Plano Independent School District

Pearson Early Childhood School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:37 PM

Mission Statement

At Pearson ECS, we lay the foundation for early learners by supporting families, fostering a love of learning through play, developing the whole child, and providing a nurturing, safe haven for all.

Vision

Committed to Excellence

Dedicated to Caring

Powered by Learning

Pearson Proud

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 11

School Processes & Programs 25

Perceptions 32

Priority Problem Statements 40

Data Documentation for CNA 42

Improvement Planning Data 43

Accountability Data 43

Student Data: Assessments 43

Student Data: Student Groups 43

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 44

Employee Data 44

Parent/Community Data 45

Support Systems and Other Data 45

Priorities 46

Priority 1 : 1.1 Strategic Plan: Improve, align and remove barriers for academic prog... 47

Priority 2 : 4.2 Strategic Plan: Improve interventions and systems of supports to en... 52

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What is the profile of our campus? Who are we and who do we serve?	Ethnicity: Asian - 36.4% White - 25% AA - 19.1% Two+ - 9.6% Hispanic - 8.6% Am. Indian - 1.0% M- 58.6%; F-41.4% ESL - 52.7%; Denial - .91% ED - 28.6% At Risk - 63.6% Sped - 51%	In regards to ethnicity, our percentages have stayed consistent over the past two years. We have a diverse campus student population that enriches experiences and meaningful learning for students, but also requires significant support and differentiation in addressing the diverse needs of students (SPED, ESL, At-risk).
What are the trends in enrollment over the last three years by demographics and programs (Eco Dis, EL, SPED, GT)? Are the demographics within each program proportional to the campus demographics?	In 25-26 our ESL population has grown by appx. 4%. Students coded at risk increased in 25-26 from 52% to 64% - an increase of 12%. This is a significant shift. Sped ratios have maintained consistency.	The ED percentage grew in 24-26 over the prior year from 28% to 44%. This year we dropped back down to the 23-24 percentages. Consider why at-risk numbers have increased, since our student population (Ethnicity and geographical area) have not really changed. Could the factor be economical climate and change with increasing inflation, cost of living, and job trends causing families to be more at-risk.

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What are the trends in graduation over three years by ethnicity?	n/a	n/a
What are the teacher/student ratios? How do these ratios compare to performance? (discuss after all CNA groups are completed)	Maximum in PK: 2:18 Maximum in EE: 3: 10	Increase in consistency of staff. Ratios are largely the same across similar classroom types. Not enough variation to impact student performance significantly. Students with IEPs who need more specialized support are supported in higher staff: student ratio classrooms.
CCMR: What are the trends in 6th grade advanced academics course enrollments within each student group?	n/a	n/a

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What are the trends in attendance, including PARB Referrals, within each student group?	Overall Attendance: Excused Absences: 0 - 25% 1-11 - 70% 12-19 - 5% 20+ - 1% Unexcused Absences: 0 - 33% 1-3 - 39% 4-9 - 22% 10+ - 6% Tardy: 0 - 47% 1-6 - 32% 7-15 - 13% 16+ - 8% Students coded as EE on average have 1-2% more absences than PK students. This is similar to the 24-25 school year. Homeless students are inconsistent in attendance from period to period.	The number of students with unexcused absences and tardies is of concern. Specifically tardies disrupt learning and flow for the student who is late, the teacher, and the classroom of students who have to stop instruction and reset each time a child enters the classroom late. We need to focus supports and parent education on tardies. Teachers report parents share transportation as a concern for getting to school on time. EE students are more often out for related services/therapies than their PK counterparts, so their increased absences may be a result of this. Homeless students struggle to have basic needs met and reliable transportation. They are often living further from the school as well in shelters or go between multiple living spaces. Offering MKV transportation could help provide consistent and reliable transportation for these students. This has not been offered previously, but will be offered going forward as a resource for PK MKV students.

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What are the trends in behavior placements (ISS, OSS, DAEP, JJAEP expulsions) within each student group?	We don't have ISS/OSS, however, we reviewed Review360 campus incidents. Physical aggression increased from 59 to 68%. Sped physical aggression increased from 63 to 73% Unsafe actions increased from 55% to 58% Classroom disruptions decreased from 51% to 46% Aggravation/ agitation of others increased from 35% to 44% Emotional outbursts increased from 33% to 38%, but are still significantly down from 23-24 when they were 70%. 94% of the incidents involved males 6% of the incidents involved females	Students' emotional regulation has decreased over the past three years, in part due to an increase in intentional instruction on self-regulation and emotional state regulation strategies. It's important to note that 115 of the 242 in-class incidents were 2 students. This greatly skews the overall behavioral data for all students across the campus.

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
Based on the demographic trends and patterns, what are the strengths and needs of the campus?		What are our greatest strengths? 1. Diversity 2. Intentional focus on feelings, emotions, and self-regulation strategies through instructional content daily which correspond with a reduction in emotional outburst data over the past 3 years. 3. Training delivered to staff to support the diverse language and behavioral needs of students. What are our greatest needs? (Potential Problem Statements) 1. Education for parents on truancy and how it impacts their child and others. • 21% of students have 7 or more tardies. 2. Strategies to help teachers with aggressive student behaviors. • Aggression behaviors have increased by 9% over last year. 3. Strategies to support engagement of males to reduce overall behaviors. • Male students account for 94% of all incident reports. 4. Provide parents education on how school works to prepare them and their child through the summer to support transition into this type of environment. The committee feels it is important to note that due to state criteria changes for PK eligibility (students of educators) and district changes including allowing tuition students to be placed at ECS campuses and opening PreK for transfers from other districts, our demographics will likely be notably different for the 26-27 school year. In addition, the number of students served per classroom has been increased and the allocation of special education students per classroom has been decreased.

Strengths

What are our greatest strengths?
1. Diversity
2. Intentional focus on feelings, emotions, and self-regulation strategies through instructional content daily which correspond with a reduction in emotional outburst data over the past 3 years.
3. Training delivered to staff to support the diverse language and behavioral needs of students.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.
2	Based on Review360 behavior reports, physical aggression and unsafe behaviors were the most frequent student behavior concerns, with physical aggression occurring in 67.8% of incidents and unsafe actions occurring in 60.0% of incidents during the 2025-2026 school year.	Limited development of age-appropriate self-regulation, communication, and problem-solving skills contributed to the high frequency of physical aggression and unsafe behaviors.
3	Behavior incident reports are disproportionately attributed to male students, who account for 94.5% of reports while representing 59.6% of total campus enrollment.	A mismatch between the behavioral regulation needs of some male students and the intensity and timing of available supports contributed to their disproportionate representation in incident reports.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Student Achievement Mathematics A. CLI Circle - Math (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on CLI Math Reports.

*PK Students Only Reported

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support	Monitor	Out of Range
Wave 1 Eng	84%	16%	0%	0%
Wave 2 Eng	91%	9%	0%	0%
Wave 3 Eng	91%	9%	0%	0%

- Percentage on track to meet Early Childhood Math goals at BOY, MOY and EOY.

B. Quick Check - Math / Rote Counting (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on Quick Check Reports.

**Data reported for students at Pearson all year.

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support
QC #1	29%	71%
QC #2	52%	48%
QC #3	70%	30%
QC #4	79%	21%

- Percentage that met standard/guidelines at each 9-week period.

C. Math CNA Summary

See instructions on page 4.

