Plano Independent School District

Wells Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:43 PM

Mission Statement

The mission of the Plano Independent School District is to provide an excellent education for each student.

Vision

Plano ISD schools empower students to be able to adapt to new learning and career opportunities throughout their lives, collaborate with, and contribute to, the global community and to be disciplined and creative in their thinking.

Value Statement

Wells Elementary provides challenging opportunities in a nurturing community allowing children to reach their potential.

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 : The percentage of grade 3 meeting the "approaches grade level" stand... 16

Priority 2 : The percentage of grade 4 students meeting the "approaches grade lev... 20

Priority 3 : The number of students who did not achieve the approaches increased ... 24

Priority 4 : Campus attendance rate was 95.4%, below the district-recommended r... 29

Priority 5 : Relative risk ratio for special population for discipline incidents is higher... 33

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Hispanic students represent a smaller percentage of the overall student population; however, this student group has a disproportionately higher rate of documented disciplinary incidents. Additional discipline areas of concern include Hispanic students receiving general education services and African American and Asian students receiving special education services.

Attendance data reflect a decline during the third six-week grading period compared with the first, second, fourth, fifth, and sixth six weeks. Chronic attendance concerns, including students identified within the highest level of attendance intervention, remain an area of focus.

College, Career, and Military Readiness data indicate that mathematics performance is approximately 15–20 percentage points lower than reading performance across all student groups. Projected SAT success in math is particularly low among African American students, at approximately 20%, and students receiving special education services, at approximately 19%.

The campus serves significant Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Asian student populations. Increasing academic growth and achievement among these student groups remains a priority across formative and summative assessments, including MAP, STAAR, and TELPAS. Although improvement has occurred over several years, continued targeted instruction, progress monitoring, and intervention are needed to address persistent performance gaps.

Strengths

Overall disciplinary incidents were low across all student populations, reflecting a positive campus culture, consistent behavioral expectations, and effective student support systems.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus attendance rate was 95.4%, below the district recommended rate of 96%. Hispanic/Latino rate was 92.8%, and economically disadvantaged attendance was 91.5% (district average 92.5%).	Attendance intervention systems are not implemented consistently and in a timely fashion.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Students identified in Q5 and those receiving HB 1416 accelerated instruction remain priority groups for targeted support and progress monitoring. Additional areas of focus include mathematics performance for current fourth-grade students entering fifth grade and reading performance for current third-grade students entering fourth grade. Continued alignment of instruction, intervention, and assessment practices will be necessary to strengthen achievement and ensure sustained student growth.

Strengths

Campus MAP performance is stronger than STAAR performance, indicating that students demonstrate greater success on local progress-monitoring assessments than on the state assessment. Growth was evident in both reading and mathematics among students in Q1 and Q2.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The percentage of grade 4 students meeting "approaches grade level" standard on Math STAAR is 66% percentage compared to the district average of 73%.	Instructional practices and intervention supports are not consistently meeting the needs of 4th-grade students.
2 ★	The percentage of grade 3 meeting "approaches grade level" standard on reading STAAR is 74% percentage compared to the district average of 76%.	Academic instruction (Tier 1, small group, targeted intervention such as AI groups) is not consistently aligned to the rigor of STAAR Reading and Writing expectations.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Although a structured small-group intervention plan was in place, students receiving HB 1416 accelerated instruction did not demonstrate the level of improvement anticipated. Strengthening intervention fidelity, monitoring student progress more frequently, and adjusting instruction based on student response remain areas of focus.

