Plano Independent School District

Wyatt Elementary

Accountability Rating: A

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 23, 2026 at 03:44 PM

Mission Statement

A caring community dedicated to academic excellence for all learners in a challenging and nurturing environment.

Vision



Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Demographics 5

Student Learning 7

Priority Problem Statements 9

Priorities 11

Priority 1 : 1.1 - Improve, align, and remove barriers for academic programs to ensu... 12

Priority 2 : 2.3 - Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR r... 17

Priority 3 : 4.2 - Implement interventions and systems of support to ensure a safe, ... 20

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Wyatt Elementary is in PISD's West Cluster, and is the furthest north school in our district. Our school has shown staff stability, and families tend to buy a house in the neighborhood and stay for a long time.We have served families with multiple children that start in Kindergarten and stay with us through 5th grade. Our population is 51.26% Asian, 25.5% White, 7% Hispanic and 7% African American, and 5% 2 or more races.

Economically disadvantaged and Free and Reduced lunch in <10% and fluctuates above slightly and below slightly throughout the year.

PROGRAMS - Dyslexia 7%, Gifted & Talented 28%, SpEd 19%, Bilingual 19%, 504 6%

Strengths

Our community is very diverse with families from all over the United States as well as around the world. We are a blend of many cultures which we celebrate throughout the year!

Our families wish for their children to have a great academic experience, high achievement, and to be prepared for a bright future, most students will attend college. Parents are supportive of our initiatives and are eager to volunteer and join our active PTA!

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	One-third of EBs are not on track to meet the college and career readiness benchmarks in both reading and math by the end of 5th grade.	Inconsistent language supports such as language scaffolding and opportunities for academic discourse across all grade levels.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Wyatt 25-26 CNA
This document tracks data from the whole year BOY, MOY, EOY and shows progress across our campus using multiple measures.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Reading: Q1 and Q2 students fell short of meeting or exceeding 120% growth.	Key causes include an imbalance in teacher-table time, reliance on previous years resources rather than current district curriculum, and overusing computer apps as primary teaching tools rather than supplemental supports.
2 ★	Math: 1st grade Quintile 1 (119%) and 2nd grade Quintile 1 (107%) failed to reach the campus benchmark of 120% growth, alongside minor deficits in 3rd grade Quintile 5.	Lack of fidelity in the Level Up implementation consistency across all grade levels, insufficient targeted tiered support using direct intervention instruction, and inconsistency in the grade leveled instructional schedules.
3	Science: High MAP science growth (200%+ in 3rd/4th; 120%+ in 5th) is not translating into STAAR success.	Inconsistent use of curriculum "Science Talks." Lack of systematic review of 3rd/4th grade TEKS prior to testing. Weak vertical alignment across 3rd-5th grades.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Reading: Q1 and Q2 students fell short of meeting or exceeding 120% growth.	Key causes include an imbalance in teacher-table time, reliance on previous years resources rather than current district curriculum, and overusing computer apps as primary teaching tools rather than supplemental supports.
2 ★	Math: 1st grade Quintile 1 (119%) and 2nd grade Quintile 1 (107%) failed to reach the campus benchmark of 120% growth, alongside minor deficits in 3rd grade Quintile 5.	Lack of fidelity in the Level Up implementation consistency across all grade levels, insufficient targeted tiered support using direct intervention instruction, and inconsistency in the grade leveled instructional schedules.
3 ★	One-third of EBs are not on track to meet the college and career readiness benchmarks in both reading and math by the end of 5th grade.	Inconsistent language supports such as language scaffolding and opportunities for academic discourse across all grade levels.
4 ★	(PBIS) - Level 1 and Level 2 behaviors should be handled in the classroom and logged as a teacher managed incidents. 37% of admin referrals were due to Level 1 disruptive behavior (59 total admin reviews - 22 of them due to disruptive behavior).	Unclear definition of an admin referral and PISD Leveled Guide of Behaviors.

★ = Priority

Priorities

Priority 1

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

Goal 1

In the 2026 - 2027 school year, students in grades K - 5 will achieve growth that exceeds 100% of projected growth in Reading as measured by the percent of projected growth report. (PGR)

Performance Target: 100% growth with a stretch goal of 120% growth or greater on MAP in reading.

Expected Result: All students will meet or exceed 100% growth in Reading, with Quintile 4 & Quintile 5 students showing growth of 120% or greater.

Strategy 1

Intentional planning of Level Up, HB1416, and time at the teacher table.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Level Up and Teacher Table: Cynthia Hentges and Melinda Rauch
HB 1416: Mary Lee Grounds

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Monitor engagement of ALL students during independent learning time.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Cynthia Hentges and Melinda Rauch

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Use current PISD curriculum materials and relevant enrichment based on data analysis.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Leverage and monitor computer applications intentionally as supplemental tools to enhanced direct, teacher-led instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading: Q1 and Q2 students fell short of meeting or exceeding 120% growth.	Key causes include an imbalance in teacher-table time, reliance on previous years resources rather than current district curriculum, and overusing computer apps as primary teaching tools rather than supplemental supports.
2	Math: 1st grade Quintile 1 (119%) and 2nd grade Quintile 1 (107%) failed to reach the campus benchmark of 120% growth, alongside minor deficits in 3rd grade Quintile 5.	Lack of fidelity in the Level Up implementation consistency across all grade levels, insufficient targeted tiered support using direct intervention instruction, and inconsistency in the grade leveled instructional schedules.