	Strengths	Areas to Grow
CIRCLE	**Number Identification and Discrimination** showed exceptional growth and became a clear campus strength. By Wave 3, 92% of students were on track in Number Discrimination and 88% in Number Naming, reflecting strong development in foundational number recognition skills. **Shape Skills** emerged as another major strength. Shape Naming increased from 56% to 90% on track, while Shape Discrimination grew from 56% to 91%, indicating students developed strong geometry and visual discrimination skills over the course of the year. **Counting Sets and Rote Counting** de monstrated significant growth in foundational counting concepts. Counting Sets improved from 48% to 86% on track, and Rote Counting increased from 27% to 82%, showing strong gains in number sense and counting fluency.	**Operations** continues to be the weakest math skill area. While students improved significantly from 14% on track in Wave 1 to 59% on track in Wave 3, 41% of students still need support in solving simple operations problems. This suggests students continue to struggle with applying number concepts to addition/ subtraction thinking and problem solving. **Rote Counting** showed strong growth (27% to 82% on track), but it remains one of the lower-performing foundational number skills compared to other math areas by Wave 3. This indicates some students still need continued practice with counting fluency and sequence automaticity.
QuickCheck-RoteCounting	**The campus demonstrated strong overall growth in rote counting across the school year.** Students meeting standard increased from 27% on Quick Check #1 to 75% on Quick Check #4, showing significant gains in foundational counting fluency and number sequence understanding. **Consistent upward growth occurred across each assessment window.** Th e percentage of students meeting standard steadily increased from 27% → 50% → 68% → 75%, indicating instructional practices and interventions supported continuous student progress throughout the year.	**Additional support is still needed to move more students to mastery by the end of the year.** While growth was substantial, approximately 25% of students were still not meeting the rote counting standard by Quick Check #4, suggesting continued focus is needed on counting automaticity and foundational number sense skills for some learners. Students get stuck in their teens. Need to find strategies that nonverbally instruct to continue counting.

Priority Problem Statements (you can look back at the specifics you entered before the summary to help narrow down priority problem statements especially when considering specific student groups).

	Strengths	Areas to Grow

1. Based on CLI Circle Math data, 41% of Pre-K students continued to need support in Operations by Wave 3, despite overall campus growth from 14% to 59% on track between Wave 1 and Wave 3.
2. Based on Quick Check Rote Counting data, 21% of Pre-K students did not meet grade-level expectations by Quick Check #4, and rote counting remained one of the lowest-performing math skill areas compared to other end-of-year math measures.
3. Based on CLI Circle Math data, foundational counting skills demonstrated lower overall performance than number identification and shape skills throughout the year, with Rote Counting reaching 82% on track by Wave 3 compared to 90–92% mastery in shape and number discrimination skills.

Student Achievement Reading

A. CLI Circle - Phonological Awareness

Record the percentage of students based on CLI PA Reports.

*PK Students Only Reported

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support	Monitor	Out of Range
Wave 1 Eng	73%	27%	0%	0%
Wave 2 Eng	76%	24%	0%	0%
Wave 3 Eng	78%	22%	0%	0%

- Percentage on track to meet Early Childhood PA goals at BOY, MOY and EOY.

B. Quick Check - Literacy / Letter Sound Correspondence (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on Quick Check Reports.

**Data reported for students at Pearson all year.

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support
QC #1	24%	76%
QC #2	63%	37%
QC #3	83%	17%
QC #4	89%	11%

- Percentage that met standard/guidelines at each 9-week period.

C. CFA - Receptive and Expressive Language (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on CFA Reports.

Testing Wave	Receptive			Expressive		
	Mastered	Approaching	Needs Support	Mastered	Approaching	Needs Support
CFA #1 Pre	43%	43%	15%	5%	44%	52%
CFA #1 Post	80%	14%	6%	57%	32%	10%
CFA #1 Growth	**37%**			**53%**		
CFA #2 Pre	59%	37%	4%	6%	55%	39%

CFA #2 Post	82%	13%	4%	53%	35%	13%
CFA #2 Growth	**24%**			**47%**		
CFA #3 Pre	69%	21%	10%	10%	58%	32%
CFA #3 Post	88%	8%	4%	56%	38%	6%
CFA #3 Growth	**19%**			**46%**		
CFA #4 Pre	57%	38%	5%	8%	47%	45%
CFA #4 Post	90%	7%	2%	64%	28%	8%
CFA #4 Growth	**34%**			**56%**		

- Percentage that met standard/guidelines at each check point.

D. Reading CNA Summary

See instructions on page 4.

	Detailed Summary Strengths	Detailed Summary Areas to Grow
CIR CLE	**Rapid Letter Naming showed exceptional growth and became a major literacy strength.** Students increased from 59% on track in Wave 1 to 91% on track in Wave 3, indicating strong gains in automatic letter recognition and early literacy readiness. **Letter-Sound Correspondence emerged as a strong end-of-year skill area.** While not assessed in Wave 1, by Wave 3, 91% of students were on track, demonstrating strong foundational phonics development and the ability to connect letters to sounds. **Phonological Awareness skills demonstrated substantial overall growth.** Students made significant gains across all subskills, especially Onset-Rime (19% to 70%) and Syllabication (4% to 59%), showing strong development in hearing, identifying, and manipulating sounds in words.	We need to teach the children the process of thinking in the way that the assessment task is asking them to perform. Additionally, we need to strengthen working memory. **Rapid Vocabulary continues to be an area of need.** Although students improved from 39% to 62% on track, 38% of students still require support, suggesting expressive/receptive vocabulary development remains a challenge. **Advanced phonological awareness skills remain inconsistent for many students.** Despite strong growth, Alliteration (51% on track) and Rhyming (59% on track) remain lower-performing literacy skills by Wave 3, indicating continued need for targeted phonological awareness instruction.

	Detailed Summary Strengths	Detailed Summary Areas to Grow
Quick Check - Letter Sound Correspondence	**The campus demonstrated strong overall growth in letter-sound correspondence throughout the year.** Across classrooms, students showed steady gains from Quick Check #1 through Quick Check #4, reflecting strong growth in foundational phonics skills and increasing ability to connect letters with their corresponding sounds. **Most classrooms reached high levels of mastery by the final assessment window.** By Quick Check #4, many classes had large majorities of students meeting standard, with several classrooms reaching near or full mastery. This indicates that instruction and intervention practices effectively supported early literacy development across the campus.	**Continued support is needed for students who are still developing automaticity with sounds.** While overall growth was significant, some classrooms continued to show groups of students who had not yet mastered the full set of letter-sound correspondences by the final quick check, suggesting a continued need for targeted small-group phonics instruction and repeated practice opportunities.

	Detailed Summary Strengths	Detailed Summary Areas to Grow
CFA - Oral Language	**Receptive vocabulary development was a significant campus-wide strength across all units.** Students consistently demonstrated strong growth from the Beginning of Unit Quick Checks to the End of Unit Quick Checks. Receptive mastery increased: • **Unit 2:** 43% → 80% (**+37 percentage points**) • **Unit 4:** 59% → 82% (**+24 points**) • **Unit 6:** 69% → 88% (**+19 points**) • **Unit 8:** 57% → 90% (**+34 points**) By the end of instruction, students consistently demonstrated the ability to understand and identify vocabulary words and concepts at very high levels, with Unit 8 reaching **90% mastery campus-wide**. This suggests strong instructional alignment, repeated exposure to vocabulary, and effective use of visual and contextual supports. **Expressive vocabulary growth showed substantial gains across every unit.** Students demonstrated major improvement in their ability to verbally use and apply vocabulary: • **Unit 2:** 5% → 57% mastery (**+53 points**) • **Unit 4:** 6% → 53% mastery (**+47 points**) • **Unit 6:** 10% → 56% mastery (**+46 points**) • **Unit 8:** 8% → 64% mastery (**+56 points**) This data reflects strong student growth in verbal language production, oral language confidence, and ability to make connections using newly learned vocabulary. Unit 8 was especially notable, with expressive mastery increasing by more than half the student population. **Instructional impact was strongest over time, indicating cumulative language growth throughout the year.** As the year progressed, beginning-of-unit receptive scores became progressively higher (43% → 59% → 69% → 57%), while end-of-unit mastery continued climbing to as high as **90% receptive mastery** and **64% expressive mastery** by Unit 8. This suggests students retained prior vocabulary learning and increasingly generalized language skills across units rather than learning in	**Expressive language continues to lag behind receptive language development.** Although expressive language showed strong growth, expressive mastery remained consistently lower than receptive mastery in every unit: • Unit 2: 80% receptive vs. 57% expressive • Unit 4: 82% receptive vs. 53% expressive • Unit 6: 88% receptive vs. 56% expressive • Unit 8: 90% receptive vs. 64% expressive This indicates many students can recognize and understand vocabulary before they are able to independently verbalize and apply it. Continued focus on oral language opportunities, sentence stems, peer conversation, and structured expressive language practice will help close this gap. **A significant percentage of students remained in the "some knowledge" category at the end of units, especially in expressive language.** At the end of Unit 8 expressive language, **28% of students still demonstrated only partial mastery**, while 8% remained at little/no knowledge. Similar patterns were seen across Units 2–6. This suggests students benefit from repeated exposure and scaffolds but may need additional opportunities for independent vocabulary application and generalization in authentic classroom interactions.

	isolation.	