Strengths

Implementation of schoolwide instructional initiatives, KidTalk, Data, Collaborative, MTSS, and CIP meetings were used effectively to identify students experiencing academic difficulties, reviewed available data, and coordinated appropriate interventions and supports periodically.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	School progress-Accelerated Learning in 4th grade reading and math: The number of students who did not achieve approaching increased from 65% in 2025 to 79% in 2026 in math and 54% for 2025 to 78% for 2026 for reading.	Invention systems are not consistently accelerating learning for HB1416 students.
2 ★	The relative risk ratio for discipline incidents is higher for Hispanic students in general education and for African American and Asian students receiving Special Education services.	Inconsistent implementation of behavior supports, documentation, and intervention practices across staff and settings may contribute to differences in how student behavior is identified, addressed, and referred for disciplinary action, resulting in disproportionate discipline outcomes for some student groups.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

The campus demonstrates strong communication among staff, families, and other stakeholders. Consistent behavioral and operational expectations have been established through PBIS systems. Improving the campus website and ensuring information is current, accessible, and easy to navigate remain identified areas for growth. Additionally, working to maximize instructional time as well as time for planning are continued areas of focus.

Strengths

HRS survey results indicate overall satisfaction among teachers and parents with campus operations and school climate. The retention rate is high for Wells going into this 26-27 school year. There are no area from parents, staff, or students that are not within the range of the standard deviation for the HRS results.

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The percentage of grade 4 students meeting "approaches grade level" standard on Math STAAR is 66% percentage compared to the district average of 73%.	Instructional practices and intervention supports are not consistently meeting the needs of 4th-grade students.
2 ★	The percentage of grade 3 meeting "approaches grade level" standard on reading STAAR is 74% percentage compared to the district average of 76%.	Academic instruction (Tier 1, small group, targeted intervention such as AI groups) is not consistently aligned to the rigor of STAAR Reading and Writing expectations.
3 ★	School progress-Accelerated Learning in 4th grade reading and math: The number of students who did not achieve approaching increased from 65% in 2025 to 79% in 2026 in math and 54% for 2025 to 78% for 2026 for reading.	Invention systems are not consistently accelerating learning for HB1416 students.
4 ★	Campus attendance rate was 95.4%, below the district recommended rate of 96%. Hispanic/Latino rate was 92.8%, and economically disadvantaged attendance was 91.5% (district average 92.5%).	Attendance intervention systems are not implemented consistently and in a timely fashion.
5 ★	The relative risk ratio for discipline incidents is higher for Hispanic students in general education and for African American and Asian students receiving Special Education services.	Inconsistent implementation of behavior supports, documentation, and intervention practices across staff and settings may contribute to differences in how student behavior is identified, addressed, and referred for disciplinary action, resulting in disproportionate discipline outcomes for some student groups.

★ = Priority

Priorities

Priority 1

The percentage of grade 3 meeting the "approaches grade level" standard on reading STAAR is 74% compared to the district average of 76%.

Goal 1

In the 26-27 school year, 4th and 5th grade students will improve performance by 10% or more from the baseline data on prior year's RLA STAAR. At least 52.5% of Economically Disadvantaged students will earn STAAR growth points in RLA.

Performance Target: Growth of 10% or more on reading STAAR from last year, 52.5% of Economically Disadvantaged students will earn STAAR growth points in RLA.

Expected Result: All 4th and 5th grade reading students will grow 10% or more on reading STAAR

Strategy 1

Use flexible, data-driven small groups.
Teachers and support staff will use current assessment and classroom data to create and adjust targeted reading groups based on identified student needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: k-5

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Plan for cognitive rigor during Tier 1 and small-group instruction.
Teachers will intentionally incorporate Depth & Complexity prompts and cognitively complex questions into whole-group and small-group reading instruction, with developmentally appropriate implementation in grades K-5.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Increase structured student discussion.
Teachers will provide regular opportunities for students to discuss, explain, justify, and respond to texts using developmentally appropriate collaborative structures, sentence stems, visuals, vocabulary supports, and other scaffolds as needed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Provide explicit word study and morphology instruction.
Students will receive systematic instruction in developmentally appropriate word-analysis skills, including phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, roots, prefixes, suffixes, and morphology to strengthen decoding and comprehension.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Monitor student progress and respond to data.
Grade-level teams will regularly review student performance during PLCs/KidTalk and adjust instruction, intervention, grouping, and supports based on identified strengths and needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Provide targeted support for students not demonstrating expected growth.
Teachers, specialists, and intervention staff will identify students who are below grade-level expectations or not demonstrating adequate growth and provide targeted, skill-specific intervention with ongoing progress monitoring.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 7

Prioritize support for identified student groups.
Teams will regularly review the progress of Economically Disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and other identified student groups to ensure access to rigorous Tier 1 instruction, appropriate scaffolds, and timely intervention.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 8

Address instructional gaps related to student absences.

