Plano Independent School District

Christie Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

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

Mission Statement

At Christie, we believe every child deserves an engaging, challenging and student-owned learning experience within an accountable, safe, and collaborative high-performing culture.

Vision

Be the change. Make a difference.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Needs Assessment Overview 5

Demographics 6

Student Learning 8

School Processes & Programs 10

Perceptions 12

Priority Problem Statements 14

Data Documentation for CNA 16

Improvement Planning Data 17

Accountability Data 17

Student Data: Assessments 17

Student Data: Student Groups 17

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 18

Employee Data 18

Parent/Community Data 18

Support Systems and Other Data 18

Priorities 20

Priority 1 : 1.2 Develop and deliver systems for learning that articulate expectations... 21

Priority 2 : 4.3 Create a culture of belonging for all members of the Plano ISD com... 26

Funding Summary 30

211 Title I, Part A 31

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Needs Assessment Overview

Summary

CNA 25-26 Working Document

Demographics

Summary

After referring to the demographics data, we found that the male AA students had the highest number of disciplinary actions. Of the 151 offenses, 91 come from our ED population. Fifth grade had the highest number of incidences with horseplay and roughness was the most common.
First six weeks had the lowest attendance. The sixth six weeks had the highest attendance.
Hispanic had the most attendance with 47% and then At Risk students had 70%, ED was 59%.

Strengths

Our strength is the diversity of our community.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus attendance rate was 94.3% which is below the district average of 96%. (AA having cumulative 91.6)	Lack of a clear/ robust system for tracking and following up with absences and rewards for attendance.
2	The highest number of relative risk of students receiving a disciplinary action was AA at 2.74 which is significantly higher than any other demographic at our campus.	

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

- 1416 kids remain stagnant especially in 4th grade are a huge concern 13% are Approaches based on MAP
- **1416 kids and our Hispanic and AA population are under performing based on MAP**
- Students not maintaining their performance level from grade level to grade level

Grade		STAAR A	STAAR M	STAAR MS
3rd	Math Reading	61 56	39 42	20 21
4th	Math Reading	68 55	47 38	21 22
5th	Math Reading	74 59	47 32	21 12

Strengths

One notable strength is that the students are, for the most part, well-behaved, compliant, and eager to engage in learning. They come into the classroom with a positive attitude and demonstrate a readiness to follow directions, which helps create a calm and productive learning environment.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Mathematics academic growth (61%) is below the 69% target despite year-over-year improvement.	Not a clear understanding of TEKS and productive struggle.
2 ★	Only 39% of students reached Meets in mathematics (target 49%), with Hispanic (31%), Econ Disadv (31%), Emergent Bilingual (21%), and Special Ed (31%) students furthest from target.	Small groups instruction is not consistently targeted or data driven across grade levels. Monitoring is not done with fidelity.
3	Meets performance in 3rd grade reading was 39% with special attention to our AA 28% and Hispanic populations 31%who are underperforming.	Lack of CBLI strategies to level up the opportunities for EB's to interact with grade level content.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Overall, the campus is in need of updated systems and programs that all staff are accountable for.

While teams planned collaboratively and analyzed data to drive instruction and intervention, accountability or follow up on developed plans was lacking. Planning was focused more on plugging from curriculum and completing lesson plans rather than rehearsal of instruction. Overall, students did not make expected growth. Organization of SSPs and intervention were strong, however, documentation of implementation was lacking. HB1416 students did not make growth. Rehearsal of instruction was not implemented until March.

PBIS systems need updating, whole staff buy in and follow through with administrative support. Processes for discipline/behavior need review and to be implemented with fidelity.

Changes to the mentor program will focus on more individualized support and on specific learning that benefits new teachers.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Over 50% of office referrals occurred outside the classroom	Lack of clear streamlined expectations and guidelines for common areas for both staff and students (PBIS).
2	Overall, students did not meet district standards for expected growth.	
3	Student data reflects lack of progress monitoring for student support plans	

