Plano Independent School District

Williams High School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

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

Mission Statement

Our Plano ISD learning community will educate, inspire and empower every student to activate their unique potential in a dynamic world.

Vision

Williams HS students will be inspired and equipped to achieve personal success as lifelong learners and responsible productive citizens.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 8

School Processes & Programs 10

Perceptions 12

Priority Problem Statements 14

Priorities 16

Priority 1 : Improve, align and remove barriers for academic programs to ensure th... 17

Priority 2 : Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR readin... 24

Priority 3 : Create a culture of belonging for all members of the Plano ISD communi... 26

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

What key takeaways did your group have related to the behavior questions in the CNA?

- For a total student enrollment of 842 students, there were a total of 1,097 disciplinary referrals submitted over the course of the 25-26 school year.
- The Hispanic population at Williams for the 25-26 school year represented 53.2% of the total student population, yet 78% of total disciplinary referrals.
- The African-American population at Williams for the 25-26 school year represented 12.5% of the total student population, yet 9.6% of total disciplinary referrals.
- The White population at Williams for the 25-26 school year represented 8% of the total student population, yet 9.5% of total disciplinary referrals.
- The Asian population at Williams for the 25-26 school year represented 3.2% of the total student population, yet 2.5% of total disciplinary referrals.

What do you notice about discipline by student groups? Are there any disproportionalities?

- Minority (Hispanic/EB) populations of students at Williams receive a disproportionate percentage of disciplinary referrals as compared to their enrollment percentage.
- The Hispanic population at Williams represents 53.2%, yet 78% of total disciplinary referrals.
- The African-American population at Williams represents 12.5%, yet 9.5% of total disciplinary referrals.

Are there any concerns with the number of hate-related incidents? Are there specific groups of students that may be targeted with hate-related speech or actions?

- There is no evidence of hate-related speech or actions according to the data in Edugence.

What do you notice about attendance trends?

- For the 25-26 school year, attendance percentage was 92.8% The subpopulations by ethnicity are as follows:
    - Hispanic - 91.3%
    - African American - 92.9%
    - Asian - 96.2%
    - White - 94.2%
- All subpopulation ethnicity groups' attendance rates are below the District expectation of 96%.
- Attendance rates for males (92.3%) and females (93.1%) are comparable.
- Attendance rates for 9th (93%) and 10th (92.5%) are comparable.
- McKinney Vento students yearly average attendance is 80.3%, well below the Williams average and District expectation of 96%.

Attendance is reported to the state each six weeks. Which six weeks is attendance the lowest? The highest?

- For all students, the 6th 6-week period was the lowest attendance rate at 91%.
- For all students, the 1st 6-week period was the highest attendance rate at 94.4%.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus attendance rate was 92.8% across all student subpopulations, significantly lower than the District expectation of 96%. Cumulative Hispanic and African -American attendance for the 25-26 school year were the two lowest ethnic groups at 91.3% and 92.9% respectively.	Attendance intervention systems and communication/collaboration with parents have not increased attendance rates nor decreased absenteeism.
2	Minority (Hispanic/EB) populations of students at Williams receive a disproportionate percentage of disciplinary referrals as compared to their enrollment percentage. The Hispanic population at Williams represents 53.2%, yet 78% of total disciplinary referrals.	

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Overall, we had more students approach, meet, and master than the 2025 Algebra 1 EOC administration. We saw a 17% growth in our EB population from the 2025 administration to the 2026 administration in the approaching category. Our lowest performing subpopulations were EB and SPED. A specific area of growth would be to move those subpopulations from DNM to approaches and approaches to meets.

A significant percentage of English I first-time testers who pass are doing so at the *Meets* level or higher, which is a strong indicator of solid core tier-1 instruction. Both EB and SPED student groups face barriers (that must be identified) at the highest level, hovering at 0% to 1% *Masters* across both grade levels. Across both English I and English II first-time testers, Asian students achieved exceptionally high rates of success, outperforming overall campus averages. Both EB and SPED student groups face barriers (that must be identified) at the highest level, hovering at 0% to 1% *Masters* across both grade levels.

