Hutto Independent School District

Hutto Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan



Mission Statement

At Hutto Elementary School, we inspire all students to achieve excellence in academics, character, and community.

Vision

The vision of Hutto Elementary School is inspiring excellence.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4
- Demographics 4
- Student Learning 6
- School Processes & Programs 8
- Perceptions 9

Priority Problem Statements 10

Goals 12
- Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations. 12
- Goal 2: Expand strategies that attract and retain high-performing talent. 20
- Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact. 24
- Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes. 28

Campus Funding Summary 31

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 32

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Hutto Elementary serves a diverse and growing student population that reflects the Hutto community. The campus benefits from a dedicated staff, a strong culture of belonging, and systems designed to support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students. Hutto Elementary provides a variety of programs and services, including Special Education, Emergent Bilingual services, Dyslexia services, Gifted and Talented services, intervention supports, counseling services, and leadership opportunities through Leader in Me. The campus also benefits from a blend of experienced and developing educators who work collaboratively to support student success.

Demographic data indicate that Hutto Elementary serves a significant population of students identified as at-risk (40.94%), economically disadvantaged (34.52%), and in need of specialized academic supports (17.55%) . Attendance and behavior data reveal that some student groups experience higher rates of chronic absenteeism and behavioral concerns, which may impact instructional time and academic performance. As student needs continue to evolve, demographic trends suggest a need to strengthen systems that support attendance, student engagement, and equitable access to academic and behavioral supports while maintaining the positive culture and sense of belonging that exist across the campus.

2025-2026 Fall PEIMS Student Indicators

Student Indicators		
At-Risk	287	40.94%
Foster Care	3	0.43%
IEP Continuer	0	0.00%
Immigrant	7	1.00%
Intervention Indicator	153	21.83%
Migratory	0	0.00%
Military Connected	52	7.42%
MS Advanced Math Participation	0	0.00%
Transfer In Students	7	1.00%
Unschooled Asylee/Refugee	0	0.00%
Economic Disadvantage		
Economic Disadvantage Total	242	34.52%
Free Meals	195	27.82%
Reduced-Price Meals	47	6.70%
Other Economic Disadvantage	0	0.00%
Homeless and Unaccompanied Youth		
Homeless Status Total	4	0.57%
Shelter	0	0.00%
Doubled Up	4	0.57%
Unsheltered	0	0.00%
Hotel/Motel	0	0.00%
Not Unaccompanied Youth	4	0.57%
Is Unaccompanied Youth	0	0.00%

Demographics Strengths

- Dedicated and Collaborative Staff: Hutto Elementary benefits from a strong blend of experienced and developing educators, with 65% of staff having 0–10 years of experience and 35% having more than 10 years of service. This balance promotes mentorship, collaboration, innovation, and continuous professional growth, creating a strong foundation for student success.

- Comprehensive Student Support Systems: The campus provides a wide range of services to meet the needs of all learners, including Special Education, Emergent Bilingual, Dyslexia, Section 504, Gifted and Talented, counseling, and intervention supports. These systems ensure students receive targeted academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support.
- Positive School Culture and PBIS Implementation: Hutto Elementary has established a positive and supportive learning environment through PBIS and Leader in Me practices. Staff consistently recognize and reinforce positive student behaviors school-wide, helping foster a culture of belonging, leadership, empathy, and student engagement.
- Commitment to Student Leadership and Belonging: Through the campus theme of *"You Belong Here"* and the implementation of Leader in Me, students are provided opportunities to develop leadership skills, build positive relationships, and take ownership of their learning in an inclusive environment.
- Data-Driven Systems Focused on Continuous Improvement: Teachers and leaders engage in regular PLCs, data analysis, progress monitoring, and instructional coaching to identify student needs and adjust instruction. These systems support continuous improvement and ensure decisions are focused on maximizing student growth and achievement.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: During the 2025-2026 school year, 58 students (8%) were identified as chronically absent. Fourth grade had the highest number of chronically absent students (11) and also demonstrated the lowest STAAR and MAP performance on campus, indicating a need for strengthened attendance interventions and family engagement efforts.
Root Cause: Campus attendance intervention processes, including data reviews, family outreach, and student support plans, are not consistently implemented with fidelity, resulting in missed opportunities to reduce chronic absenteeism and improve student outcomes.