Priority Problem Statements (you can look back at the specifics you entered before the summary to help narrow down priority problem statements especially when considering specific student groups).
1. Based on CLI Circle Reading data, 38% of Pre-K students continued to need support in Rapid Vocabulary by Wave 3, despite growth from 39% to 62% on track between Wave 1 and Wave 3. 2. Based on CLI Phonological Awareness data, advanced phonological awareness skills remained inconsistent by the end of the year, with only 51% of students on track in Alliteration and 59% on track in Rhyming by Wave 3. 3. Based on CFA Oral Language data, expressive vocabulary performance remained consistently lower than receptive vocabulary performance across all units, with Unit 8 ending at 90% receptive mastery compared to 64% expressive mastery. 4. Based on Quick Check Letter-Sound Correspondence data, 11% of students continued to need support by Quick Check #4 despite overall campus growth from 24% to 89% on track throughout the year.

Develop Priority Problem Statements (you can look back at the specifics you entered before the summary to help narrow down priority problem statements especially when considering specific student groups).

Student Achievement Social Emotional Learning

A. CLI Circle - Social Emotional Learning (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on CLI SEL Reports.

*PK Students Only Reported

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support	Overall Average Score	2024-2025 average score, % mastery
Wave 1 Eng	98%	2%	36.45	35.27, 89%
Wave 2 Eng	93%	7%	47.96	41.78, 86%
Wave 3 Eng	92%	8%	54.35	48.23, 80%

- Percentage on track to meet Early Childhood SEL goals at BOY, MOY and EOY.
- “On Track” Wave 1 is 9/62, Wave 2 29/62, Wave 3 is 37/62

B. Quick Check - Follows Classroom Rules and Routines (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on Quick Check Reports.

**Data reported for students at Pearson all year.

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support
QC #1	39%	61%
QC #2	61%	39%
QC #3	70%	30%
QC #4	78%	22%

- Percentage that met standard/guidelines at each 9-week period.

C. Quick Check - Regulates Own Behavior (Pre-K)

Record the percentage of students based on Quick Check Reports.

**Data reported for students at Pearson all year.

Testing Wave	On Track	Needs Support
QC #1	45%	55%
QC #2	58%	42%
QC #3	68%	32%
QC #4	75%	25%

- Percentage that met standard/guidelines at each 9-week period.

D. SEL CNA Summary

See instructions on page 4.

	Strengths	Areas to Grow
CIRCLE	**Overall Social Emotional Learning remained a strong campus-wide area.** Students maintained very high performance from Wave 1 (98% on track) to Wave 3 (92% on track), indicating students consistently demonstrated strong social-emotional functioning across the year. **Classroom routines, self-care, and learning behaviors appear to be well established across classrooms.** While the subdomains are not individually benchmarked, the consistently high overall SEL outcomes suggest strengths in classroom community, student independence, and approaches to learning.	**Maintaining emotional regulation and social behaviors across the full school year remains an area for continued support.** Although performance remained strong overall, the slight decline from 98% to 92% on track suggests some students continue to need support with emotional regulation, peer interactions, and behavioral consistency as expectations and rigor increase through the year. **Continued focus on self-regulation and independence will help close remaining gaps for students needing support.** By Wave 3, 8% of students were still identified as needing support in SEL-related behaviors, indicating a need for ongoing explicit instruction and reinforcement of coping, problem-solving, and independent functioning skills.

	Strengths	Areas to Grow
QuickCheck-Rules&Routines	**Students demonstrated strong overall growth (39%) in following classroom rules and routines across the year.** Most classrooms showed substantial increases from Quick Check #1 to Quick Check #4, indicating students became increasingly independent with classroom expectations, transitions, and daily procedures. **Many classrooms reached high levels of mastery by the end of the year.** Several classes demonstrated 85–100% of students meeting the standard on the final quick check, showing that consistent instruction, structure, and reinforcement systems effectively supported student behavior and independence.	Compared to last year (43% growth), students have not demonstrated comparable growth in following routines. **Consistency across classrooms and student groups remains an area for continued focus.** While overall growth was strong, some classrooms still had groups of students requiring reminders and adult support to consistently follow routines by Quick Check #4, suggesting a continued need for explicit modeling, repetition, and individualized behavior support for some learners.
QuickCheck-RegulatesBehavior	**The campus demonstrated strong overall growth in students' ability to regulate their own behavior throughout the year.** The percentage of students meeting standard increased from **49% on Quick Check #1 to 80% on Quick Check #4**, representing a growth increase of more than **31 percentage points**. This indicates students became increasingly successful with managing emotions, responding to adult guidance, and functioning independently within classroom expectations. **Growth was consistent across each assessment window, showing sustained progress over time.** Campus percentages increased steadily from **49% → 60% → 72% → 80%**, suggesting that social-emotional supports, classroom structures, and explicit behavior instruction positively impacted student self-regulation skills across the year.	**A group of students continues to require adult support for independent behavior regulation.** Although overall growth was strong, approximately **20% of students were still not meeting the standard by Quick Check #4**, indicating continued need for targeted support with coping skills, emotional control, flexibility, and independent problem-solving. Continued focus on co-regulation strategies, visual supports, and explicit SEL instruction will help strengthen outcomes for these students.

	Strengths	Areas to Grow

Priority Problem Statements (you can look back at the specifics you entered before the summary to help narrow down priority problem statements especially when considering specific student groups).

1. Based on campus SEL and Quick Check data, a significant percentage of Pre-K students continued to require support with independent self-regulation and behavior management by the end of the year, with 25% of students not meeting expectations for regulating their own behavior and 22% not meeting expectations for following classroom rules and routines on Quick Check #4.
2. Based on campus behavior and demographic data, physical aggression and unsafe behaviors increased during the 2025–2026 school year, with physical aggression incidents increasing from 59% to 68% overall and from 63% to 73% among Special Education students.
3. Based on SEL implementation walkthrough data, consistent use of self-regulation and behavior support systems varied across classrooms, with Zones of Regulation strategies not observed during 61% of classroom walkthroughs despite being visibly displayed in classrooms.

Behavior & Attendance Data

A. Risk Ratios

Record the Risk Ratios based on each of the RDA indicators as outlined below.

Note: To retrieve Risk Ratio Data: Go to OnPoint; Click on the "Accountability" Header; Open "Results Driven Accountability"; Open "Indicators: Special Education"; Find Reports for all indicators (Risk Ratios are on the last line of the report); Run at end of year.

