpEd student accommodations and visual/linguistic scaffolds.

Coaching & Walkthroughs: Conduct weekly administrative and specialist walkthroughs using a unified Small-Group Quality Rubric, dedicating 50% of instructional coaching capacity to Grade 4 teams.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus STAAR outcomes failed to match projected MAP growth trends.	Preplanning routines lacked focus on instructional rigor and higher-order questioning, which hindered teachers from fully leveraging curriculum resources and engaging all students during core instruction.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Student growth across grade levels is inconsistent.	Inconsistent discussion and delivery of small group instruction, limited time for peer observation, and inconsistent frequency of reviewing SSP student progress

Priority 3

Pillar 4.2 Implement interventions and systems of support to ensure a safe, orderly and respectful learning environment.

Goal 1

By May 2027, 100% of classrooms will demonstrate fidelity to PBIS Tier 1 practices on monthly walkthrough rubrics ([?]90% score), driving a 35% reduction in total office discipline referrals and reclaiming critical Tier 1 instructional time.

Strategy 1

Implement campuswide PBIS routines with daily 10-minute proactive classroom meetings and explicit matrix modeling during the first 3 weeks of each semester.

Establish a standardized Behavior Escalation Flowchart & Review 360 Coding Guide with bi-weekly administrative coaching audits to calibrate reporting thresholds.

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	During the 2025-2026 school year, Review 360 data indicated that Code of Conduct violations (23%) and physical aggression (14%) were the primary disciplinary incidents, while campus attendance declined from 97.2% to 94.9%. This double trend led to an estimated loss of over 1,200 Tier 1 instructional hours, disproportionately affecting student proficiency in STAAR tested grades.	Schoolwide and classroom PBIS routines are inconsistently enforced due to a lack of concrete behavioral expectations, clear Tier 1 escalation ladders, and standardized reporting calibration across grade-level teams.

Goal 2

By May 2027, overall campus attendance will average [?]96.5% across all six reporting periods, reducing chronic absenteeism by 40% and ensuring students remain present for foundational Tier 1 instruction.

Strategy 1

Early Warning System (EWS): Implement weekly Monday data tracking to flag students hitting 2 consecutive absences or falling below 96% within any 3-week window

Tiered Contact Protocol: Require parent contact by Day 2 of an absence, home visits/ conferences led by the intervention team at Day 5, and mandatory attendance contracts at Day 8.

Proactive Incentives: Deploy grade-level and individual 6-week "96%+ Attendance Challenges" with weekly visual trackers and PBIS reward integration, targeting historical low points (3rd and 4th six weeks).

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	During the 2025-2026 school year, campus attendance fell below the district's 96.0% baseline in three out of six reporting cycles (dipping to 94.9% in the 4th six weeks with 604 total absentees), directly correlating with a 21.8% "Did Not Meet" rate on state academic assessments.	Attendance interventions are entirely reactive rather than proactive. The campus lacks an early warning protocol to identify students accumulating 2-3 unexcused absences before they reach chronic absenteeism thresholds.