Plano Independent School District



Saigling Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:40 PM

Mission Statement

Saigling, a heart-based school, provides a positive environment to promote individual potential, encourage academic growth, and develop respectful, responsible citizens who are lifelong learners.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 9

Perceptions 11

Priority Problem Statements 13

Priorities 15

Priority 1 : 1.1 Improve, align, and remove barriers for academic programs to ensure... 16

Priority 2 : 2.3 Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR re... 19

Priority 3 : 4.2 Implement interventions and systems of support to ensure a safe, o... 21

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Saigling Elementary is a small neighborhood school in Plano ISD serving approximately 330 students across grade levels with two to four teachers per grade level. The campus serves a diverse population and supports students through specialized programming including Focus and Achieve classrooms, as well as services for Special Education, ESL, GT, and Dyslexia support. The campus maintains a strong sense of community through high parent involvement and a supportive PTA partnership.

Enrollment trends indicate Saigling continues to maintain a smaller campus population while supporting a broad range of student needs through specialized programming. Program services such as Special Education, ESL, GT, and intervention supports remain essential components of campus structures. Continued review of proportionality across programs will ensure equitable access and identification practices.

Attendance emerged as a concern during the 2025-2026 school year. Attendance monitoring processes and incentives may need strengthening when the 3rd and 4th six weeks is where we saw the dip in attendance below the 95% mark. In alignment with our demographics, the majority of our discipline incidents were among our White population with Hispanic as the second highest.

Saigling utilizes structured supports and specialized classrooms such as Achieve and Focus to provide proactive behavioral interventions and support students with social-emotional and behavioral needs. Continued monitoring of behavioral trends and intervention effectiveness will help ensure students receive appropriate support.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Attendance declines in the 3rd and 4th 6-weeks period below 95%.	Families aren't fully aware of how quickly cumulative absences impact academic standing.
2	EB students make up 14% of our population but make up 66% of absences.	
3	SPED students make up 37% of our population but make up 66% of absences.	

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

The campus demonstrated several positive academic trends during the 2025–2026 school year, particularly in overall student achievement and the number of students performing at higher proficiency levels. MAP and STAAR data indicate growth in science with students achieving advanced performance levels, with MAP achievement increasing from 37% to 53% at Meets and from 20% to 29% at Masters. Similarly, STAAR results showed 77% of students meeting Approaches, 53% meeting Meets, and 33% achieving Masters, reflecting continued success for science in moving many students toward higher levels of academic performance.

Early literacy data also showed encouraging results. Overall, the percentage of K–2 students performing At or Above Benchmark on mCLASS increased from 74% to 77%, with Kindergarten demonstrating exceptional growth. Students performing Above Benchmark increased from 38% to 67%, while those performing Below or Well Below Benchmark decreased from 42% to 11%, indicating that early literacy instruction is producing strong outcomes.

Despite these strengths, several areas require focused improvement. MAP growth data indicate that many students are not meeting expected growth targets, particularly in Math (Grades 1 and 4) and Reading (Grades 1, 3, 4, and 5). Although achievement increased overall, the percentage of students in the lowest achievement band remained relatively unchanged, suggesting that current interventions are not accelerating learning sufficiently for the lowest-performing students.

STAAR results also highlight areas of concern. Grades 3 and 4 Math performed below expectations and demonstrated significant achievement gaps between Economically Disadvantaged (ED) and Non-Economically Disadvantaged (Non-ED) students. While Grade 5 Reading and Math did not show this disparity, campuswide performance gaps persist for Emergent Bilingual (EB) students and students receiving Special Education services. Additionally, STAAR Reading data showed increases in students achieving the Masters performance level but declines in the percentage meeting the Approaches standard in Grades 3 and 5, suggesting that higher-achieving students are progressing while a larger group of struggling students is not reaching minimum proficiency.