RISK RATIOS *Rate Threshold > 2.5 = SD designation for: SD (Year 1), SD (Year 2), SD (Year 3), or SD RP if applicable*	**Hispanic / Latino**	**Amer Indian / Alaskan**	**Asian**	**African American**	**Native Hawaiian / Pacific**	**White**	**Two or More Races**
RDA SPED Indicator #14: SPED OSS and Expulsion 10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)	0	0	0	**0**	0	0	0
RDA SPED Indicator #16: SPED ISS 10 Days Rate (Ages 3-21)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RDA SPED Indicator #18: SPED Total Disciplinary Removals Rate (Ages 3-21)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

B. Behaviors by Student Group

Record the data related to student groups and disciplinary actions as indicated below; the second table is specifically for special education students.

Note: Navigate to the Root Cause Tab in Edugence by logging in to Edugence on the Webdesk; from the menu on the left, click "Discipline". Once there, your discipline dashboard will appear. Click on the Root Cause Analysis tab. Run at end of year.

All Students	**Afr. Amer**	**Asia**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**Pacific Islander**	**Two or more**	**Whit**	**Tota**
Number of students referred for Disciplinary Action								
Number of students enrolled in District/School								
%age of students referred for Disciplinary Action								
%age of students enrolled in District/School								
%age of students within group reflected by referrals for disciplinary action								
Relative risk ratio of students receiving a disciplinary action								

	Afr. Amer	**Asia**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**	**Pacific Islander**	**Two or more**	**Whit**	**Tota**
Number of SPED students referred for Disciplinary Action								
Number of SPED students enrolled in District/School								
%age of SPED students referred for Disciplinary Action								
%age of SPED students enrolled in District/School								
%age of SPED students within group reflected by referrals for disciplinary action								
Relative risk ratio of all SPED students receiving a disciplinary action								

C. Attendance Data

Record the attendance percentages by reporting period.

To access your data, log into **OnPoint** on the **Webdesk**. At the top, click on **Students.** Then, click on the **Attendance Reports** tab. Once there, your information will be under **Percentage in Attendance Comparison by Ethnicity, Gender, Grade and Special Populations.**

Fill in at the end of each six weeks.	PIA - Reporting Period 1	PIA - Reporting Period 2	PIA - Reporting Period 3	PIA - Reporting Period 4	PIA - Reporting Period 5	PIA - Reporting Period 6	PIA - Cumulativ
All Students	95.6%	93.3%	92.3%	91.9%	91.6%	89.4%	92.2%
By Ethnicity							
Hispanic/Latino	96.2%	93.9%	93.9%	93.9%	90.6%	90.5%	93.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	100.0%	100%	94.9%	87.5%	96.8%	86.7%	93.0%
Asian	96.0%	93.0%	92.3%	91.6%	92.5%	91.2%	92.7%
Black or African American	95.6%	92.9%	91.1%	88.2%	88.9%	87.1%	90.3%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
White	96.8%	95.7%	93.5%	94.3%	92.3%	88.6%	93.1%
Two or More Races	88.4%	87.2%	90.3%	94.3%	93.3%	88.8%	90.6%
By Gender							
Male	95.2%	92.7%	92.0%	91.7%	91.4%	89.0%	91.8%
Female	96.4%	94.2%	92.8%	92.4%	91.9%	90.1%	92.7%
By Grade							
Early Education	95.7%	91.7%	91.7%	91.7%	89.8%	86.7%	90.9%
PreK	95.6%	94.2%	92.6%	92.1%	92.8%	91.1%	92.9%
By Special Population							
At Risk	95.0%	93.4%	91.9%	91.7%	91.6%	90.0%	92.2%
Economic Disadvantage	94.8%	92.7%	91.2%	87.3%	87.8%	86.8%	89.9%
Emergent Bilingual	96.0%	94.2%	92.6%	91.9%	92.2%	90.1%	92.7%
Foster Care	100.0%	96.0%	100.0%	94.6%	96.2%	87.3%	94.4%
Homeless Status	95.0%	84.6%	93.1%	87.5%	91.0%	91.9%	90.8%
Military Connected	98.2%	96.0%	97.2%	97.0%	97.9%	92.0%	96.5%
Section 504	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Special Education	95.7%	92.3%	92.7%	91.6%	90.9%	88.1%	91.9%
Transfer In Students	89.3%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%	92.5%	83.3%	92.6%
Unaccompanied Youth	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95.0%	86.7%	90.0%

Strengths

Number Identification and Discrimination showed exceptional growth and became a clear campus strength. By Wave 3, 92% of students were on track in Number Discrimination and 88% in Number Naming, reflecting strong development in foundational number recognition skills.

Shape Skills emerged as another major strength. Shape Naming increased from 56% to 90% on track, while Shape Discrimination grew from 56% to 91%, indicating students developed strong geometry and visual discrimination skills over the course of the year.

The campus demonstrated strong overall growth in rote counting across the school year. Students meeting standard increased from 27% on Quick Check #1 to 75% on Quick Check #4, showing significant gains in foundational counting fluency and number sequence understanding.

Consistent upward growth occurred across each assessment window. The percentage of students meeting standard steadily increased from 27% → 50% → 68% → 75%, indicating instructional practices and interventions supported continuous student progress throughout the year.

Counting Sets and Rote Counting demonstrated significant growth in foundational counting concepts. Counting Sets improved from 48% to 86% on track, and Rote Counting increased from 27% to 82%, showing strong gains in number sense and counting fluency.

Rapid Letter Naming showed exceptional growth and became a major literacy strength. Students increased from 59% on track in Wave 1 to 91% on track in Wave 3, indicating strong gains in automatic letter recognition and early literacy readiness.

Letter-Sound Correspondence emerged as a strong end-of-year skill area. While not assessed in Wave 1, by Wave 3, 91% of students were on track, demonstrating strong foundational phonics development and the ability to connect letters to sounds.

Phonological Awareness skills demonstrated substantial overall growth. Students made significant gains across all subskills, especially Onset-Rime (19% to 70%) and Syllabication (4% to 59%), showing strong development in hearing, identifying, and manipulating sounds in words.

The campus demonstrated strong overall growth in letter-sound correspondence throughout the year. Across classrooms, students showed steady gains from Quick Check #1 through Quick Check #4, reflecting strong growth in foundational phonics skills and increasing ability to connect letters with their corresponding sounds.

Most classrooms reached high levels of mastery by the final assessment window. By Quick Check #4, many classes had large majorities of students meeting standard, with several classrooms reaching near or full mastery. This indicates that instruction and intervention practices effectively supported early literacy development across the campus.

Receptive vocabulary development was a significant campus-wide strength across all units.

Students consistently demonstrated strong growth from the Beginning of Unit Quick Checks to the End of Unit Quick Checks. Receptive mastery increased:

- **Unit 2:** 43% → 80% (**+37 percentage points**)
- **Unit 4:** 59% → 82% (**+24 points**)
- **Unit 6:** 69% → 88% (**+19 points**)
- **Unit 8:** 57% → 90% (**+34 points**)

By the end of instruction, students consistently demonstrated the ability to understand and identify vocabulary words and concepts at very high levels, with Unit 8 reaching **90% mastery campus-wide**. This suggests strong instructional alignment, repeated exposure to vocabulary, and effective use of visual and contextual supports.

Expressive vocabulary growth showed substantial gains across every unit.

Students demonstrated major improvement in their ability to verbally use and apply vocabulary:

- **Unit 2:** 5% → 57% mastery (**+53 points**)
- **Unit 4:** 6% → 53% mastery (**+47 points**)
- **Unit 6:** 10% → 56% mastery (**+46 points**)
- **Unit 8:** 8% → 64% mastery (**+56 points**)

This data reflects strong student growth in verbal language production, oral language confidence, and ability to make connections using newly learned vocabulary. Unit 8 was especially notable, with expressive mastery increasing by more than half the student population.

Instructional impact was strongest over time, indicating cumulative language growth throughout the year.

