Plano Independent School District

Thomas Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:42 PM

Mission Statement

At Thomas Elementary, we celebrate diversity and are committed to providing excellence in education for all students. We empower our students to be caring, responsible, life-long learners with big dreams.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 10

Perceptions 12

Priority Problem Statements 14

Data Documentation for CNA 16

Improvement Planning Data 17

Accountability Data 17

Student Data: Assessments 17

Student Data: Student Groups 18

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 18

Employee Data 18

Parent/Community Data 19

Support Systems and Other Data 19

Priorities 20

Priority 1 : Pillar 1: Teaching & Learning Objective 1.4 - Design student experiences ... 21

Priority 2 : Pillar 2: Life Ready 2.3 Increase access and opportunites for students to... 26

Priority 3 : Pillar 4: Safety, Wellness, & Community Engagement Objective 4.2: Impl... 29

Priority 4 : 4.2 Implement interventions and systems of support to ensure a safe, o... 31

Funding Summary 33

199 State Comp Ed 34

199 Bilingual/ESL/ELL 34

211 Title I, Part A 34

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Our campus serves approximately **701 students** and reflects a diverse population with increasing numbers of students receiving specialized services. Over recent years, there has been growth in populations served through **bilingual/ESL and Special Education programs**, indicating a need for differentiated instruction and targeted supports.

The campus serves a high percentage of **economically disadvantaged (ED), emergent bilingual (EB), and Special Education (SPED)** students. Data also reflects a range of academic needs, with a significant portion of students performing below grade level, particularly in upper grades. While pockets of high performance exist (e.g., GT students and early grades), the overall campus profile reflects a need for strong Tier 1 instruction and targeted interventions to support diverse learners.

African American students account for more than half of discipline incidents and, along with students receiving special education services, have risk ratios above the targeted limits. Disproportionality is also evident in the disciplinary actions involving African American and White students. A small group of five to six students generates a significant percentage of referrals, indicating a need to strengthen Tier 1 behavior supports and provide more effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Although classroom disruptions remain the most common behavior, they decreased over time; however, physical behaviors such as pushing and shoving increased from 16% to 25%. There were no concerns related to hate-based incidents. Attendance data shows that third grade has the highest attendance and Pre-K has the lowest, with an overall decline during the third and fourth instructional periods. The first six weeks had the highest attendance, while the third reporting period had the lowest.

Strengths

Our greatest strengths:

1. Overall Reading scores increased from last year
2. Dual language extended response scores higher than the states
3. EcoDis population high percent passing rate

We have a diverse population of students. Our primary grades(K-1) are a strength and continued to show growth in both Reading and Math. Our offer multiple opportunities for community/parent involvement to include Free computer computer via mobile service, campus parent workshops, PTA community events, and grade level cultural diverse performances.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	African American students account for more than half of all campus discipline incidents, demonstrating disproportionality in disciplinary actions among student groups.	
2	A group of only five to six students generates a significant percentage of all campus discipline referrals, indicating that referrals are concentrated among a small number of students.	
3 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, campus attendance declined from 96.5% in the first six weeks to 93.9% in the third six weeks, falling 2.1 percentage points below the campus goal of 96%.	The campus attendance reward system is not designed to recognize varied attendance needs, individual improvement, or incremental progress, limiting its effectiveness in motivating students whose attendance is below the 96% campus goal..

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Student achievement data reflects areas of strength as well as continued opportunities for improvement across subjects, grade levels, and student groups. In reading, 68% of students achieved Approaches or above on the English and Spanish STAAR assessments. English reading performance increased across grade levels, with 70% of third and fourth graders and 75% of fifth graders reaching Approaches or above; however, Meets/Masters performance remained lower at 32% in third grade, 42% in fourth grade, and 53% in fifth grade. MAP reading data showed similar grade-level variation, with fourth and fifth grades demonstrating the strongest achievement and third grade showing the greatest need. Most grade levels and quintiles met or exceeded projected growth, although some quintiles in first, second, and fifth grades fell below 100% of projected growth. Additionally, third-grade MAP projections did not align with end-of-year STAAR performance, indicating a need to review how assessment data is used to predict achievement and plan instruction.