With our Biology I EOC scores, we remained steady with our scores overall. There was a slight jump in scores in meets and masters for both the overall population and EB. However, there was a slight decrease in scores in SPED.

We had significant growth in TELPAS across all domains, particularly with our 9th graders. We could continue to show growth in reading and speaking.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on English 1 EOC is 21% and 40% respectively, compared to the campus average of 69%. English II EOC is 36% and 44% compared to the campus average of 75%.	Intervention systems, instructional pacing, and differentiation are not consistently aligned to student readiness levels and growth targets.
2 ★	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on Algebra 1 EOC is 53% and 68% respectively, compared to the campus average of 79%.	Academic language supports and scaffolded instruction are not consistently embedded within math instruction for EB and SPED students.
3 ★	Of the TSIA ELAR/Essay testers, 76% scored below the qualifying metric.	Academic language supports and targeted instruction support are not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TSIA.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Over the past two years, our teams have shown growth personalizing and utilizing the PLC processes and norms, with school level administrators frequently attending PLC meetings. Teachers are still growing using data to inform decision making. We can continue to grow in using data to identify how to grow our tier 2 and tier 3 instruction.

We are using advisory time for intervention for our students. During the advisory we used Mathia and ReadingPlus for intervention. This is a huge area of growth on our campus. This has not been an effective time for students to receive intervention. We also support students through enrollment in Academic Literacy and Strategic Learning for Math. These programs are taught by a certified English and Math team. They use district created resources in this class.

All content teams worked with Multilingual Services to create professional development based on teacher needs that were content specific. On top of this, our school participates in a new teacher mentor program, where each new member to campus is assigned a mentor. Mentees received regular check-ins with mentors and received extra professional development.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There is low student engagement and minimal academic growth within our accelerated instruction / advisory courses.	
2	Data driven tier 2 and tier 3 interventions are not being consistently executed across campus.	

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Data is gathered at district required intervals, like the HRS. We have made progress on cultivating community with our students though an area of growth continues to be engaging more with parents and external community members.

Teachers are trained on using Review 360 and regularly review procedures for documentation. We need to improve the accountability and follow-through in terms of expectation management for teachers, administrators, and parents.

Teachers and staff rated formal input opportunities regarding school functioning on the HRS Level 1 survey, for example, documentation of how teacher input was used to make specific decisions was rated at more than 40% neither agree or disagree or below. Parents and students rated formula input opportunities regarding school functioning on the HRS Level 1 survey at 2.63. Student perceptions regarding schoolwide recognition and acknowledgment of success on the HRS level 1 survey averaged 2.91, with high variability among responses (SD 1.18).

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers and staff rated formal input opportunities regarding school functioning on the HRS Level 1 survey, for example, documentation of how teacher input was used to make specific decisions was rated at more than 40% neither agree or disagree or below.	
2	Parents and students rated formula input opportunities regarding school functioning on the HRS Level 1 survey at 2.63.	
3	Student perceptions regarding schoolwide recognition and acknowledgment of success on the HRS level 1 survey averaged 2.91, with high variability among responses (SD 1.18).	

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on English 1 EOC is 21% and 40% respectively, compared to the campus average of 69%. English II EOC is 36% and 44% compared to the campus average of 75%.	Intervention systems, instructional pacing, and differentiation are not consistently aligned to student readiness levels and growth targets.
2 ★	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on Algebra 1 EOC is 53% and 68% respectively, compared to the campus average of 79%.	Academic language supports and scaffolded instruction are not consistently embedded within math instruction for EB and SPED students.
3 ★	Of the TSIA ELAR/Essay testers, 76% scored below the qualifying metric.	Academic language supports and targeted instruction support are not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TSIA.
4 ★	Campus attendance rate was 92.8% across all student subpopulations, significantly lower than the District expectation of 96%. Cumulative Hispanic and African -American attendance for the 25-26 school year were the two lowest ethnic groups at 91.3% and 92.9% respectively.	Attendance intervention systems and communication/collaboration with parents have not increased attendance rates nor decreased absenteeism.

★ = Priority

Priorities

Priority 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 2026-2027 school year, Williams High School will increase the percentage of Hispanic students meeting or exceeding grade-level standards on the STAAR EOC English I and English II tests.