Problem Statement 2: During the 2025-2026 school year, Hutto Elementary recorded 262 behavior referrals, an increase from the previous year. Staff and family perception data also identified concerns regarding the consistency of behavior expectations and disciplinary practices across grade levels.
Root Cause: Campus behavior expectations, disciplinary procedures, and communication regarding behavioral decisions are not consistently implemented and communicated across grade levels and stakeholder groups.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Hutto Elementary students demonstrate a strong foundation in reading and math, with many students meeting grade-level expectations and showing academic growth. Overall performance, however, indicates that students are more successful at reaching Approaches than demonstrating deeper mastery at the Meets and Masters levels. Achievement gaps are most evident among Special Education, Emergent Bilingual, Economically Disadvantaged, and High Focus student groups, particularly in math and reading. Science also remains an area requiring continued attention. Moving forward, HES will focus on strengthening Tier 1 instruction, increasing rigor and differentiation, and using targeted intervention and extension during GAME time to accelerate growth and increase the number of students performing at Meets and Masters while closing student-group gaps.

Overall Accountability

- Overall rating: 77 / C, down from last year's 85 / B (a drop of roughly 8 scaled-score points, per the source table — worth confirming against the official TEA report).
- Domain I (Student Achievement): 77 / C
- Domain II-A (Academic Growth): 76
- Domain II-B (Relative Performance): 65 — this is the campus's lowest domain score
- Domain III (Closing the Gaps): 77

STAAR Performance (All Students, All Subjects Combined)

- Meets Grade Level or above: 49%
- Masters Grade Level: 23%
- Did Not Meet Grade Level: 23%

By Subject

- Reading: 52% Meets, 24% Masters
- Math: 50% Meets, 24% Masters
- Science: 43% Meets, 21% Masters

Student Learning Strengths

- **Kindergarten early literacy is responding positively to instruction.** Students classified Well Below on mCLASS declined from 40% to 23% from BOY to MOY, a 17-point reduction, while the Above group increased from 21% to 27%. This provides evidence that early identification and targeted literacy instruction can produce meaningful movement within the school year.
- **Several grade levels demonstrate above-average MAP growth.** Fifth-grade Math and second-grade Reading each earned a 74th growth percentile, while second-grade Math reached the 78th growth percentile and first-grade Math the 68th percentile.
- **Fifth-grade Math and second-grade Reading show meaningful achievement movement, not only growth scores.** Fifth-grade Math moved from the 56th to 73rd achievement percentile and second-grade Reading from the 59th to 70th percentile from BOY to MOY.
- **Mathematics STAAR achievement improved substantially year over year at the Meets level.** Campus Meets performance increased from 41% in 2025 to 50% in 2026, a nine-percentage-point gain.
- **Reading remains the strongest overall STAAR content area at grade-level proficiency.** Seventy-nine percent of Reading assessments are at Approaches or above and 52% are at Meets or above, the highest overall Meets rate among Reading, Math, and Science.
- **The campus already has a defined multi-tiered instructional framework on which to build.** The CNA identifies acceleration, intervention, whole-child supports, and

differentiation as the intended components of the HES approach; the improvement opportunity is therefore greater consistency and fidelity rather than creation of an entirely new instructional model.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1: During the 2025-2026 school year, 58 students (8%) were identified as chronically absent. Fourth grade had the highest number of chronically absent students (11) and also demonstrated the lowest STAAR and MAP performance on campus, indicating a need for strengthened attendance interventions and family engagement efforts.
Root Cause: Campus attendance intervention processes, including data reviews, family outreach, and student support plans, are not consistently implemented with fidelity, resulting in missed opportunities to reduce chronic absenteeism and improve student outcomes.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Student groups are not achieving at the same rate as the campus overall on STAAR. While 49% of all students achieved Meets or above, performance was lower for Special Education (23%), African American (37%), Economically Disadvantaged (42%), and EB/EL students (42%), with Special Education students demonstrating the largest gap at 26 percentage points below the campus rate.
Root Cause: Differentiated, explicit, and scaffolded Tier 1 instructional practices are not consistently embedded across grade levels and content areas, resulting in varied access to grade-level learning for students requiring additional support.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters.
Root Cause: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Hutto Elementary values the perspectives of students, staff, and families and uses stakeholder feedback to guide continuous improvement efforts. Perception data indicate that stakeholders view the campus as a caring and supportive environment where positive relationships, student leadership opportunities, and a commitment to student success are evident. Students generally reported that consequences are administered fairly, and families expressed a strong desire to be actively involved in their child's educational experience and the school community.