As the year progressed, beginning-of-unit receptive scores became progressively higher (43% → 59% → 69% → 57%), while end-of-unit mastery continued climbing to as high as **90% receptive mastery** and **64% expressive mastery** by Unit 8. This suggests students retained prior vocabulary learning and increasingly generalized language skills across units rather than learning in isolation.

Overall Social Emotional Learning remained a strong campus-wide area. Students maintained very high performance from Wave 1 (98% on track) to Wave 3 (92% on track), indicating students consistently demonstrated strong social-emotional functioning across the year.

Classroom routines, self-care, and learning behaviors appear to be well established across classrooms. While the subdomains are not individually benchmarked, the consistently high overall SEL outcomes suggest strengths in classroom community, student independence, and approaches to learning.

Students demonstrated strong overall growth (39%) in following classroom rules and routines across the year. Most classrooms showed substantial increases from Quick Check #1 to Quick Check #4, indicating students became increasingly independent with classroom expectations, transitions, and daily procedures.

Many classrooms reached high levels of mastery by the end of the year. Several classes demonstrated 85–100% of students meeting the standard on the final quick check, showing that consistent instruction, structure, and reinforcement systems effectively supported student behavior and independence.

The campus demonstrated strong overall growth in students' ability to regulate their own behavior throughout the year. The percentage of students meeting standard increased from **49% on Quick Check #1 to 80% on Quick Check #4**, representing a growth increase of more than **31 percentage points**. This indicates students became increasingly successful with managing emotions, responding to adult guidance, and functioning independently within classroom expectations.

Growth was consistent across each assessment window, showing sustained progress over time. Campus percentages increased steadily from **49% → 60% → 72% → 80%**, suggesting that social-emotional supports, classroom structures, and explicit behavior instruction positively impacted student self-regulation skills across the year.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	An average of 57% of 4-year-old students demonstrated on-track mastery for rote counting on CLI data and 66.9% mastery on Quick Checks during the 2025-2026 school year.	Students experienced inconsistent exposure to rote counting reinforcement and math integration opportunities across classrooms and throughout the instructional day.
2 ★	Based on CLI Reading and Oral Language data, expressive language development remained significantly lower than receptive language development across all units, with Unit 8 ending at 90% receptive mastery compared to 64% expressive mastery.	Students had fewer consistent opportunities to engage in structured expressive language practice across the instructional day than opportunities to demonstrate receptive understanding.
3 ★	Based on CIRCLE Social Emotional Behaviors Overall Measure data, the percentage of Pre-K students on track decreased from 98% in Wave 1 to 93% in Wave 2 and 92% in Wave 3, while students needing support increased from 2% in Wave 1 to 7% in Wave 2 and 8% in Wave 3.	Students experienced inconsistent implementation of self-regulation strategies and behavior support systems across classrooms throughout the school year.
4	An average of 57% of 4-year-old students demonstrated on-track mastery for rote counting on CLI data and 66.9% mastery on Quick Checks during the 2025-2026 school year.	Inconsistent opportunities for explicit instruction, repeated practice, and application of rote counting skills across daily routines contributed to lower levels of mastery.
5 ★	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
How is the campus utilizing the Instructional Framework to improve student learning? What is the evidence of the effectiveness?	Pearson Website	The teachers utilize a shared planning agenda and have access to other teams agendas as well.
What does the data reflect about classes, schedules, and student/ staff teams? Does your master schedule take into consideration intervention, enrichment, etc?	Pearson Master Schedule 2025-2026 Pearson ECSE Documentation of Sped Services Walkthrough data through November	Within the master schedule, teachers have linked their class schedules to show small group intervention times. There is also a Special Education master schedule that shows the TLs schedule. Walkthrough data also looks at if small group or individual interventions were observed during the observation time.
What structures do you have in place for collaborative teams to effectively plan together using the Collaborative Team Framework? What role does the Campus Leadership Team have at these meetings?	Pearson Running PLC Agenda/ Notes P1	PLC Agenda is ongoing and the same between planning teams. The IC and/or admin are present at weekly planning meetings on Tuesdays.

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
How is data used to inform curriculum, instruction, and assessment decisions? How is data used to determine Targeted (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) supports and interventions for students?	Unit Data Tracker/ Quick Checks QUICK CHECK DATA 2025-2026 Pearson Data Binder 2025-2026	Using the quick check data, teachers select the students they are going to provide tier 2 and 3 interventions for and their scores are looked at on the following quick checks to see if they still meet that requirement. The Data Binder shows students who are not meeting standards and their progress each wave. This makes it easy for staff to see which students need more support.
CCMR: What is our process for advising students in grade 5 for course selections in grade 6? What data do we use to support advising students for the transition from grade 5 to grade 6? How can we ensure that students that show potential for success in advanced coursework in grade 6 select those courses?	NA	NA
What does the general data reflect regarding teacher quality on the campus? How is the follow-up data regarding teacher performance provided to teachers? Have you determined how you would provide Targeted (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) support and interventions for teachers?		
What is the impact/effect of our teacher mentor program? How are new staff supported? What feedback do they provide? How do mentors provide Targeted (Tier 2) and Intensive (Tier 3) support and interventions for their mentees?		New staff is supported through SpEd mentors and coaching. They are also assigned a campus mentor.
What systems are in place to build capacity and support the notion of continuous improvement? Do your Campus Leadership Teams set goals for the school year that are measurable? Do you map out how you will address an area of concern? How will you review the data to determine if your plan of action has been implemented with fidelity?	SBIC Meetings CNA and CIP HRS Surveys and staff meeting review	The HRS survey was taken by professional staff members. There was then a follow up meeting to give ideas and reasons why on the lowest scoring areas. The CIP is updated by the CARE team multiple times a year where it is discussed how much progress has been made.

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What is our process for interventions? How are students identified? How is it communicated to students and parents? How are intervention resources chosen? How do you progress monitor the intervention's rate of improvement? How do you determine if a student's lack of growth is related to the fidelity of intervention? What Universal (Tier 1), Targeted (Tier 2), and Intensive (Tier 3) supports and services are in place for students for attendance, behavior, and academics?	SST process and SST goal data Quick Check data Review 360	Counselor Buddy Group SST process Students are identified as tier 2 and 3 on their quick checks throughout the year Review 360 data is reviewed once a month to identify which students are needing consistent behavior interventions. Student Response Plans are then created for students who are needing this kind of support.
What is our behavior management process? What systems do we have in place to develop teacher capacity on behavior management? How do our teachers utilize the Leveled Behavior Guide?	TBSI Certificates	Student Response plans- created through SST for General Education students and with BIS support for Special Education students. BIS collaboration on campus Review 360- CARE team does a monthly data dig of the reports. CPI training for all of the CORE team and for all staff in self-contained classrooms. TBSI certificates maintained for all staff CORE/support team is in place to help assist in behavior management when needed.
How are we using data to determine professional learning for staff? What types of professional learning have staff attended? How is implementation monitored? What impact has it had on the intended area of practice? What is the follow-up?	Pearson ECS Staff Meeting Agendas 2025-2026 Walkthrough data	SIOP for all staff at staff meetings - walkthrough data shows how these strategies are being implemented and how often Ready Bodies Learning Minds training - implemented in weekly motor lab. IS member sets up new RBLM activities every few weeks. Love It Lose It Launch It for staff feedback and requests for trainings Coreboard communication training

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What does the data show as our 3 greatest strengths and 3 greatest needs?		What are our greatest strengths? 1. Quick checks have been super successful and give us lots of great data. 2. CORE team/support have been super consistent and good with helping behavior management and using a school wide cool down procedure. 3. SIOP strategies have been successful and there has been evidence of implementation in classrooms. What are our greatest needs? (Potential Problem Statements) 1. Having SSTs for students that are showing academic concerns/documenting on Edugence. 2. Identifying speech and behavior concerns/suspected eligibility earlier in the school year. 3. Collaborative planning structure set up from the beginning of the year and implemented with fidelity across planning teams.