Math performance at the Meets/Masters level was lowest in third grade at 32%, increased to 34% in fourth grade, and reached 36% in fifth grade. Fourth grade demonstrated the greatest improvement, increasing by nine percentage points, while fifth grade declined by six points and represents an area of concern. Dual-language data reveals additional disparities, particularly on Spanish STAAR assessments. In reading, dual-language students' English Meets/Masters performance ranged from 33% to 52%, compared with 9% to 42% in Spanish. In math, English Meets/Masters performance ranged from 25% to 56%, while Spanish performance ranged from 15% to 46%. Across both subjects, third-grade dual-language students demonstrated the greatest need, while fourth grade showed comparatively stronger results. Overall, the data emphasizes the need for stronger Tier 1 instruction, targeted intervention, language-responsive support, and closer progress monitoring—particularly for third grade, fifth-grade math, students performing in lower-growth quintiles, and dual-language students assessed in Spanish. Additional teacher-level data and specific CIP targets are needed to determine performance by teacher and identify precisely which annual targets were met or missed.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	MAP PGR Quintiles <120% at 63% for K-5 ELAR/ Reading (only grades Kinder & 5th grade are at 100%), SLAR/Reading at 30% in 2026 (BOY MAP to EOY MAP).	Teachers are not consistently using formative assessment data, TEKS-aligned progress monitoring, and lesson progression to adjust instruction and target comprehension skills. Inconsistent data tracking systems, limited use of exit tickets and formative assessments, and gaps in teacher content knowledge have resulted in instructional decisions that are not consistently aligned to student needs.
2	All Grades MATH English MAP PGR Quintiles above 120% at 53%, Math Spanish PGR Quintiles at 60% in 2026 (BOY MAP to EOY MAP)	Teachers are not consistently using formative assessment data, progress monitoring, & lesson progression to adjust instruction & target comprehension skills. Inconsistent data tracking systems, limited use of exit tickets and formative assessments, and gaps in teacher content knowledge have resulted in instructional decisions that are not consistently aligned to student needs.
3 ★	All Grades Reading at the Meets/Masters STAAR performance only at 24% (2025) and 22% (2026).	PLC implementation is inconsistent across teams, resulting in variation in how teachers use student data and priority standards to guide instructional pacing and lesson focus.
4 ★	Grades 3-5 Math Meets/Masters STAAR performance increased from 19% in 2025 to 23% in 2026 but remained 19 percentage points below the campus goal of 42%.	Inconsistent, teacher-centered instructional practices, specifically the implementation of student discourse & limited problem-solving strategies. This limits student ownership, peer interactions, and mathematical reasoning; there is more emphasis on procedural completion over reasoning, solving in multiple ways, flexible thinking, and students' ability to explain, justify, and compare strategies.

5	Only 33% of HB1416 Accelerated Learners scored Low Approaches or Above (66% Did Not Meet) on 2026 STAAR (34.6% DNM Math and 30% DNM Reading)	Overall instructional impact of I&E. Specifically, inconsistent or missing formative data to monitor and track student progress & timely identification and adjustment of student needs; skills taught in I&E are not being systematically monitored and may not be transferred and reinforced in whole-class instruction. Also, small-group instruction lacks a clear, targeted focus aligned to address gaps.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Thomas Elementary will continue strengthening instructional systems that ensure high levels of learning for every student through consistent, data-driven practices and collaborative professional learning. This year, the campus demonstrated strong growth by protecting intervention time, using ongoing assessment data to drive instructional decisions, strengthening Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and increasing student ownership through goal setting and progress monitoring. These systems contributed to significant student growth, particularly in mathematics and science, and established a stronger culture of collective responsibility for student success.

During the 2026–2027 school year, the campus will focus on increasing instructional rigor and ensuring greater consistency across all classrooms. Teachers will implement lessons that require students to engage in higher-order thinking, justify their reasoning, and assume greater cognitive responsibility through intentional questioning, academic discourse, and the use of success criteria and exemplars. PLCs will continue to refine lesson alignment, analyze student data, and proactively plan instruction based on student needs and TEKS progression.