Stakeholder feedback also identified opportunities for growth related to communication, consistency of behavioral expectations, family engagement, and attendance. Staff and families expressed concerns regarding the consistent application of discipline practices across grade levels and the clarity of communication regarding campus expectations and procedures. Families reported a desire for increased awareness of volunteer opportunities and greater access to information that would allow them to participate more fully in the school community. Additionally, attendance concerns and scheduling challenges were identified as factors impacting the overall campus experience.

Overall, perception data suggest that Hutto Elementary has established a positive foundation built on relationships, student support, and a culture of belonging. At the same time, stakeholder feedback indicates a need to strengthen communication systems, increase family engagement opportunities, ensure consistent implementation of campus expectations, and continue fostering strong partnerships among students, staff, and families to support student success.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- Bi- Weekly PLC and DDI structures support ongoing analysis of student data and identification of students needing additional support.
- Strong teacher support systems, including T-TESS goal setting, mentoring, instructional coaching, and professional learning opportunities.
- Comprehensive student support services, including SPARK interventions, Special Education, Dyslexia, Gifted and Talented, counseling, and Leader in Me.
- Positive campus culture supported through PBIS, student recognition systems, leadership opportunities, and cross-grade engagement activities.
- Strong family engagement traditions through events such as Back-to-School Night, Trunk-or-Treat, Dude's Night, Ladies Night, Grandparents' Day, and Thanksgiving Lunch.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Staff feedback and implementation data indicate inconsistent implementation of campus initiatives, including Leader in Me and Summit K12, resulting in varying levels of student engagement and instructional effectiveness across classrooms.
Root Cause: Professional learning, coaching, and implementation support for campus initiatives lack a consistent structure for training, monitoring, and follow-up, resulting in varying levels of teacher implementation.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Staff feedback indicates that PLC and DDI processes are not consistently implemented across teams, resulting in inefficiencies in data analysis and inconsistent use of student performance data to guide instructional decisions.
Root Cause: Campus data protocols, expectations, and accountability measures are not clearly defined or consistently monitored, limiting the effectiveness of PLC and DDI structures.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Hutto Elementary will continue strengthening school health and wellness practices by ensuring students have consistent opportunities for daily physical activity and by utilizing FitnessGram data to monitor physical fitness and support student wellness.
Root Cause: A consistent campuswide process for reviewing physical fitness data and connecting results to school health and physical activity initiatives has not been formally established.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Hutto Elementary values feedback from students, staff, and families to continuously improve the campus experience and strengthen relationships among stakeholders. Survey results indicate that students, staff, and families generally perceive the campus as a welcoming and supportive environment where students are cared for and encouraged to succeed. Stakeholders identified positive relationships between staff and students, opportunities for student leadership through Leader in Me, and a commitment to creating a safe learning environment as campus strengths.

Feedback also identified opportunities for improvement related to communication, consistency in behavior expectations and discipline practices, family engagement, and attendance. While students generally reported that consequences are administered fairly, staff and families expressed concerns regarding the consistency of behavior expectations and disciplinary responses across grade levels. Families indicated a desire for increased involvement in the school community but reported barriers related to communication and awareness of volunteer opportunities. Additionally, stakeholder feedback highlighted concerns regarding chronic absenteeism and its impact on student learning and engagement. Overall, survey responses suggest a need to strengthen communication systems, increase family involvement opportunities, and ensure consistent implementation of campus expectations while continuing to build on the positive culture and relationships established at Hutto Elementary.