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Based on the data, teachers want to be able to provide more input on the optimal functioning of the school. We also need to work on finding a way for parents and the community to be able to provide input on our school. Success needs to be celebrated across the board for staff and students.
Staff would like more opportunities to observe and discuss effective teaching. This will be helped when the new coaching model is implemented, where teachers can go through a rehearsal of teaching and get clear and modeled feedback.
Communication could be improved. We would love more information and communication about what is going on at our school and what is coming up.
A big strength is that students and staff feel safe at school. Parents feel like the school is a safe place. Community engagement is strong with Custer Road Church and the PTA.
For attendance, we need to focus on parents. Students want to be at school, it's just the parents that are struggling to get them there.
We feel like staff retention will improve with new leadership. More hopeful about support moving forward. We do not feel like there is any missing data related to public perceptions. It felt very comprehensive.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers need regular opportunities to observe effective teaching and practice instructional strategies with direct feedback and modeling.	
2	Teachers and staff are looking for a structured, reliable channel to provide meaningful input on school operations.	
3	Teachers and staff desire greater transparency into current school activities and future scheduling.	
4 ★	Based on feedback from HRS, only 22% of teachers strongly agreed to the statement: "I can explain which of my instructional strategies have the strongest and weakest relationships to student achievement."	There is lack of clarity of RBIS as well as limited feedback and coaching for staff on instructional practices.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus attendance rate was 94.3% which is below the district average of 96%. (AA having cumulative 91.6)	Lack of a clear/ robust system for tracking and following up with absences and rewards for attendance.
2 ★	Mathematics academic growth (61%) is below the 69% target despite year-over-year improvement.	Not a clear understanding of TEKS and productive struggle.
3 ★	Only 39% of students reached Meets in mathematics (target 49%), with Hispanic (31%), Econ Disadv (31%), Emergent Bilingual (21%), and Special Ed (31%) students furthest from target.	Small groups instruction is not consistently targeted or data driven across grade levels. Monitoring is not done with fidelity.
4 ★	Over 50% of office referrals occurred outside the classroom	Lack of clear streamlined expectations and guidelines for common areas for both staff and students (PBIS).
5 ★	Based on feedback from HRS, only 22% of teachers strongly agreed to the statement: "I can explain which of my instructional strategies have the strongest and weakest relationships to student achievement."	There is lack of clarity of RBIS as well as limited feedback and coaching for staff on instructional practices.

★ = 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] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**
- [x] **Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data**

Accountability Data

- [x] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **State and federally required assessment information**
- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **STAAR released test questions**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Tejas LEE, or other alternate early reading assessment results**
- [x] **Local diagnostic reading assessment data**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**
- [x] **Observation Survey 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] **Homeless data**
- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**

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] **Professional development needs assessment data**
- [x] **T-TESS data**
- [x] **T-PESS data**

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Organizational structure data**
- [x] **Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation**
- [x] **Communications data**

☑ **Capacity and resources data**

Priorities

Priority 1

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

Raise student achievement to the Meets standard and close group gap, with a focus in math, so Christie exits CSI status

Performance Target: Math meet all STAAR % increase from 39% to 49%.
EB students math STAAR % increase from 21% to 35%
SPED students math STAAR % increase from 31% to 45 %

Expected Result: Increase STAAR meet percentage for all students in math. With specific attention to EB population, Sped population

Strategy 1

Run data-driven small groups in mathematics (and reading) formed from common formative assessments and progress monitoring, with named rosters for Hispanic, Econ Disadv, Emergent Bilingual, and Special Ed students at Approaches and within reach of Meets.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Instructional Coaches, PLC Facilitators, Data/ Assessment Lead

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Funding Sources: 211 Title I, Part A, $4,000

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Use weekly PLCs for the rehearsal of math instruction: teams unpack the TEKS to Meets-level depth, then plan, practice, and refine the lesson and the small-group task before delivering it to students.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Staff Responsible PLC Facilitators, Instructional Coaches, Team/ Grade-Level Leads, Assistant Principals, Principal

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Funding Sources: 211 Title I, Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Deploy learning labs centered on math and explicit gradual release -- coaches model, teams observe, debrief, and immediately apply the moves that carry students from Approaches to Meets.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches, Host Teachers, Principal, District Curriculum Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Integrate language supports (sentence stems, vocabulary routines, comprehensible input) into math and reading small groups for Emergent Bilingual students, so the campus's strong TELPAS progress translates into content Meets.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Staff Responsible Teachers, EB/ESL Specialist, Instructional Coaches, Dual language coaches, Administrators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Funding Sources: 211 Title I, Part A, $4,800

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Implement HB 1416 accelerated instruction by using MAP, STAAR and formative assessment

data to identify students, provide targeted support and monitor progress to improve student achievement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Walkthrough feedback, unit assessments, district assessments, team planning agendas and grade level data dashboards

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Mathematics academic growth (61%) is below the 69% target despite year-over-year improvement.	Not a clear understanding of TEKS and productive struggle.
2	Only 39% of students reached Meets in mathematics (target 49%), with Hispanic (31%), Econ Disadv (31%), Emergent Bilingual (21%), and Special Ed (31%) students furthest from target.	Small groups instruction is not consistently targeted or data driven across grade levels. Monitoring is not done with fidelity.