To build teacher capacity, the campus will strengthen coaching and feedback systems through instructional rounds, peer observations, explicit modeling, lesson rehearsal during PLCs, and consistent administrator and instructional coach feedback. Leadership will continue refining observation and feedback processes to ensure alignment between planning, classroom instruction, and student outcomes.

The campus will also prioritize strengthening academic language development, supporting multilingual learners and middle-performing students, expanding vertical alignment, and sustaining effective intervention systems. By continuing to develop strong instructional systems, collaborative teacher teams, and consistent implementation of best practices, Thomas Elementary will increase student achievement, accelerate academic growth, and ensure every student experiences high-quality instruction every day.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Classroom observation and team reflection data show that higher-order questioning, student justification, and cognitively demanding learning experiences are not consistently evident across all classrooms and grade levels	
2	Campus assessment data and instructional reflections show inconsistent student use of academic vocabulary, structured discourse, and written justification, particularly among emergent bilingual students, students receiving special education services, and students completing constructed-response tasks.	
3	Campus reflection and instructional data show inconsistent use of ongoing progress monitoring to identify students needing earlier intervention and targeted Tier 1 support.	
4 ★	Classroom observations and campus data indicate inconsistent teacher efficacy in delivering rigorous, language-rich, data-informed, cognitively demanding learning experiences and aligned Tier 1 instruction, with learning targets referenced in only 17% of walkthroughs, exemplars or success criteria evident in 5%, and MAP reading growth ranging from 25% to 95% across classrooms.	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are not consistently structured to build teacher capacity through lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, and collaborative planning that ensures rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.
5	With a Title I allotment of $333,000, we fund key staff who drive both teacher and student success.	our educators with coaching, modeling, and PLCs, while directly boosting student growth through targeted small-group lessons.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Campus perception data reflects a structured and supportive school climate with clear behavioral expectations, systems for gathering staff input, and recognition of staff contributions. However, feedback indicates a need to strengthen communication, improve transparency in decision-making, and more clearly demonstrate how staff feedback influences campus actions. Discipline disparities, particularly the overrepresentation of African American students and the high number of referrals generated by a small group of students, emphasize the need for targeted and equitable behavioral supports. Overall, the campus should continue strengthening Tier 1 instruction and interventions to meet the needs of its diverse learners while ensuring all students and staff experience a positive, inclusive environment. Additional PBIS data would provide greater clarity and a more complete understanding of campus perceptions and behavioral systems.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Staff report a lack of clear communication and visibility into how leadership processes their input or makes operational decisions.	
2 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, less than 1% of the approximately 660 students enrolled--generated 114 office referrals, representing approximately 29% of all campus referrals.	Classroom walkthroughs, PBIS data, and staff feedback indicate inconsistent implementation of relationship-centered Tier 1 classroom-management routines, contributing to repeated behavior referrals among the five to six students generating a significant portion of campus referrals.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, less than 1% of the approximately 660 students enrolled--generated 114 office referrals, representing approximately 29% of all campus referrals.	Classroom walkthroughs, PBIS data, and staff feedback indicate inconsistent implementation of relationship-centered Tier 1 classroom-management routines, contributing to repeated behavior referrals among the five to six students generating a significant portion of campus referrals.
2 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, campus attendance declined from 96.5% in the first six weeks to 93.9% in the third six weeks, falling 2.1 percentage points below the campus goal of 96%.	The campus attendance reward system is not designed to recognize varied attendance needs, individual improvement, or incremental progress, limiting its effectiveness in motivating students whose attendance is below the 96% campus goal..
3 ★	Classroom observations and campus data indicate inconsistent teacher efficacy in delivering rigorous, language-rich, data-informed, cognitively demanding learning experiences and aligned Tier 1 instruction, with learning targets referenced in only 17% of walkthroughs, exemplars or success criteria evident in 5%, and MAP reading growth ranging from 25% to 95% across classrooms.	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are not consistently structured to build teacher capacity through lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, and collaborative planning that ensures rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.
4 ★	All Grades Reading at the Meets/Masters STAAR performance only at 24% (2025) and 22% (2026).	PLC implementation is inconsistent across teams, resulting in variation in how teachers use student data and priority standards to guide instructional pacing and lesson focus.
5 ★	Grades 3-5 Math Meets/Masters STAAR performance increased from 19% in 2025 to 23% in 2026 but remained 19 percentage points below the campus goal of 42%.	Inconsistent, teacher-centered instructional practices, specifically the implementation of student discourse & limited problem-solving strategies. This limits student ownership, peer interactions, and mathematical reasoning; there is more emphasis on procedural completion over reasoning, solving in multiple ways, flexible thinking, and students' ability to explain, justify, and compare strategies.