Perceptions Strengths

- Approximately 71% of surveyed students reported that consequences are given fairly and quickly at Hutto Elementary.
- Families expressed a strong interest in being involved in their child's education and school community.
- Hutto Elementary maintains multiple opportunities for family engagement through campus events, PTA activities, and volunteer opportunities.
- Staff, students, and families actively participated in the perception survey process, providing valuable feedback for campus improvement efforts.
- The campus has established PBIS and Leader in Me systems that support student leadership and positive school culture.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Parent perception data indicate that some families are unaware of available volunteer opportunities and campus involvement options, limiting participation in school activities and partnerships. Approximately 41% of surveyed parents reported they either did not know how to volunteer or were unsure of available opportunities.
Root Cause: Campus systems for communicating volunteer opportunities, family engagement events, and participation procedures are not consistently communicated through a centralized and accessible process.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Stakeholder feedback identified communication gaps related to campus expectations, procedures, and opportunities for involvement, resulting in inconsistent understanding among staff and families.
Root Cause: Communication practices vary across classrooms, grade levels, and campus programs, limiting stakeholder access to timely and consistent information.

Problem Statement 3: During the 2025-2026 school year, Hutto Elementary recorded 262 behavior referrals, an increase from the previous year. Staff and family perception data also identified concerns regarding the consistency of behavior expectations and disciplinary practices across grade levels.
Root Cause: Campus behavior expectations, disciplinary procedures, and communication regarding behavioral decisions are not consistently implemented and communicated across grade levels and stakeholder groups.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Student groups are not achieving at the same rate as the campus overall on STAAR. While 49% of all students achieved Meets or above, performance was lower for Special Education (23%), African American (37%), Economically Disadvantaged (42%), and EB/EL students (42%), with Special Education students demonstrating the largest gap at 26 percentage points below the campus rate.

Root Cause 1: Differentiated, explicit, and scaffolded Tier 1 instructional practices are not consistently embedded across grade levels and content areas, resulting in varied access to grade-level learning for students requiring additional support.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters.

Root Cause 2: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Staff feedback and implementation data indicate inconsistent implementation of campus initiatives, including Leader in Me and Summit K12, resulting in varying levels of student engagement and instructional effectiveness across classrooms.

Root Cause 3: Professional learning, coaching, and implementation support for campus initiatives lack a consistent structure for training, monitoring, and follow-up, resulting in varying levels of teacher implementation.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: Staff feedback indicates that PLC and DDI processes are not consistently implemented across teams, resulting in inefficiencies in data analysis and inconsistent use of student performance data to guide instructional decisions.

Root Cause 4: Campus data protocols, expectations, and accountability measures are not clearly defined or consistently monitored, limiting the effectiveness of PLC and DDI structures.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: Parent perception data indicate that some families are unaware of available volunteer opportunities and campus involvement options, limiting participation in school activities and partnerships. Approximately 41% of surveyed parents reported they either did not know how to volunteer or were unsure of available opportunities.

Root Cause 5: Campus systems for communicating volunteer opportunities, family engagement events, and participation procedures are not consistently communicated through a centralized and accessible process.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 6: Stakeholder feedback identified communication gaps related to campus expectations, procedures, and opportunities for involvement, resulting in inconsistent understanding among staff and families.

Root Cause 6: Communication practices vary across classrooms, grade levels, and campus programs, limiting stakeholder access to timely and consistent information.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 7: Hutto Elementary will continue strengthening school health and wellness practices by ensuring students have consistent opportunities for daily physical activity and by utilizing FitnessGram data to monitor physical fitness and support student wellness.

Root Cause 7: A consistent campuswide process for reviewing physical fitness data and connecting results to school health and physical activity initiatives has not been formally established.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Goals

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.