Teams will identify priority skills and standards missed by students with excessive absences and develop a plan for targeted reteaching and opportunities to recover essential learning.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, sped, academic support

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The percentage of grade 3 meeting "approaches grade level" standard on reading STAAR is 74% percentage compared to the district average of 76%.	Academic instruction (Tier 1, small group, targeted intervention such as AI groups) is not consistently aligned to the rigor of STAAR Reading and Writing expectations.

Priority 2

The percentage of grade 4 students meeting the "approaches grade level" standard on Math STAAR is 66% compared to the district average of 73%.

Goal 1

In the 26-27 school year, 5th grade students will improve performance by 10% or more from the baseline data on prior year's Math STAAR. At least 65% of Economically Disadvantaged students will earn STAAR growth points in math.

Performance Target: Growth of 10% or more on math STAAR from last year, 65% of Economically Disadvantaged students will earn STAAR growth points in Math.

Expected Result: All 4th and 5th-grade math students will show growth of 10% or more on math STAAR from last year,

Strategy 1

Strengthen vertical alignment across grade levels.
Grade-level teams will collaborate vertically to identify prerequisite skills, priority standards, common mathematical language, and connections between concepts to support a coherent progression of learning from Kindergarten through 5th grade.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Teach students to analyze and make sense of problems.
Teachers will explicitly model and provide regular opportunities for students to identify what a problem is asking, determine relevant information, select an appropriate strategy, and explain their reasoning.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Build computational fluency and fact automaticity.
Students will engage in consistent, developmentally appropriate practice to build accuracy, efficiency, and automaticity with foundational number skills and the four operations.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Provide targeted small-group instruction using flexible grouping.
Teachers and support staff will use current assessment and classroom data to form and adjust small groups based on specific student needs and skills.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Identify and respond to trends in student performance.
Grade-level teams will regularly analyze assessment, classroom, and student work data to identify patterns of strength and struggle and determine appropriate instructional responses.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Intentionally spiral and connect mathematical concepts.
Teachers will regularly revisit previously taught skills and intentionally connect new learning to prior concepts to strengthen retention, application, and conceptual understanding.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 7

Use errors and misconceptions as opportunities for learning.
Teachers will intentionally analyze student errors and misconceptions and provide opportunities for students to identify, discuss, correct, and explain mathematical thinking.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 8

Increase meaningful mathematical discourse.
Teachers will provide regular opportunities for students to discuss mathematical ideas, compare strategies, justify solutions, ask questions, and explain their reasoning using developmentally appropriate sentence stems, models, and vocabulary supports.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 9

Monitor progress and adjust instruction.
Grade-level teams will use PLCs/KidTalk and other collaborative planning structures to monitor student progress and adjust Tier 1 instruction, intervention, grouping, and supports based on student need.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5, Sped, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The percentage of grade 4 students meeting "approaches grade level" standard on Math STAAR is 66% percentage compared to the district average of 73%.	Instructional practices and intervention supports are not consistently meeting the needs of 4th-grade students.

Priority 3

The number of students who did not achieve the approaches increased in both 4th-grade reading and math STAAR. In reading, this number increased from 54% for 2025 to 78% for 2026. In math, this number increased from 65% in 2025 to 79% in 2026.

Goal 1

In the 26-27 school year, all HB1416 students will show 50% growth from the previous school year.

Performance Target: All 4th and 5th grade HB students will show 50% growth from the previous school year.

Expected Result: All HB students will show 50% growth from the previous school year.