★ = 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**
- [x] **State and federal planning requirements**

Accountability Data

- [x] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Effective Schools Framework data**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Think Through Math assessment data for Grades 3-8 and Algebra I (TEA approved statewide license)**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments 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] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **Section 504 data**
- [x] **Homeless data**
- [x] **Dyslexia data**
- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Student surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Class size averages by grade and subject**
- [x] **School safety data**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**

Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **State certified and high quality staff data**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **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**

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation**
- [x] **Communications data**
- [x] **Action research results**

Priorities

Priority 1

Pillar 1: Teaching & Learning Objective 1.4 - Design student experiences to increase student agency and engagement in and out of the classroom.

Goal 1

By May 2027, the campus will implement a systematic data analysis protocol and strengthen planning protocols so that by May 2027, at least 50% of students score Meets or Masters on Reading STAAR, Reading MAP projections, and demonstrate at least 46% TELPAS growth score.

Performance Target: Achievement status & Growth Report - Percent of Projected Growth Met for each grade level will be a least 100%. Student Growth Summary Report - Percent Met Projection for each grade will be at Least 60-65%. Student Growth Summary Report - Student Median Conditional Growth Percentile for each grade will be at least 50th percentile.

The percent of 3rd, 4th & 5th-grade students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase to 44% by the end of the 26-27 school year, including our continuously enrolled student population.

The percent of 3rd, 4th & 5th-grade students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase to 42% by the end of the 26-27 school year, including our continuously enrolled student population.

The percent of Special Education students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase to 23% by the end of the 26-27 school year. The percent of Special Education students that score Meets grade levels or above on STAAR Math will increase to 24% by the end of the 25-26 school year.

The percent of White students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase to 60% by the end of the 26-27 school year. The percent of White students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase to 59% by the end of 25-26 school year.

The percent of Economically Disadvantaged students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase to 41% by the end of the 26-27 school year. The percent of Economically Disadvantaged students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase to 39% by the end of the 26-27 school year.

Expected Result: Strong school leadership, planning and data analysis protocols, positive school culture, and effective instruction

Strategy 1

1. Professional Development - Train teachers on planning protocols that focus on lesson progression, progress monitoring, and data analysis. Provide ongoing professional development focused on how to design lessons that are student-centered and increase student cognitive lift.

2. Collaborative Planning Teams- Enhance weekly collaborative team meetings where teachers use the Collaborative Team Framework and Internalization (LAFA) strategies to improve planning processes to include creating exemplars, criteria for success/exit tickets, lesson rehearsal, and data analysis. Teams will co-plan cognitively complex tasks, share effective strategies, create rigorous lessons aligned with curriculum standards, and analyze data to guide instruction.

3. Differentiated Instruction with Complex Tasks- Encourage teachers to design differentiated, open-ended tasks that require students to apply their knowledge in new and challenging ways, regardless of skill level. The focus will be on effective Tier I lessons, intentional small-group instruction, and intervention and enrichment.

4. Use of Formative Assessment for Deeper Understanding- Continuous use of formative assessments to drive instruction through regular monitoring of students' critical thinking and cognitive growth. Teachers can adjust instruction based on these assessments to ensure tasks remain rigorous. Use of criteria for success, exit tickets, and progress monitoring tools such as cruising clipboards.