Performance Target: Specifically, the percentage of Hispanic students meeting the identified academic performance standard will increase by at least 10 percentage points more than the 2025-2026 baseline by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.

Expected Result: Increase the percentage of Hispanic students meeting or exceeding grade-level standards on STAAR EOC English I and English II tests.

Strategy 1

Conduct Focused PLC Meetings: Dedicate professional learning community (PLC) time for English I and II teachers to dissect student work, identify specific TEKS where Hispanic students face learning gaps, and plan immediate re-teaching.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; Admin Team; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Align Formative Assessments to STAAR: Ensure all campus-wide short-constructed response (SCR) and extended-constructed response (ECR) prompts strictly mirror the rigor and scoring rubrics of the online STAAR platform.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Embed SIOP Techniques: Implement sheltered instruction strategies such as sentence stems, structured conversations, and total response signals across all English classrooms to support academic vocabulary development.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

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 Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on English 1 EOC is 21% and 40% respectively, compared to the campus average of 69%. English II EOC is 36% and 44% compared to the campus average of 75%.	Intervention systems, instructional pacing, and differentiation are not consistently aligned to student readiness levels and growth targets.

Goal 2

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, Williams High School will increase the percentage of Hispanic students who demonstrate one or more years of academic growth on the STAAR EOC English I and English II tests.

Performance Target: Specifically, the percentage of Hispanic students who demonstrate one or more years of academic growth will increase by at least 10 percentage points more than the 2025-2026 baseline by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.

Expected Result: Increase the percentage of Hispanic students who demonstrate one or more years of

academic growth on STAAR EOC English I and English II tests.

Strategy 1

Conduct Focused PLC Meetings: Dedicate professional learning community (PLC) time for English I and II teachers to dissect student work, identify specific TEKS where Hispanic students face learning gaps, and plan immediate re-teaching.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC; Admin Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Align Formative Assessments to STAAR: Ensure all campus-wide short-constructed response (SCR) and extended-constructed response (ECR) prompts strictly mirror the rigor and scoring rubrics of the online STAAR platform.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Embed SIOP Techniques: Implement sheltered instruction strategies such as sentence stems, structured conversations, and total response signals across all English classrooms to support academic vocabulary development.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC; Admin Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on English 1 EOC is 21% and 40% respectively, compared to the campus average of 69%. English II EOC is 36% and 44% compared to the campus average of 75%.	Intervention systems, instructional pacing, and differentiation are not consistently aligned to student readiness levels and growth targets.

Goal 3

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, Williams High School will increase the percentage of Hispanic and SpEd students meeting or exceeding grade-level standards on the STAAR EOC Algebra I test.

Performance Target: Specifically, the percentage of Hispanic and SpEd students meeting the identified academic performance standard will increase by at least 10 percentage points more than the 2025-2026 baseline by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.

Expected Result: Increase the percentage of Hispanic and SpEd students meeting or exceeding grade-level standards on STAAR EOC Algebra I test.

Strategy 1

Implement HB 1416 Targeted Intervention: Organize small-group accelerated instruction during built-in advisory periods or after school for students who did not pass the previous year's STAAR exam.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; Admin Team; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Align Formative Assessments to STAAR: Ensure all campus-wide common formative assessments/summative assessments strictly mirror the rigor and scoring rubrics of the online STAAR platform.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Conduct Focused PLC Meetings: Dedicate professional learning community (PLC) time for Algebra I teachers to dissect student work, identify specific TEKS where Hispanic students face learning gaps, and plan immediate re-teaching.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Embed SIOP Techniques: Implement sheltered instruction strategies such as sentence stems, structured conversations, and total response signals across all Algebra I classrooms to support academic vocabulary development.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on Algebra 1 EOC is 53% and 68% respectively, compared to the campus average of 79%.	Academic language supports and scaffolded instruction are not consistently embedded within math instruction for EB and SPED students.

Goal 4

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, Williams High School will increase the percentage of Hispanic and SpEd students who demonstrate one or more years of academic growth on the STAAR EOC Algebra I test.