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	(PBIS) - Level 1 and Level 2 behaviors should be handled in the classroom and logged as a teacher managed incidents. 37% of admin referrals were due to Level 1 disruptive behavior (59 total admin reviews - 22 of them due to disruptive behavior).	Unclear definition of an admin referral and PISD Leveled Guide of Behaviors.

Goal 2

In the 2026 - 2027 school year, students in grades K - 5 will achieve growth that exceeds 100% of projected growth in Math on the MAP test as measured by the percent of projected growth report. (PGR)

Performance Target: 100% growth with a stretch goal of 120% growth or greater on MAP in Math.

Expected Result: All students will meet or exceed 100% growth in Math, with Quintile 4 & Quintile 5 students showing growth of 120% or greater.

Strategy 1

Intentional planning of Level Up, HB1416, and time at the teacher table.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Level Up and Teacher Table - Cynthia Hentges and Melinda Rauch
HB1416 - Mary Lee Grounds

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Monitor engagement of ALL students during independent learning time.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Use current PISD curriculum materials and relevant enrichment based on data analysis.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 4

Leverage and monitor computer applications intentionally as supplemental tools to enhanced direct, teacher-led instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading: Q1 and Q2 students fell short of meeting or exceeding 120% growth.	Key causes include an imbalance in teacher-table time, reliance on previous years resources rather than current district curriculum, and overusing computer apps as primary teaching tools rather than supplemental supports.
2	Math: 1st grade Quintile 1 (119%) and 2nd grade Quintile 1 (107%) failed to reach the campus benchmark of 120% growth, alongside minor deficits in 3rd grade Quintile 5.	Lack of fidelity in the Level Up implementation consistency across all grade levels, insufficient targeted tiered support using direct intervention instruction, and inconsistency in the grade leveled instructional schedules.

Priority 2

2.3 - Increase access and opportunities for students to achieve CCMR readiness status (K-5 grade system).

Goal 1

All EBs will be on track to meet the College and Career Readiness benchmarks in both reading and math by the end of 5th grade.

Performance Target: 2nd graders will finish the year on track for college readiness in both reading and math; at or above 59% in reading and at or above 47% in math. 5th graders will finish the year on track for college readiness in both reading and math; at or above 65%.

Expected Result: All EBs will be on track to meet the College and Career Readiness benchmarks in both reading and math by the end of 5th grade.

Strategy 1

Consistent planning and use of language supports such as language scaffolding and opportunities for academic discourse across all grade levels.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Provide opportunities for oral communication such as turn and talks, round table conversations, and read alouds.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Monitor student progress through conversations and peer interactions BOY, MOY, and EOY using Summit K12 data or reports.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	One-third of EBs are not on track to meet the college and career readiness benchmarks in both reading and math by the end of 5th grade.	Inconsistent language supports such as language scaffolding and opportunities for academic discourse across all grade levels.

Goal 2

We will maintain our record of 96% or above for student attendance each of the 6 week periods during the 26 - 27 school year.

Performance Target: 96% or above, each of the 6 week periods.

Expected Result: We expect students will show academic growth which contributes to meeting the College & Career Readiness benchmarks in reading and math.

Strategy 1

Monitor attendance every two weeks during campus MTSS meetings.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Mary Lee Grounds SSL, Rochelle Carter Counselor

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Create Student Support Plans for students who need more than a phone call home due to chronic absence or tardies.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Mary Lee Grounds SSL, Rochelle Carter Counselor

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	One-third of EBs are not on track to meet the college and career readiness benchmarks in both reading and math by the end of 5th grade.	Inconsistent language supports such as language scaffolding and opportunities for academic discourse across all grade levels.

Priority 3

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

Goal 1

Level 1 and Level 2 behaviors will be handled in the classroom and logged in Review 360 as teacher-managed incidents.

Performance Target: 100% of Level 1 and Level 2 behaviors will be handled in the classroom and logged in Review 360 as teacher-managed incidents.

Expected Result: 100% of Level 1 and Level 2 behaviors will be handled in the classroom and logged in Review 360 as teacher-managed incidents.

Strategy 1

At BOY, set clear expectations as to what tier/level student behaviors fall into and how to code in Review 360 whether incidents were teacher-managed or need an admin review.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Melinda Rauch

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 2

Review throughout the year examples and expectations.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Melinda Rauch

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Strategy 3

Have private conversations with those who need additional support.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Melinda Rauch

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	June

Goal 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	(PBIS) - Level 1 and Level 2 behaviors should be handled in the classroom and logged as a teacher managed incidents. 37% of admin referrals were due to Level 1 disruptive behavior (59 total admin reviews - 22 of them due to disruptive behavior).	Unclear definition of an admin referral and PISD Leveled Guide of Behaviors.