A. Student Support Plans (Campus Reflection Tool)

- *Please begin your data review using the Student Support Dashboard in Edugence. To access your reports* logi to Edugence on the Webdesk. In the menu on the left, click “AI/Student Support”. Once there, your AI/ Student Support dashboard will appear. Click on the Student Support tab.
- *Complete the tables provided.*
- *Complete the guiding questions once you have completed the tables provided.*

All Students	Active SSPs	% of Active SSPs
212	7	3.3%

Type of SSP	Number of Active SSPs with Goals
Speech	12 (don’t know how to pull only active)
R/LA	0
Math	0
Behavior	4
Attendance	0

Guiding Questions	Observations from discussion
Is your percentage of Active SSPs greater than 10%?	No
Which grade level has the highest number of Active SSPs?	-
Which SSP type has the highest number of Active SSPs?	Speech
How often do you review the SSPs as a Campus Leadership Team including your MTSS Facilitators (Counselors, Sped Team Leader, EB Team Leader, and SSL)?	The Instructional Coach tracks them with the teachers involved.
What support do you need from district staff to support your Campus Leadership Team including your MTSS Facilitators (Counselors, Sped Team Leader, EB Team Leader, and SSL) in creating, implementing, and monitoring SSPs?	We need earlier identification of students of concern, especially those with speech or behavior concerns.

Strengths

What are our greatest strengths?

1. Quick checks have been super successful and give us lots of great data.
2. CORE team/support have been super consistent and good with helping behavior management and using a school wide cool down procedure.
3. SIOP strategies have been successful and there has been evidence of implementation in classrooms.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Based on walkthrough and instructional focus data, math skill reinforcement and integration occurred inconsistently across classrooms, with counting skills reinforced through songs or activities observed in only 33% of walkthroughs and rote counting identified as the instructional focus in only 10% of CIP observations.	Campus-wide expectations and systems for daily math integration and rote counting practice were implemented inconsistently across classrooms.
2	0% (0/17) of students tracked in Edugence and identified as Tier 2 or Tier 3 were monitored for academic needs.	The absence of a clearly defined and consistently implemented process for documenting and monitoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic interventions resulted in limited progress-monitoring data.
3	Based on walkthrough and instructional focus data, math skill reinforcement and integration occurred inconsistently across classrooms, with counting skills reinforced through songs or activities observed in only 33% of walkthroughs and rote counting identified as the instructional focus in only 10% of CIP observations.	The absence of a consistent campuswide approach for intentionally embedding and reinforcing counting skills across daily instruction and classroom routines contributed to uneven implementation.
4	4 out of 13 staff on the "Love it, lose it, launch it" requested increased sped training (IEP support, data support, case manager support, etc)	Limited access to ongoing, role-specific training and support related to IEP implementation, data collection, and case management contributed to staff-identified professional learning needs.
5 ★	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

6 ★	Based on CIRCLE Social Emotional Behaviors Overall Measure data, the percentage of Pre-K students on track decreased from 98% in Wave 1 to 93% in Wave 2 and 92% in Wave 3, while students needing support increased from 2% in Wave 1 to 7% in Wave 2 and 8% in Wave 3.	Students experienced inconsistent implementation of self-regulation strategies and behavior support systems across classrooms throughout the school year.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

A.

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
How do students and staff describe school climate including attitudes, respect, relationships, belonging, support, etc.? How does this compare across groups? Which groups responded in which manner?	Pearson love it, lose it, launch it, HRS Survey- Staff Jotform walkthrough form Graphs/Walkthrough Data	Generally across campus, there established procedures and staff perceives campus as safe and orderly. On the launch it, love it, lose it survey there seems to be positive feedback on connection activities, SOCO events, and little moments of joy, e.g., the 5 minute surprises. There were some concerns noted on HRS survey regarding: • It is clear which decisions will be made with direct teacher input. 1.3 – 3.91 • Reports of opinion data from staff, parents, and community are regularly generated and used transparently 1.5 – 3.86 • I have regular time to meet with other teachers to discuss effective instructional practices– 2.6– 3.9 • I have adequate time to teach effectively. 1.8 – 3.71 • School leaders limit the number of new initiatives, prioritizing those related to our schoolwide model of instruction. 2.1 — 3.76 • Opportunities to observe and discuss effective teaching via technology. 2.6 – 3.81 • School leaders collect data about how effective professional development is in improving teacher practices– 2.5– 3 .95 • My individual accomplishments have been adequately acknowledged and celebrated. – 1.7– 3.95 • School leaders give me feedback frequently. – 2.4 — 3.76 Key concerns from Love it, Lose it, Launch it: • Concerns were noted related to insufficient time for planning instruction/ completing required paperwork • Concerns noted regarding SPED paperwork checks for all staff • Noted concerns about lack of communication among team members supporting students • Staff requesting additional training for challenging behaviors • Structuring 3s classes to support differentiation • Teachers not feeling included in student discussions or recognizing how an SST can be utilized (not just for referrals, but to collaborate as a team regarding student needs)

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What does data reflect regarding student attendance, behaviors, discipline, etc.? What trends and patterns do you see? What trends and patterns do you see in regard to subpopulations? How do you know that universal (tier 1), targeted (tier 2), and intensive (Tier 3) interventions and supports are understood by our staff?	Attendance reports, Review 360 data	It's observed that many absences are from particular students and families. School administration has been working with many of these families to provide support. The data reflects that many of the reported Review 360 incidents involve a small number of students with multiple reports. Data shows that `100 percent of the discipline incidents involved black/african american students. Data shows that 100 percent of the reported incidents needing administrative review involved black/african american students.
What does the data indicate regarding effective classroom management and organization? How does this compare to classroom student achievement data?	Classroom walkthroughs, Circle data, Formative assessments, and quick checks	Focus observed- rote counting 10%, oral language/literacy = 44%. With increased focus on oral language and literacy this year, rote counting / transitions were not as frequently observed. Were counting skills observed with songs/ activities? 67% of the time, no. Zones of regulation not being utilized during time of observation 61% of the time. They are being displayed with evidence of use 83% of the time.
How do we monitor the current level of staff knowledge and usage of how and when to document incidents and run reports in Review 360?	Compare support calls to documented incidents, SST documentation and preparedness, care team kid talk and comparing to Review 360 data	Staff still are not documenting all calls for support / CORE team in Review 360. 252 reported incidents throughout the school year to date (as of 4/8/2026).
What evidence exists that families and community members are involved in meaningful activities that support students' learning? What are the activities? Which parents and community members are involved? What trends and patterns do we observe?	Parent training attendance, SBIC minutes and attendance, afterschool event attendance, parent craft/connection meetings, SPED parent trainings, Kari's community outreach.	34.8% of students attended the BOY family picnic with their parent(s). 46% of students attended the September classroom playdate with their parent(s). ** at MOY SBIC meeting, campus staff shared progress on key data highlights and areas of growth from CIRCLE assessment and Quick Checks with community members on SBIC **Preparing your home- 15 people attended; Potty training with special needs- 11 people attended; Routines and Rituals- 5 individuals; Intro to Autism- 17 people ** Parent Crafts/ Activity events- 1st- 6 people; 2nd one- 5 attendees, 3rd one- 5 attendees; March one- 2-3 attendees ** insert attendance info from Mariana's trainings ** Wellness Walk- around 250 attendees

Guiding Questions	Specific Data used for discussion	Observations from discussion
What are the community perceptions of our ability to support early literacy, early numeracy, and preparing students for their lives after school? (the bookends)	Parent feedback forms, Parent HRS Survey	Parent HRS survey indicated a score of 4.59 of 5 on indicator 1.4: "Teams of teachers at my child's school look at student achievement data to figure out how to improve students' learning."
What does the data show as our 3 greatest strengths and 3 greatest needs?	What are our greatest strengths? 1. School safety and procedures. 2. A PLC process is in place in our school. 3. School leaders and teacher leaders have developed a written document articulating our schoolwide model of instruction (i.e. Campus Instructional Snapshot). What are our greatest needs? (Potential Problem Statements) 1. Increasing staff awareness and utilization of SST as kid talk to problem solve and support student needs. 2. Continued difficulty with underreporting of support calls leading to inaccurate behavioral data in Review 360 regarding trends. 3. Staff morale suffering due to certain staff feeling excluded from shoutouts, staff afterschool events, etc. 4. Considerations for which meetings certain staff members need to attend, for example, some things may be less relevant to TAs. There are often weekly standing meetings which can limit time to set up the classroom/ complete paperwork. Limited time impacts all staff members.	