5. Utilize Adult Temps to tutor students in Grades 3-5.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: 1. Walkthrough Data from admin, superintendent cabinet, and instructional team
2. Reduction in Review360 reports
3. Increase of MAP scores
4. CFA Data
5. Unit Assessments
6. Daily grades
7. Increase of STAAR scores

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

With a Title I allotment of $333,000, we fund key staff who drive both teacher and student success. This investment supports our educators with coaching, modeling, and PLCs, while directly boosting student growth through targeted small-group lessons." The screenshot below indicates where this statement should be added in your campus improvement plan. Please have this done by September 30, 2026.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Title 1 coaches, admin, leadership team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4

Funding Sources: NA 211 Title I, Part A, $19,065

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	All Grades Reading at the Meets/Masters STAAR performance only at 24% (2025) and 22% (2026).	PLC implementation is inconsistent across teams, resulting in variation in how teachers use student data and priority standards to guide instructional pacing and lesson focus.
4	Grades 3-5 Math Meets/Masters STAAR performance increased from 19% in 2025 to 23% in 2026 but remained 19 percentage points below the campus goal of 42%.	Inconsistent, teacher-centered instructional practices, specifically the implementation of student discourse & limited problem-solving strategies. This limits student ownership, peer interactions, and mathematical reasoning; there is more emphasis on procedural completion over reasoning, solving in multiple ways, flexible thinking, and students' ability to explain, justify, and compare strategies.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Classroom observations and campus data indicate inconsistent teacher efficacy in delivering rigorous, language-rich, data-informed, cognitively demanding learning experiences and aligned Tier 1 instruction, with learning targets referenced in only 17% of walkthroughs, exemplars or success criteria evident in 5%, and MAP reading growth ranging from 25% to 95% across classrooms.	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are not consistently structured to build teacher capacity through lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, and collaborative planning that ensures rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.

Goal 2

NEW: The campus will strengthen Tier I, small group, and I& E instruction through the use of high-yield strategies that focus on student ownership, discourse, and mathematical reasoning to promote students' ability to explain, justify, and use multiple problem solving strategies, so that by May 2027, at least 42% of students score Meets or Master on Math STAAR, Math MAP projections, and demonstrate at least 46% TELPAS growth score.

Expected Result: Student-centered instructional practices and an increase in the consistent use of high-quality instructional materials, collaborative learning, academic discourse, and formative assessments. Also higher levels of student engagement, increased opportunities for students to explain their thinking, and improved alignment to grade-level standards.

Strategy 1

Strategy 1
1. Professional Development - Train teachers on questioning strategies that increase students' cognitive lift through both verbal and written responses, with strategies such as Lead4ward, AVID, and active technology engagement that promote student collaboration and deep thinking (structured conversation, think, ink, pair, share, turn and talk, Fact or Fib, IQ slap down, Costa's leveled thinking). Provide ongoing professional development focused on how to design lessons that encourage problem-solving, critical thinking, and student discourse.

2. Collaborative Planning Teams- Enhance weekly collaborative team meetings where teachers use the Collaborative Team Framework and Internalization (LAFA) strategies to improve planning processes to include creating exemplars, criteria for success/exit tickets, and lesson rehearsal. Teams will co-plan cognitively complex tasks that incorporate student discourse, written and verbal response opportunities for all students, explaining or justification of work, rehearse difficult concepts and use of hands-on tools to share expertise, and create rigorous lessons that promote student cognitive lift.

3. Differentiated Instruction with Complex Tasks- Encourage teachers to design differentiated, open-ended tasks that require students to apply their knowledge in new and challenging ways, regardless of skill level. The focus will be on Tier I instruction, intentional small-group instruction, intervention, and enrichment.

4. Use of Formative Assessment for Deeper Understanding-Continuous use of formative assessments to drive instruction through regular monitoring of students' problem-solving abilities and cognitive growth. Teachers can adjust instruction based on these assessments to ensure tasks remain targeted and aligned to the rigor of the STAAR through the use of criteria for success, exit tickets, and progress monitoring tools such as cruising clipboards.

5. Consistent Observation and Feedback Cycles: Utilize LAFA, LIFT, and Bambrick observation and feedback strategies to provide teachers with ongoing, meaningful feedback to improve instructional practices based on teachers' specific needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, instructional coaches

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	All Grades Reading at the Meets/Masters STAAR performance only at 24% (2025) and 22% (2026).	PLC implementation is inconsistent across teams, resulting in variation in how teachers use student data and priority standards to guide instructional pacing and lesson focus.