Strategy 1

Ensure HB1416 students receive targeted instruction from the classroom teacher.
Students receiving HB1416 accelerated instruction will also participate in consistent, targeted small-group instruction with the classroom teacher based on identified skill and TEKS needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Provide differentiated practice at students' instructional levels.
Teachers will assign developmentally appropriate DreamBox lessons and other targeted learning activities that address prerequisite skills and identified gaps while maintaining connections to grade-level content.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Use multiple data sources to identify instructional needs.
Teachers and teams will analyze MAP, STAAR, classroom assessments, student work, and other available data to identify specific strengths, gaps, and priority skills for intervention.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Provide consistent practice with STAAR-aligned questioning and problem-solving.
In STAAR-tested grades, teachers will intentionally incorporate released STAAR questions and STAAR-aligned tasks into instruction to build familiarity with question types, reasoning expectations, and application of grade-level standards.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Use consistent problem-solving structures across grade levels.
Teachers will use district-provided station boards, problem-solving templates, and common instructional structures to help students organize their thinking, explain their reasoning, and

make connections across concepts. These structures will be introduced developmentally across grades K-5.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Provide HB1416 intervention consistently and protect intervention time.
Teams will establish a consistent schedule for accelerated instruction and monitor implementation to ensure students receive required and targeted support without unnecessary interruptions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 7

Track progress by individual TEKS and skill needs.
Teachers and students will use TEKS-aligned tracking tools, student goal-setting sheets, or teacher data charts to document mastery, identify areas needing continued support, and reflect on progress.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 8

Monitor student progress frequently and adjust instruction.
Teachers and collaborative teams will review HB1416 student progress regularly and adjust grouping, instructional focus, intervention strategies, and level of support based on evidence of student growth.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 9

Increase the depth of student thinking and academic conversations.
Teachers will ask purposeful, higher-level questions and hold students accountable for explaining, justifying, and discussing their thinking. Developmentally appropriate Depth & Complexity icons, graphic organizers, sentence stems, and other scaffolds will be used to support student responses.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 10

Analyze student misconceptions and provide targeted reteaching.

Teachers will use student work and assessment responses to identify patterns of errors and misconceptions and provide explicit reteaching, modeling, guided practice, and opportunities for students to demonstrate corrected understanding.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All K-5 teachers, special education teachers, and academic specialists

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus attendance rate was 95.4%, below the district recommended rate of 96%. Hispanic/Latino rate was 92.8%, and economically disadvantaged attendance was 91.5% (district average 92.5%).	Attendance intervention systems are not implemented consistently and in a timely fashion.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	School progress-Accelerated Learning in 4th grade reading and math: The number of students who did not achieve approaching increased from 65% in 2025 to 79% in 2026 in math and 54% for 2025 to 78% for 2026 for reading.	Invention systems are not consistently accelerating learning for HB1416 students.

Priority 4

Campus attendance rate was 95.4%, below the district-recommended rate of 96%. Hispanic/Latino rate was 92.8%, and economically disadvantaged attendance was 91.5% (district average 92.5%).

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the campus attendance rate will increase from 95.4% to at least 96%, meeting the district attendance target, as measured by attendance records.

Performance Target: All students will contribute to the 96% campus attendance rate for the year.

Expected Result: The campus will have a yearly average of 96% attendance.

Strategy 1

Provide timely, positive outreach when students are absent.
Teachers and staff will use consistent "We Missed You" emails, messages, or other positive communication to let students and families know their presence is noticed and valued.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Provide a trusted adult mentor for students with significant attendance concerns.
Students identified for Tier 4 attendance support will be paired with a staff member outside of their grade-level team who will provide regular check-ins, encouragement, and connection to school.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Strengthen student belonging through daily relationship-building practices.
Teachers will intentionally use CharacterStrong, morning meetings, classroom circles, and other relationship-building structures to strengthen students' sense of belonging and connection to their classroom and school community.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Create opportunities for students to build relationships across grade levels.
Grade levels will participate in intentional cross-grade partnerships, such as buddy classes, reading buddies, leadership opportunities, or collaborative activities, to increase student connections across the campus.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Provide individualized family communication and support.
Staff will communicate directly with families of students experiencing attendance concerns to identify barriers and connect families with appropriate campus, district, or community resources based on individual needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Use a flexible menu of attendance interventions.
Campus staff will use a range of response options based on the needs of each student and family, rather than relying on a one-size-fits-all approach. Supports may include teacher outreach, mentor check-ins, problem-solving meetings, resource referrals, attendance plans, or administrative support.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 7