A. HRS Level 1 Data Review

Which HRS Level 1 Leading Indicators show agreement or disagreement in perceptions as indicated by the level of standard deviation?

- *Leading Indicators - Show what a school should work on to achieve a high reliability level (they provide direction to the right work). From Leading a High Reliability School, p. 30.*
- *Lagging Indicators - Evidence a school gives to validate its achievement of a high reliability level (proof, such as surveys, discipline/attendance data, and collected quick data).*

Materials needed for the data review:

- HRS Summary Reports (from ARPE and Survey Monkey)

Leading Indicators:
Using the HRS Level 1 Leading Indicator Summary report, identify teacher/staff leading indicators with a standard deviation of .80 or higher (blue font). High standard deviation indicates significant disagreement among responses.

Leading Indicator	Standard Deviation
1.5 – The manner in which opinion data from teachers and staff are used is transparent.	Don't have access to the standard deviation values at this time, however, these indicators appear to have the most disagreement between responses.

Mean Responses by Group
Using the grade level reports, identify mean responses lower than 4.0 (agree).

Leading Indicator	Means below 4.0
• It is clear which decisions will be made with direct teacher input.	• 1.3 – 3.91
• Reports of opinion data from staff, parents, and community are regularly generated and used transparently	• 1.5 – 3.86
• I have adequate time to teach effectively.	• 1.8 – 3.71
• My individual accomplishments have been adequately acknowledged and celebrated.	• 1.7– 3.95

What does the data show as our 3 greatest strengths and 3 greatest needs for HRS Level 1?	What are our greatest strengths? 1. Our school is a safe place. 2.School leaders coordinate with local law enforcement agencies regarding school safety issues. 3. A professional learning community (PLC) process is in place in our school. What are our greatest needs? (Potential Problem Statements) 1. Limited time for effective teaching. 2. Teachers' voices feeling heard.

In the following section, list leading indicators with high agreement.

HIGH LEADING INDICATOR
We do not have the gap of means data report to calculate exact agreement.

For questions with high disagreement, list the leading indicator.

LOW LEADING INDICATOR
See above for indicators with perceived high disagreement, however, note we do not have the exact data report to calculate this.

B. HRS Level 2 Data Review

Which HRS Level 2 Leading Indicators show agreement or disagreement in perceptions as indicated by the level of standard deviation?

- *Leading Indicators - Show what a school should work on to achieve a high reliability level (they provide*

direction to the right work). From Leading a High Reliability School, p. 30.

- *Lagging Indicators - Evidence a school gives to validate its achievement of a high reliability level (proof, such as surveys, achievement data, and collected quick data).*

Materials needed for the data review:

- HRS Summary Reports (from ARPE and Survey Monkey)

Leading Indicators
Using the HRS Level 2 Leading Indicator Summary report, identify teacher/staff leading indicators with a gap of means higher than .50. A significant gap in the means indicates a higher level of disagreement in perception of the leading indicator.

Leading Indicator	Gap of Means
2.1 – School leaders limit the number of new initiatives, prioritizing those related to our schoolwide model of instruction.	Don't have access to the standard deviation values at this time, however, these indicators appear to have the most disagreement between responses.
2.4– School leaders give me feedback frequently.	
2.5 School leaders collect data about how effective professional development is in improving teacher practices.	

Mean Responses by Group
Using the grade level reports, identify mean responses lower than 4.0 (agree).

Leading Indicator	Means below 4.0
• School leaders give me feedback frequently.	• – 2.4 — 3.76
• School leaders collect data about how effective professional development is in improving teacher practices–	• 2.5– 3.95
• Opportunities to observe and discuss effective teaching via technology.	• 2.6 – 3.81
• School leaders limit the number of new initiatives, prioritizing those related to our schoolwide model of instruction.	• 2.1 — 3.76
• I have regular time to meet with other teachers to discuss effective instructional practices–	• 2.6– 3.9

What does the data show as our 3 greatest strengths and 3 greatest needs for HRS Level 2?	What are our greatest strengths? 1. I have written statements of my instructional growth goals. 2. School leaders and teacher leaders have developed a written document articulating our schoolwide model of instruction (i.e. Campus Instructional Snapshot). 3. We regularly discuss instructional practices at faculty and department meetings. What are our greatest needs? (Potential Problem Statements) 1. Ensuring changes to protocols and procedures are limited and very intentional. 2. Providing consistent feedback, perhaps expanding beyond the walkthrough form. 3. Reminding staff of resources available digitally.

Strengths

What are our greatest strengths?

1. I have written statements of my instructional growth goals.
2. School leaders and teacher leaders have developed a written document articulating our schoolwide model of instruction (i.e. Campus Instructional Snapshot).
3. We regularly

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Based on staff perception data and HRS survey results, staff reported concerns regarding adequate time for instruction, planning, collaboration, and completion of required responsibilities, with HRS indicator 1.8 ("I have adequate time to teach effectively") receiving a mean score of 3.71.	Competing instructional, planning, collaboration, and compliance demands within the available workday contributed to staff perceptions of insufficient time to complete responsibilities effectively.
2	Based on teacher and staff HRS survey data, staff perceptions regarding transparency and communication of feedback processes were lower than other campus systems, with "Reports of opinion data from teachers and staff are regularly generated and used transparently" receiving a weighted average score of 3.86 out of 5.0.	Inconsistent processes for communicating how staff feedback is analyzed, used, and followed up on contributed to lower perceptions of transparency.
3	There were 255 reported in-class incidents in Review360 during the 2025-2026 school year; however, campus support and CORE calls exceeded documented incident reports.	Inconsistent expectations and processes for documenting classroom behavior incidents resulted in a gap between campus support and CORE calls and incidents recorded in Review360.
4 ★	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	An average of 57% of 4-year-old students demonstrated on-track mastery for rote counting on CLI data and 66.9% mastery on Quick Checks during the 2025-2026 school year.	Students experienced inconsistent exposure to rote counting reinforcement and math integration opportunities across classrooms and throughout the instructional day.
2 ★	Based on CIRCLE Social Emotional Behaviors Overall Measure data, the percentage of Pre-K students on track decreased from 98% in Wave 1 to 93% in Wave 2 and 92% in Wave 3, while students needing support increased from 2% in Wave 1 to 7% in Wave 2 and 8% in Wave 3.	Students experienced inconsistent implementation of self-regulation strategies and behavior support systems across classrooms throughout the school year.
3 ★	Based on CLI Reading and Oral Language data, expressive language development remained significantly lower than receptive language development across all units, with Unit 8 ending at 90% receptive mastery compared to 64% expressive mastery.	Students had fewer consistent opportunities to engage in structured expressive language practice across the instructional day than opportunities to demonstrate receptive understanding.
4 ★	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

★ = 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] **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**

Accountability Data

- [x] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Effective Schools Framework data**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **State and federally required assessment information**
- [x] **Local diagnostic reading assessment data**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**
- [x] **Observation Survey results**
- [x] **Prekindergarten Self-Assessment Tool**
- [x] **Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data**
- [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] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Student surveys and/or other feedback**
- [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] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [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] **T-PESS data**
- [x] **Staff mobility/stability**

- [x] **Support structures: mentors**
- [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**
- [x] **Parent and community partnership data**
- [x] **Parent activity evaluations and feedback data**
- [x] **Community service agencies and support services**

Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Organizational structure data**
- [x] **Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation**
- [x] **Communications data**
- [x] **Capacity and resources data**
- [x] **Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data**
- [x] **Study of best practices and high yield strategies**
- [x] **Technology and resource allocation data**
- [x] **Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents**

Priorities

Priority 1

1.1 Strategic Plan: 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

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, 70% of Pearson students who begin and end the year at Pearson will achieve proficiency on Wave 3 of the CIRCLE Rapid Vocabulary assessment and 70% will demonstrate mastery of PK4.II.D.1 through a common formative assessment.