Performance Target: Specifically, the percentage of Hispanic and SpEd students meeting the academic performance standard will increase by at least 10 percentage points more than the 2025-2026 baseline by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.

Expected Result: Increase the percentage of Hispanic and SpEd students who demonstrate one or more years of academic growth on STAAR EOC Algebra I test.

Strategy 1

Implement HB 1416 Targeted Intervention: Organize small-group accelerated instruction during built-in advisory periods or after school for students who did not pass the previous year's STAAR exam.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Align Formative Assessments to STAAR: Ensure all campus-wide common formative assessments/summative assessments strictly mirror the rigor and scoring rubrics of the online STAAR platform.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Conduct Focused PLC Meetings: Dedicate professional learning community (PLC) time for Algebra I teachers to dissect student work, identify specific TEKS where Hispanic students face learning gaps, and plan immediate re-teaching.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The percentage of Sped and EB students meeting the Approaches Grade Level standard on Algebra 1 EOC is 53% and 68% respectively, compared to the campus average of 79%.	Academic language supports and scaffolded instruction are not consistently embedded within math instruction for EB and SPED students.

Priority 2

Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR readiness status (Pre-K through 12th grade system).

Goal 1

By May 2027, the percentage of students taking the TSIA ELAR/Essay assessment who score below the qualifying metric will decrease from 76% to 50% or less, as measured by TSIA assessment results.

Performance Target: Specifically, the percentage of students taking the TSIA ELAR/Essay assessment and meeting the qualifying metric will increase
from 24% to at least 50% by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.

Expected Result: Increase the percentage of students meeting the TSIA ELAR/Essay qualifying metric.

Strategy 1

Establish Routine Timed Writing Prompts: Integrate bi-weekly, 30-minute timed writing prompts into upper-level English classes that directly mirror the informational or persuasive topics found on the TSIA2 Essay exam.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: English I/II Teachers; Academic Literacy Teacher

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Embed Daily "Bell Ringer" Warm-Ups: Integrate 5-to-10-minute daily TSIA-style practice questions into all 9th and 10th-grade English classes, focusing heavily on syntax, punctuation rules, and vocabulary in context.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: English I/II Teachers; Academic Literacy Teacher

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Implement sheltered instruction strategies such as sentence stems, structured conversations, and total response signals across all English classrooms to support academic vocabulary development.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers; IC

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Of the TSIA ELAR/Essay testers, 76% scored below the qualifying metric.	Academic language supports and targeted instruction support are not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TSIA.

Priority 3 Create a culture of belonging for all members of the Plano ISD community.

Goal 1

By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, Williams High School will increase the overall campus attendance rate to meet the District expectation of 96%.

Performance Target: Specifically, the campus will increase the cumulative attendance rate for Hispanic students from 91.3% to at least 96% and African-American students from 92.9% to at least 96%

Expected Result: The 26-27 student attendance rate will increase from 92.8% to at least 96%, aligning with the District expectation.

Strategy 1

Conduct Weekly Data Reviews: Disaggregate attendance data by grade level, subpopulation, and period weekly to identify systemic trends or specific periods with high absenteeism.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MTSS Committee; Admin Team; Attendance Clerk

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Form an Attendance/MTSS Committee: Establish a dedicated campus attendance committee comprising administrators, counselors, and key teachers to review attendance data bi-weekly.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MTSS Committee; Admin Team; Attendance Clerk; Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Host Attendance Awareness Nights: Conduct informational parent meetings at the start of each semester to explain the direct correlation between attendance, academic funding, and graduation rules under Texas 90% attendance laws.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MTSS Committee; Admin Team

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Establish Attendance Incentives: Implement monthly and quarterly rewards for both perfect attendance and "most improved attendance" to incentivize students who are actively turning habits around.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: MTSS Committee; Admin Team; Teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus attendance rate was 92.8% across all student subpopulations, significantly lower than the District expectation of 96%. Cumulative Hispanic and African -American attendance for the 25-26 school year were the two lowest ethnic groups at 91.3% and 92.9% respectively.	Attendance intervention systems and communication/collaboration with parents have not increased attendance rates nor decreased absenteeism.