Monitor attendance data and intervene early.
Campus and grade-level teams will regularly review attendance data to identify patterns, students approaching attendance thresholds, and student groups needing additional support so interventions can begin before concerns become chronic.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MTSS team.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 8

Recognize and reinforce improved attendance.
The campus will celebrate improved attendance, individual growth, and positive attendance habits in ways that are encouraging, inclusive, and developmentally appropriate for students in Kindergarten through 5th grade.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus attendance rate was 95.4%, below the district recommended rate of 96%. Hispanic/Latino rate was 92.8%, and economically disadvantaged attendance was 91.5% (district average 92.5%).	Attendance intervention systems are not implemented consistently and in a timely fashion.

Priority 5

Relative risk ratio for special population for discipline incidents is higher for Hispanic gen ed students and Special Education African American and Asian students.

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, Wells Elementary will strengthen a safe, respectful, and welcoming school culture by increasing the percentage of students who consistently demonstrate a 10% reduction in office discipline referrals.

Performance Target: All campus behavior incidents will be reduced by 10%

Expected Result: All campus behavior incidents will be reduced by 10%

Strategy 1

Ensure consistent and complete documentation of behavior incidents and interventions.
Teachers and staff will document significant or repeated behavior concerns, including the behavior observed, context, strategies attempted, student response, and communication with families. Documentation will be used to identify patterns and provide families and support teams with a complete picture of student needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Build positive relationships with students and families early.
Teachers and staff will intentionally establish positive communication with families before concerns arise and maintain ongoing communication when behavior support is needed to strengthen trust and collaboration.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Provide early behavior intervention before concerns escalate.
Teachers will implement and document appropriate classroom-based behavior strategies before an office referral, when appropriate, and seek assistance from support staff when initial interventions are not effective.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Identify the function and underlying need behind behavior.
Staff will consider patterns, triggers, antecedents, environmental factors, and the possible purpose of the behavior to determine appropriate supports rather than responding only to the behavior itself.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 5

Increase the use of Tier 2 behavior supports through SST.
Students demonstrating repeated or escalating behavior concerns will be referred for SST or other problem-solving meetings to develop targeted interventions, identify responsible staff, establish progress-monitoring methods, and determine next steps.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 6

Monitor student response to interventions and adjust supports.
Teachers, support staff, and administrators will regularly review behavior data and intervention outcomes to determine whether supports are effective and make adjustments as needed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 7

Use multiple trusted adults to support student problem-solving.
When a student is not responding to a conversation or intervention with one staff member, another trusted staff member may be involved to help the student regulate, communicate, reflect, and problem-solve.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 8

Use consistent, developmentally appropriate behavior expectations and responses.

Staff will explicitly teach, model, reinforce, and reteach campus and classroom expectations using developmentally appropriate language and consistent responses across settings.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 9

Review discipline data for patterns and disproportionality.
Campus leadership will periodically review discipline data by grade level, behavior type, location, student group, and other relevant factors to identify patterns and determine where additional supports, staff training, or changes in practice are needed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All staff working with the student.

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The relative risk ratio for discipline incidents is higher for Hispanic students in general education and for African American and Asian students receiving Special Education services.	Inconsistent implementation of behavior supports, documentation, and intervention practices across staff and settings may contribute to differences in how student behavior is identified, addressed, and referred for disciplinary action, resulting in disproportionate discipline outcomes for some student groups.