Performance Target: 70% of students who begin and end the year at Pearson will obtain proficiency for Rapid Vocabulary on Wave 3 of the CIRCLE assessment.
Utilizing a CFA, 70% of students who start and end the year at Pearson will show mastery on Guideline PK4.II.D.1 - Child understands (receptive) and uses (expressive) a wide variety of words to label, describe and make connections among objects, people, places, actions, and events.

Expected Result: Students will be Kindergarten ready.

Strategy 1

Intentional vocabulary instruction embedded into large and small group instruction, transitions, and centers

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Leadership Team through walkthroughs and feedback.
Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Intentional vocabulary instruction will be planned and implemented in every curricular unit. Common formative assessments will be administered in three identified units during the school year to formally measure student progress toward mastery of PK4.II.D.1 and inform instructional adjustments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Administrators
Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Weekly PLC planning will address intentional vocabulary and expressive-language instruction, review available student performance data, and document instructional strategies, differentiation, and reteaching based on student need.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Administrators
Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Leadership will use walkthrough, CFA, CIRCLE, and PLC data to monitor implementation and student progress, provide targeted feedback and coaching, and identify instructional adjustments, reteaching, differentiation, and professional learning needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Instructional Coach, Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Based on CLI Reading and Oral Language data, expressive language development remained significantly lower than receptive language development across all units, with Unit 8 ending at 90% receptive mastery compared to 64% expressive mastery.	Students had fewer consistent opportunities to engage in structured expressive language practice across the instructional day than opportunities to demonstrate receptive understanding.

Goal 2

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, 80% of Pearson students who start and end the year at Pearson will achieve mastery of PK4.V.A.1 (rote counting 1-30) as measured by Quick Check results and obtain a Wave 3 score of 80% "on track" in rote counting on CIRCLE.

Performance Target: Students will obtain a Wave 3 score of 80% "on track" in the area of rote counting on CIRCLE.
Utilizing Quick Check data, 80% of students who start and end the year at Pearson will show mastery on Guideline PK4.V.A.1 - PK4.V.A.1 - Child rote counts from 1-30.

Expected Result: Students will be Kindergarten ready.

Strategy 1

Intentional rote counting instruction embedded into large and small group instruction, transitions, and centers

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Leadership Team through walkthroughs and feedback.
Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Campus Quick Checks will be administered every nine weeks. PLCs will analyze campus, classroom, and individual student performance to identify areas of need and plan differentiated instruction, reteaching, and additional practice opportunities.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Administrators
Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Weekly PLC planning will address intentional rote-counting instruction and math integration, review available student performance data, and document instructional strategies, differentiation, and additional practice opportunities.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Administrators
Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Leadership will use walkthroughs, planning evidence, and Quick Check/CIRCLE data to monitor the frequency and quality of rote-counting and math integration across the instructional day and provide targeted feedback, coaching, and support when implementation or student progress indicates a need.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Instructional Coach, Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	An average of 57% of 4-year-old students demonstrated on-track mastery for rote counting on CLI data and 66.9% mastery on Quick Checks during the 2025-2026 school year.	Students experienced inconsistent exposure to rote counting reinforcement and math integration opportunities across classrooms and throughout the instructional day.

Priority 2

4.2 Strategic Plan: Improve interventions and systems of supports to ensure a safe, orderly and respectful learning environment.

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, 85% of Pearson students will achieve a cut score of at least 43 on the Wave 3 CIRCLE SEL measure and 80% of students who start and end the year at Pearson will demonstrate mastery on Quick Check assessments for PK4.1.B.1.A (following routines) and PK4.1.B.1.C (regulating behavior).

Performance Target: 85% of students will obtain a cut score of at least 43, meeting the on-track Social Emotional Learning measure on Wave 3 of the CIRCLE assessment.
Utilizing a Quick Check, 80% of students who start and end the year at Pearson will show mastery on Guideline PK4.1.B.1.A - Child follows classroom routines.
Utilizing a Quick Check, 80% of students who start and end the year at Pearson will show mastery on Guideline PK4.1.B.1.C. - Child regulates own behavior.

Expected Result: Students will be Kindergarten ready.

Strategy 1

Classrooms will utilize SEL data trackers monthly to monitor individual and class-wide progress, identify areas of need, and document instructional or behavioral supports implemented in response to the data.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Teaching Assistants
Instructional Coach
Leadership Team

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

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

After any school break, routines and procedures will be intentionally reviewed and re-taught as needed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Instructional Coach
Administrators

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

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Quick Checks will be administered four times per year to measure individual and class-wide student progress. PLCs and leadership will review results to identify areas of need and determine instructional, behavioral, or self-regulation supports.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers
Administrators
Instructional Coach

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

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Leadership will use walkthroughs, SEL data trackers, Quick Check data, and behavior data to monitor consistent implementation of campus self-regulation strategies, classroom routines, and behavior-support systems and provide coaching, feedback, or additional support based on identified needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Counselor, Instructional Coach, Leadership Team

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

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Based on CIRCLE Social Emotional Behaviors Overall Measure data, the percentage of Pre-K students on track decreased from 98% in Wave 1 to 93% in Wave 2 and 92% in Wave 3, while students needing support increased from 2% in Wave 1 to 7% in Wave 2 and 8% in Wave 3.	Students experienced inconsistent implementation of self-regulation strategies and behavior support systems across classrooms throughout the school year.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
6	Based on CIRCLE Social Emotional Behaviors Overall Measure data, the percentage of Pre-K students on track decreased from 98% in Wave 1 to 93% in Wave 2 and 92% in Wave 3, while students needing support increased from 2% in Wave 1 to 7% in Wave 2 and 8% in Wave 3.	Students experienced inconsistent implementation of self-regulation strategies and behavior support systems across classrooms throughout the school year.

Goal 2

Ensure campus systems and programs are in place to train and support families in improving school attendance.

Performance Target: By the end of the 2026-27 school year, the student attendance rate will be 96% or at least 0.5% growth over 2025-2026.

Expected Result: Attendance rates will increase.

Strategy 1

Parent event with the principal and AP to review attendance expectations, answer parent questions, and promote positive habits.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 5 - School Processes & Programs 5 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Monthly newsletter to include attendance video and reminders.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 5 - School Processes & Programs 5 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Individual emails sent out to families of students who are on track to miss more than 10 days. Another email will be sent once they reach 10 absences, and if it continues, parents are invited to an I Am Present training.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Secretary

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 5 - School Processes & Programs 5 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Administrators will review attendance and tardy data regularly to identify campus trends, students and families needing additional support, and the effectiveness of attendance interventions. Communication and support strategies will be adjusted based on identified needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Secretary

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 5 - School Processes & Programs 5 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
5	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
5	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	By the end of the third nine weeks, 21% of students had accumulated seven or more tardies, including 8% who exceeded 16 tardies.	A mismatch between the school's established arrival schedule and some families' understanding of attendance expectations contributed to persistent tardiness.