4	Grades 3-5 Math Meets/Masters STAAR performance increased from 19% in 2025 to 23% in 2026 but remained 19 percentage points below the campus goal of 42%.	Inconsistent, teacher-centered instructional practices, specifically the implementation of student discourse & limited problem-solving strategies. This limits student ownership, peer interactions, and mathematical reasoning; there is more emphasis on procedural completion over reasoning, solving in multiple ways, flexible thinking, and students' ability to explain, justify, and compare strategies.

Priority 2

Pillar 2: Life Ready

2.3 Increase access and opportunites for students to acheive CCMR readiness status.

Goal 1

By May 2027, the campus will develop and sustain an effective Professional Learning Community (PLC) process that deepens teachers' understanding of the TEKS, supports the consistent implementation of high-impact instructional strategies, and strengthens language acquisition and vocabulary development. As a result, at least 50% of 3rd-5th grade students will achieve Meets or higher on the 2027 Reading, Math, and Science STAAR assessments.

Thomas Elementary will increase equitable access to rigorous, standards-aligned instruction and targeted learning opportunities so that an increasing percentage of students achieve Meets Grade Level and Masters Grade Level performance on the Reading STAAR assessment, building a strong foundation for future College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR). As a result, at least 50% of 3rd-5th grade students will achieve Meets or higher on the 2027 Reading, Math, and Science STAAR assessments.

Performance Target: The percent of 3rd, 4th & 5th-grade students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase to 44% by the end of the 26-27 school year.

The percent of 3rd, 4th & 5th-grade students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase to 42% by the end of the 26-27 school year.

The percent of Special Education students that score Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase to 23% by the end of the 26-27 school year.

Expected: 80% of students in each grade will meet or exceed their expected growth on MAP (Reading, Math, Science).

The percent of African American students that scores Meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase from 22% to 33% by the end of the 26-27 school year.

The percent of White students that scores Meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 50% to 58% by the end of the 26-27 school year.

The percent of continuously enrolled students that scores Meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase from 31% to 45% and from 40% to 47% in STAAR Reading by the end of the 26-27 school year.

Expected Result:
Improved teacher effectiveness in planning, instructional design, and Tier 1 delivery with high-yield strategies will lead to better monitoring of student growth, reducing performance gaps on MAP, STAAR, and TELPAS, and increased overall achievement.

Strategy 1

Increasing Rigor and Student Cognitive Engagement

a. Continue strengthening intentional questioning, academic discourse, and academic vocabulary development.
b. Increase opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking and carry more of the

cognitive load during instruction.
c. Expand the use of explicit models, exemplars, success criteria, and rehearsed instructional delivery to deepen student understanding.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, assessments, professional development records,

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Building Teacher Capacity and Ownership
a. Shift coaches from doing much of the instructional "heavy lifting" toward building greater teacher and team-lead ownership of planning, data analysis, and instructional decision-making.
b. Increase opportunities for teachers to observe one another and learn from effective instructional practices across the campus.
c. Strengthen teacher ownership of student outcomes through deeper engagement with data and instructional planning.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, grade level teachers, instructional support team

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

Funding Sources: 211 Title I, Part A, $40,000

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Refine Feedback, Planning, and LAFA Implementation Systems

a. Improve calibration and consistency of classroom observations and feedback processes across administrators and coaches.
b. Strengthen the connection between planning, observation, coaching, and student outcomes through a more aligned coaching model.
c. Continue implementation of LAFA practices, particularly around success criteria, exemplars, lesson alignment, and proactive planning based on student performance data.
d. Build stronger systems for onboarding new staff and sustaining instructional momentum despite staffing changes.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, grade level teachers, instructional support team

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Classroom observations and campus data indicate inconsistent teacher efficacy in delivering rigorous, language-rich, data-informed, cognitively demanding learning experiences and aligned Tier 1 instruction, with learning targets referenced in only 17% of walkthroughs, exemplars or success criteria evident in 5%, and MAP reading growth ranging from 25% to 95% across classrooms.	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are not consistently structured to build teacher capacity through lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, and collaborative planning that ensures rigorous, standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction.

Priority 3

Pillar 4: Safety, Wellness, & Community Engagement
Objective 4.2: Implement interventions and systems of support to ensure a safe, orderly, and respectful learning environment.