Performance Objective 1: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of students achieving Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR across all tested subjects will increase from 48% to at least 51%, while reducing achievement gaps for identified student groups, with particular emphasis on Special Education, Economically Disadvantaged, African American, and EB/EL students.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Walkthrough data; T-TESS observations; student work; common assessments/CBAs; STAAR Interim/Released assessments; lesson plans; DDI documentation.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Teachers will consistently implement rigorous, explicit, differentiated, and scaffolded Tier 1 instruction aligned to grade-level TEKS and success criteria, with an emphasis on student discourse, checks for understanding, written responses, and tasks requiring students to demonstrate the depth of thinking expected at Meets and Masters. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students, including those requiring additional support, will have increased access to grade-level instruction and demonstrate greater independence, engagement, and depth of understanding. Walkthrough and student performance data will show increased consistency in rigorous, differentiated, and scaffolded Tier 1 instruction. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Classroom Teachers **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Grade-level teams will use a consistent PLC/DDI process to analyze student work and assessment data, identify TEKS misconceptions and trends, plan reteach and extension, and monitor whether instructional adjustments result in increased student mastery. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** PLC/DDI implementation will become more consistent across grade levels, resulting in timely instructional adjustments based on student need. Teams will demonstrate increased use of student work and disaggregated data to determine reteach, extension, grouping, and instructional responses. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Grade-Level Teams **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: HES will strengthen vertical instructional alignment and systematically scale effective Tier 1 practices through collaborative planning, learning walks, peer observations, student-work analysis, and targeted professional learning focused on rigor, differentiation, scaffolding, and grade-level expectations. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Effective instructional practices will become more consistently implemented across classrooms and grade levels. Teachers will demonstrate stronger vertical understanding of grade-level expectations, and students will experience increasingly consistent levels of rigor, scaffolding, and instructional expectations. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Teacher Leaders. **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student groups are not achieving at the same rate as the campus overall on STAAR. While 49% of all students achieved Meets or above, performance was lower for Special Education (23%), African American (37%), Economically Disadvantaged (42%), and EB/EL students (42%), with Special Education students demonstrating the largest gap at 26 percentage points below the campus rate. **Root Cause**: Differentiated, explicit, and scaffolded Tier 1 instructional practices are not consistently embedded across grade levels and content areas, resulting in varied access to grade-level learning for students requiring additional support.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters. **Root Cause**: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Staff feedback indicates that PLC and DDI processes are not consistently implemented across teams, resulting in inefficiencies in data analysis and inconsistent use of student performance data to guide instructional decisions. **Root Cause**: Campus data protocols, expectations, and accountability measures are not clearly defined or consistently monitored, limiting the effectiveness of PLC and DDI structures.

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.

Performance Objective 2: Students in grade 3 will increase from 54% to 60% of students achieving at 'meets' or higher on math STAAR assessments and from 56% to 60% on the reading STAAR assessments.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Implement data-driven instructional practices in grade 3 reading and math through consistent analysis of student performance, targeted reteach and enrichment, intentional spiraling of priority standards, and high-impact Tier 1 instructional practices to increase the percentage of students achieving Meets Grade Level or higher on STAAR. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** More students will receive timely, targeted instruction based on demonstrated needs, resulting in increased mastery of grade-level reading and math standards and progress toward 60% Meets or higher in both Grade 3 Math and Reading STAAR. Short Plan4Learning Strategy **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach, Grade 3 Teachers **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 2				

No Progress | Accomplished | Continue/Modify | Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student groups are not achieving at the same rate as the campus overall on STAAR. While 49% of all students achieved Meets or above, performance was lower for Special Education (23%), African American (37%), Economically Disadvantaged (42%), and EB/EL students (42%), with Special Education students demonstrating the largest gap at 26 percentage points below the campus rate. **Root Cause**: Differentiated, explicit, and scaffolded Tier 1 instructional practices are not consistently embedded across grade levels and content areas, resulting in varied access to grade-level learning for students requiring additional support.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Staff feedback indicates that PLC and DDI processes are not consistently implemented across teams, resulting in inefficiencies in data analysis and inconsistent use of student performance data to guide instructional decisions. **Root Cause**: Campus data protocols, expectations, and accountability measures are not clearly defined or consistently monitored, limiting the effectiveness of PLC and DDI structures.

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.