Data indicates that the campus is successfully increasing achievement among many students, particularly those already performing near or above grade level. The greatest opportunity for improvement is to strengthen Tier I instruction, intervention systems, and progress monitoring to accelerate growth for the lowest-performing students and reduce achievement gaps among economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and Special Education student groups.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	MAP reading had less than 70% of students in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5th met their MAP reading growth targets.	There is a need for stronger targeted interventions, differentiated instruction, and consistent progress monitoring supported by intentional planning and clearly defined planning protocols.
2 ★	Achievement gaps persist in EB and SPED across contents.. In Reading, the percentage of EB students who did not meet grade level for 3-5 grade was 33-67%, compared to 16% for Non-EB students. In Mathematics, for 3-5, 56-75% of EB students did not meet grade level, compared to 13-25% of Non-EB students. SPED showed similar patterns across grade levels and contents.	Core content instruction (Tier 1) relies primarily on general grade-level delivery methods that do not consistently integrate language scaffolds (for EB) or specialized accommodations/modifications (for SPED).
3	Less than 70% of 1st grade and 4th grade students met their Math MAP growth targets.	
4	STAAR Math did not meet expectations for 3rd and 4th grade with significant differences between ED and non-ED students. 3rd grade math had 45% ED fall in the did not meet category versus 18% of non-ED students. 4th grade math had 58% ED fall in the did not meet category versus 18% of non-ED.	

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Saigling Elementary demonstrates strong collaborative planning through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and ongoing data reflection cycles, fostering a culture of continuous improvement. The campus also implements differentiated instructional practices that provide targeted support for both on-level instruction and enrichment to meet diverse student needs. To build on these strengths, the campus should strengthen vertical team collaboration to ensure alignment of curriculum, instructional practices, and student expectations across grade levels. Additional priorities include increasing teacher internalization of high-impact instructional strategies for consistent implementation, refining intentional WIN (What I Need) Time systems through authentic interventions, progress monitoring, and evidence of student growth, and enhancing differentiated instruction to better meet the needs of Emergent Bilingual (EB), Economically Disadvantaged (ED), and Special Education (SPED) students.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	During the 2025-2026 academic year, campus systems and processes for progress monitoring, evidence collection, and targeted intervention implementation and tracking were established, but implementation lacked consistent fidelity to effectively measure and respond to individual student needs.	There was a lack of clear, standardized operational guidelines (non-negotiables) defining when [frequency & duration] intervention was delivered, what specific evidence counted, how it needed to be logged, and how to efficiently implement a structured intervention system/process with fidelity without overwhelming their daily workflow.
2	Academic performance data from the 2025-2026 school year reveal achievement gaps among Emergent Bilingual (EB), Economically Disadvantaged (ED), and Special Education (SPED) student populations.	

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Saigling Elementary is perceived as a safe, caring, and supportive school with strong relationships and a positive campus culture. While these are significant strengths, survey data indicate opportunities to improve instructional consistency, student engagement, communication, and stakeholder involvement. Differences in staff and administrator perceptions suggest a need for more consistent implementation and monitoring of instructional practices, while students and parents desire greater opportunities for voice, individualized support, and responsiveness. These trends align with academic data showing uneven growth and achievement gaps, indicating that stronger instructional systems and increased engagement are needed to improve attendance and student outcomes. Moving forward, the campus should build on its strong culture by strengthening instructional practices, enhancing communication and stakeholder partnerships, and using more targeted perception data to guide continuous improvement.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Parent perception surveys indicate that school-wide communication and stakeholder engagement strategies do not fully align with the campus mission.	
2	Differences in staff and administrator perceptions suggest a need for more consistent implementation and monitoring of instructional practices.	