Goal 2

Build the instructional system and the capacity of staff, coaches, and administrators to increase rigor -- moving students to Meets and Masters in al STAARS with a focus in Reading -- and sustain improvement

Performance Target: Raising the Reading Masters rate on STAAR from 18% to 25%

Expected Result: Increased the number of students in Meets and Masters in Reading STAAR

Strategy 1

Articulate and calibrate campus-wide expectations for rigorous Tier 1 instruction, shared look-fors defined to Meets/Masters depth, through walkthroughs and feedback cycles that include campus administrators and district office leaders.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, District Office Leaders

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Deliver explicit gradual-release professional development ("I do, we do, you do") on rigor, higher-order questioning, and student discourse, so staff experience as learners the model expected in classrooms for RLA and follow the instructional model for math

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, AP's, Instructional Coaches, teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Establish job-embedded coaching cycles tied to student data and classroom evidence, with campus administrators and district leaders participating in PLCs and learning labs to build and calibrate their instructional leadership.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches, Principal, Assistant Principals, SLI

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Institute a data-driven decision-making (DDI) routine owned by teams and monitored by leaders: common assessment, analysis of Approaches/Meets/Masters, reteach and small-group action, then progress monitoring.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: PLC Facilitators, teachers, administrators.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Implement HB 1416 accelerated instruction by using MAP, STAAR and formative assessment data to identify students, provide targeted support and monitor progress to improve student achievement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Walkthrough feedback, unit assessments, district assessments, team planning agendas and grade level data dashboards

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Mathematics academic growth (61%) is below the 69% target despite year-over-year improvement.	Not a clear understanding of TEKS and productive struggle.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Based on feedback from HRS, only 22% of teachers strongly agreed to the statement: "I can explain which of my instructional strategies have the strongest and weakest relationships to student achievement."	There is lack of clarity of RBIS as well as limited feedback and coaching for staff on instructional practices.

Priority 2 4.3 Create a culture of belonging for all members of the Plano ISD community.

Goal 1

Strengthen belonging, connection, and academic confidence for every student, especially Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and highly mobile learners to improve daily attendance, reduce chronic absenteeism, and increase student engagement.

Performance Target: Increase our attendance from 94% to at least 96%

Expected Result: Improve our attendance and mobility rate

Strategy 1

Implement consistent relationship and connection routines (/morning meetings, greetings, check-ins) plus a welcome/onboarding process for new and highly mobile students, so every student is known by name, strength, and need

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Counselors, Assistant Principals, Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Use small-group instruction as a belonging lever -- low-risk, high-support settings where Emergent Bilingual and Special Education students engage, take academic risks, and receive targeted feedback.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches, teachers, admin

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Use data -- attendance, behavior, and formative/engagement data -- to identify disconnected students early and coordinate a timely MTSS response.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselors, MTSS/Intervention Team, Assistant Principals, Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus attendance rate was 94.3% which is below the district average of 96%. (AA having cumulative 91.6)	Lack of a clear/ robust system for tracking and following up with absences and rewards for attendance.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Only 39% of students reached Meets in mathematics (target 49%), with Hispanic (31%), Econ Disadv (31%), Emergent Bilingual (21%), and Special Ed (31%) students furthest from target.	Small groups instruction is not consistently targeted or data driven across grade levels. Monitoring is not done with fidelity.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Over 50% of office referrals occurred outside the classroom	Lack of clear streamlined expectations and guidelines for common areas for both staff and students (PBIS).

Goal 2

Foster a culture of belonging among staff and families by strengthening collaboration, trust, and partnership through consistent implementation of PBIS practices that support positive relationships,

shared expectations, and a safe, inclusive school environment.

Performance Target: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, implement PBIS with fidelity across all school settings, with at least 90% of staff consistently using common behavior expectations, acknowledgment strategies, and relationship-building practices, and increase the percentage of students and families who report feeling a sense of belonging and trust in the school by 10 percentage points from the baseline.

Expected Result: Increase in retention of staff, increase on family participation on events.

Strategy 1

Build a collaborative, trusting staff culture through PLCs where educators rehearse instruction and learn together in a supportive, non-competitive setting -- protecting collective efficacy under turnaround pressure.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, AP's, PLC Facilitators, Instructional Coaches, Team Leads

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Use learning labs as non-evaluative, growth-oriented peer learning, so staff feel safe opening their classrooms and learning from one another.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coaches, Host Teachers, Assistant Principals, Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Create two-way, language-accessible family engagement -- welcoming events, academic partnership sessions, and translated communication -- that positions Emergent Bilingual and economically disadvantaged families as partners in learning.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Counselors, Family Engagement Liaison, EB/ESL Specialist, Teachers

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Funding Sources: 211 Title I, Part A, $2,400

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Gather and act on staff and family belonging/climate data, closing the loop by communicating what was heard and what actions were taken.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Campus Leadership Team, Counselors, District Office Leaders

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Based on feedback from HRS, only 22% of teachers strongly agreed to the statement: "I can explain which of my instructional strategies have the strongest and weakest relationships to student achievement."	There is lack of clarity of RBIS as well as limited feedback and coaching for staff on instructional practices.

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 Title I, Part A

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1		--	$4,000.00
1	1	2		--	$3,000.00
1	1	4		--	$4,800.00
2	2	3		--	$2,400.00
				Sub-Total	$14,200.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$29,805.00
				+/- Difference	**$15,605.00**