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, at least 90% of classrooms will consistently implement relationship-centered Tier 1 classroom-management routines, including relationship building, student engagement, de-escalation strategies, and independent learning structures. Implementation and behavior referral data will be monitored every 4 weeks through walkthroughs, coaching feedback, and MTSS progress monitoring, resulting in a 10% decrease in campus behavior referrals compared with the previous school year.

Performance Target: 90% of classrooms will consistently implement relationship-centered Tier 1 Classroom management routines

Expected Result: At each four-week reporting period, walkthrough and coaching data will show increased implementation of consistent, relationship-centered classroom routines, progressing toward the 90% target. Teachers will demonstrate greater confidence in addressing individual behavioral needs while maintaining instruction and engagement for the entire class. By the end of the school year, campus behavior referrals will decrease by at least 10%, students will experience greater consistency across classrooms, and student engagement, trust, and sense of belonging will improve.

Strategy 1

The campus will strengthen relationship-centered Tier 1 classroom management through coaching cycles, classroom modeling, and walkthrough feedback. These strategies will help teachers implement consistent routines, build positive student relationships, respond effectively to intensive behaviors, and maintain engaging instruction for all students.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom Teachers, Coaches, Administrators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	During the 2025-2026 school year, less than 1% of the approximately 660 students enrolled--generated 114 office referrals, representing approximately 29% of all campus referrals.	Classroom walkthroughs, PBIS data, and staff feedback indicate inconsistent implementation of relationship-centered Tier 1 classroom-management routines, contributing to repeated behavior referrals among the five to six students generating a significant portion of campus referrals.

Priority 4

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

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the campus will achieve and maintain an attendance rate of at least 96%. Attendance data and implementation of differentiated attendance incentives will be monitored at the end of each six-week reporting period.

Performance Target: Increase average attendance from 95.30% to 95.80% for all students.

Expected Result: At each six-week reporting period, campus attendance will demonstrate progress toward or remain at the 96% target. At least 90% of teachers will consistently implement attendance incentives aligned with campus expectations, resulting in increased teacher buy-in, stronger student participation, and improved campus attendance.A culture of consistent and engaging learning, improvement of academic performance, and support of student well-being.

Strategy 1

The campus will implement consistent attendance routines and differentiated incentives through partnerships with PBIS, counselors, and community stakeholders. These strategies will increase teacher buy-in, provide flexibility to address students' varying needs, and support the campus goal of achieving and maintaining a 96% attendance rate.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: classroom teachers, counselors, PBIS team, administration

Problem Statements: Demographics 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Strategy - Foster a culture of consistent learning, improve academic performance, and support student well-being:

1. Promote Attendance Awareness:
Implement a school-wide campaign to educate students and parents on the importance of regular attendance, including the academic and social benefits.

2. Early Intervention System:
Use the early warning system to identify students with attendance below 90% within the first month of school, providing targeted support and resources for families.

3. Positive Reinforcement:
Establish a recognition and rewards system for students who achieve perfect attendance or show significant improvement in attendance.

4. Parent Engagement:
Conduct workshops and provide resources for parents to understand how to support consistent attendance, including addressing potential barriers such as transportation and health issues.

5. Data Monitoring:
Monitor attendance data weekly and meet monthly with teachers and staff to assess progress toward the goal and make adjustments as necessary.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Skyward attendance Rates

Problem Statements: Demographics 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	During the 2025-2026 school year, campus attendance declined from 96.5% in the first six weeks to 93.9% in the third six weeks, falling 2.1 percentage points below the campus goal of 96%.	The campus attendance reward system is not designed to recognize varied attendance needs, individual improvement, or incremental progress, limiting its effectiveness in motivating students whose attendance is below the 96% campus goal..

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

199 State Comp Ed

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
				--	$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$3,750.00
				+/- Difference	**$3,750.00**

199 Bilingual/ESL/ELL

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
				--	$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$2,226.00
				+/- Difference	**$2,226.00**

211 Title I, Part A

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	NA	--	$19,065.00
2	1	2		--	$40,000.00
				Sub-Total	$59,065.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$22,936.00
				+/- Difference	**-$36,129.00**