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Attendance declines in the 3rd and 4th 6-weeks period below 95%.	Families aren't fully aware of how quickly cumulative absences impact academic standing.
2 ★	MAP reading had less than 70% of students in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5th met their MAP reading growth targets.	There is a need for stronger targeted interventions, differentiated instruction, and consistent progress monitoring supported by intentional planning and clearly defined planning protocols.
3 ★	Achievement gaps persist in EB and SPED across contents.. In Reading, the percentage of EB students who did not meet grade level for 3-5 grade was 33-67%, compared to 16% for Non-EB students. In Mathematics, for 3-5, 56-75% of EB students did not meet grade level, compared to 13-25% of Non-EB students. SPED showed similar patterns across grade levels and contents.	Core content instruction (Tier 1) relies primarily on general grade-level delivery methods that do not consistently integrate language scaffolds (for EB) or specialized accommodations/modifications (for SPED).
4 ★	During the 2025-2026 academic year, campus systems and processes for progress monitoring, evidence collection, and targeted intervention implementation and tracking were established, but implementation lacked consistent fidelity to effectively measure and respond to individual student needs.	There was a lack of clear, standardized operational guidelines (non-negotiables) defining when [frequency & duration] intervention was delivered, what specific evidence counted, how it needed to be logged, and how to efficiently implement a structured intervention system/process with fidelity without overwhelming their daily workflow.

★ = Priority

Priorities

Priority 1

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

Goal 1

By the end of the school year, at least 75% of students in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5 will meet or exceed their individualized MAP Reading growth targets.

Performance Target: By Spring of 2027, 75% of students in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5 will meet or exceed their individualized MAP Reading growth targets.

Expected Result: At least 75% of students in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5 will meet or exceed their individualized MAP Reading growth goals, as evidenced by end-of-year MAP data, indicating strengthened reading proficiency and increased readiness for grade-level texts. Allows for decrease in the number of students qualifying for HB 1416 and accelerated instruction.

Strategy 1

Strategy 1: Strengthen Tier 1 Reading Instruction

Strategy
Teachers will implement standards-aligned, high-quality Tier 1 reading instruction that includes explicit vocabulary instruction, foundational skills, comprehension strategies, close reading, text-dependent questioning, and differentiated small-group instruction based on student data.

Key Action Steps

Utilize district instructional resources with fidelity.
Plan differentiated reading lessons during PLCs.
Incorporate daily opportunities for students to read, write, and discuss grade-level texts.
Implement scaffolded instruction for EB, SPED, and struggling readers.

Evidence

Lesson plans
Walkthrough data
PLC agendas
Student work samples

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Connie Matthews, Bonny Pan, Krysta Buhler

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	MAP reading had less than 70% of students in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5th met their MAP reading growth targets.	There is a need for stronger targeted interventions, differentiated instruction, and consistent progress monitoring supported by intentional planning and clearly defined planning protocols.

Goal 2

By the end of the school year, the achievement gap for Emergent Bilingual (EB), Special Education (SPED), and HB 1416 students in grades 3-5 will decrease by 15% across Mathematics STAAR, through consistent implementation of Tier 1 scaffolded and accommodated instruction.

Performance Target: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the achievement gap between Emergent Bilingual (EB), Special Education (SPED), and HB 1416 students and their peers on the Grades 3-5 Mathematics STAAR assessment will decrease by 15% through consistent implementation of scaffolded Tier 1 instruction, accommodations, and targeted instructional support.

Expected Result: A 15% reduction in the Mathematics STAAR achievement gap for EB, SPED, and HB 1416 students in grades 3-5 will be achieved, as measured by increased performance at Meets and Masters grade level on STAAR and improved alignment with overall campus performance, reflecting the effectiveness of consistent Tier 1 scaffolded instruction and accommodations. Achievement can also be assessed by common assessments to show increased student growth.

Strategy 1

The ESL department, Special Education department, and classroom teachers collaborate to provide targeted small-group instruction during designated support windows while ensuring the consistent use of grade-level materials and standards-aligned instruction within the resource setting.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Connie Matthews, Bonny Pan, Krysta Buhler, Laura Tarantine, Elizabeth Griffin

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Achievement gaps persist in EB and SPED across contents.. In Reading, the percentage of EB students who did not meet grade level for 3-5 grade was 33-67%, compared to 16% for Non-EB students. In Mathematics, for 3-5, 56-75% of EB students did not meet grade level, compared to 13-25% of Non-EB students. SPED showed similar patterns across grade levels and contents.	Core content instruction (Tier 1) relies primarily on general grade-level delivery methods that do not consistently integrate language scaffolds (for EB) or specialized accommodations/ modifications (for SPED).

Priority 2

2.3 Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR readiness status.

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, at least 75% of students will be at proficiency or masters by End-of-Year (EOY) as measured by MAP Reading and Mathematics assessments.

Performance Target: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, at least 75% of students will score at the Proficient or Mastery level on the End-of-Year (EOY) MAP Reading and Mathematics assessments, demonstrating grade-level readiness and strengthening the campus's College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) pipeline.

Expected Result: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, at least 75% of students will perform at the Proficient or Mastery level on the End-of-Year (EOY) MAP Reading and Mathematics assessments, demonstrating strong academic growth and grade-level readiness. Through this achievement and participation in meaningful college, career, and military awareness experiences, students will strengthen the foundational knowledge, skills, and future readiness necessary to support long-term success and contribute to the campus's College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) pipeline.

Strategy 1

Strategy 1: Collaborative teams will plan & utilize CFUs for high-leverage standards in order to use the data to deliver targeted instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Connie Matthews, Bonny Pan, Krysta Buhler, Team Leaders

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Strategy 2: Each teacher will designate a time for targeted instruction in both reading and math content blocks and implement instruction with fidelity.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Connie Matthews, Bonny Pan, Krysta Buhler, Team Leaders

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	During the 2025-2026 academic year, campus systems and processes for progress monitoring, evidence collection, and targeted intervention implementation and tracking were established, but implementation lacked consistent fidelity to effectively measure and respond to individual student needs.	There was a lack of clear, standardized operational guidelines (non-negotiables) defining when [frequency & duration] intervention was delivered, what specific evidence counted, how it needed to be logged, and how to efficiently implement a structured intervention system/process with fidelity without overwhelming their daily workflow.

Priority 3

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

Goal 1

Behavior Goal: Prior to and during the 3rd and 4th six-weeks, the SST will implement proactive, communication routines that inform parents of their child's cumulative days missed and its direct connection to current classroom learning.

Performance Target: Throughout the 2026-2027 school year, the Student Support Team (SST) will consistently implement proactive parent communication and intervention protocols for students with attendance concerns by notifying families of cumulative absences and their impact on academic progress, documenting 100% of communications and follow-up actions for students who meet campus attendance thresholds.

Expected Result: Documented SST communication with parents of students with attendance concerns will result in improved attendance during the 3rd and 4th six-weeks, reduced chronic absenteeism, and increased student academic performance as measured by classroom and common assessment data.

Strategy 1

Parent communication will provide families with their child's cumulative days missed and explain how absences are impacting current classroom learning and academic progress. SST attendance meetings will be held with parents, teachers, administration, and the counselor for students with ongoing attendance concerns to review attendance patterns, discuss academic impact, identify barriers, and develop an individualized plan for improved attendance.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Bonny Pan and Krysta Buhler

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Attendance declines in the 3rd and 4th 6-weeks period below 95%.	Families aren't fully aware of how quickly cumulative absences impact academic standing.

Goal 2

Attendance Goal: Increase 3rd and 4th six-weeks attendance to at least 95% by enhancing family communication and education regarding the academic impact of cumulative absences.

Performance Target: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the campus will achieve and maintain an average student attendance rate of at least 95% by strengthening family communication and increasing parent awareness of the academic impact of cumulative absences through consistent outreach, attendance monitoring, and targeted interventions.

Expected Result: Attendance will improve to a minimum of 95% during the 3rd and 4th six- weeks, with targeted students demonstrating improved attendance patterns. Progress will be monitored through weekly attendance reports, SST documentation, and family communication records. Increased attendance will correlate with improved access to instructional time and stronger performance on classroom assignments, common assessments, and progress monitoring measures.

Strategy 1

Implement a comprehensive family engagement approach that includes ongoing parent education and communication regarding cumulative absences and their impact on student learning, along with targeted "I Am Present" and SST meetings involving parents, teachers, administration, and the counselor to identify barriers, provide support, and improve student attendance.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Bonny Pan and Krysta Buhler

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Attendance declines in the 3rd and 4th 6-weeks period below 95%.	Families aren't fully aware of how quickly cumulative absences impact academic standing.