Performance Objective 3: The percentage of students who meet projected growth on grade-level screeners in reading and mathematics will increase 3% across all screeners.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Grades 1 - 9 NWEA MAP (Reading goal = 64%, Math goal = 57%)
Grades K - 2 mCLASS (69%)
PK Circle (Baseline year for new assessment)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Teachers will implement Summit K12 with fidelity to provide targeted, language-rich instruction in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as measured by student growth across all four TELPAS domains. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students receiving intervention will demonstrate measurable growth toward grade-level expectations, and the percentage of students meeting projected growth will increase by at least 3% across campus screeners. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Interventionists, Classroom Teachers **Title I:** 2.51 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1 **Funding Sources:** Summit K12 - Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services - $8,805.60				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Teachers will use screener and progress-monitoring data to provide targeted Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading and math interventions using research-based curriculum. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** The percentage of students meeting projected growth on grade-level reading and mathematics screeners will increase by at least 3% across all screeners. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administrators, instructional coach, and teacher teams will review student progress at least every three weeks to determine whether students are responding to intervention and make timely adjustments to grouping, instructional focus, frequency, or intensity. **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2, 3 **Funding Sources:** Word Origin - Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials - $4,780				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student groups are not achieving at the same rate as the campus overall on STAAR. While 49% of all students achieved Meets or above, performance was lower for Special Education (23%), African American (37%), Economically Disadvantaged (42%), and EB/EL students (42%), with Special Education students demonstrating the largest gap at 26 percentage points below the campus rate. **Root Cause**: Differentiated, explicit, and scaffolded Tier 1 instructional practices are not consistently embedded across grade levels and content areas, resulting in varied access to grade-level learning for students requiring additional support.
Problem Statement 3: Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters. **Root Cause**: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback and implementation data indicate inconsistent implementation of campus initiatives, including Leader in Me and Summit K12, resulting in varying levels of student engagement and instructional effectiveness across classrooms. **Root Cause**: Professional learning, coaching, and implementation support for campus initiatives lack a consistent structure for training, monitoring, and follow-up, resulting in varying levels of teacher implementation.

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.

Performance Objective 4: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, HES will increase consistent implementation of identified campus initiatives, including Summit K12 and Leader in Me, through structured professional learning, coaching, implementation expectations, monitoring, and follow-up.

Evaluation Data Sources: Summit K12 usage and student-growth reports; TELPAS data; Leader in Me implementation data; MRA/student perception data; walkthrough data; professional learning documentation; teacher feedback.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Teachers will implement Summit K12 with fidelity to provide targeted, language-rich instruction in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, with campus leadership monitoring implementation, student usage, and growth across all four TELPAS domains. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** EB students will demonstrate increased active participation in Summit K12 and measurable growth across listening, speaking, reading, and writing, contributing to increased TELPAS proficiency. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal responsible for LPAC, Instructional Coach, EB/ LPAC Staff, Classroom Teachers **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: HES will strengthen consistent implementation of Leader in Me through clearly defined campus expectations, targeted professional learning, coaching, monitoring, and follow-up while expanding opportunities for student voice, leadership, goal-setting, and ownership. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Leader in Me practices will become more consistently embedded across classrooms, and students will demonstrate increased ownership, leadership, goal-setting, belonging, and understanding of their individual academic and personal goals. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Counselor, Lighthouse Team, Classroom Teachers **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback and implementation data indicate inconsistent implementation of campus initiatives, including Leader in Me and Summit K12, resulting in varying levels of student engagement and instructional effectiveness across classrooms. **Root Cause**: Professional learning, coaching, and implementation support for campus initiatives lack a consistent structure for training, monitoring, and follow-up, resulting in varying levels of teacher implementation.

Goal 2: Expand strategies that attract and retain high-performing talent.

Performance Objective 1: Hutto Elementary will retain high-performing teachers, including teachers demonstrating 80% or greater student growth, while increasing teacher effectiveness through targeted coaching, professional learning, and leadership opportunities.

Evaluation Data Sources: Retention/resignation data, Screener data (MAP, mCLASS, Circle), Stay surveys

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus administrators and the instructional coach will use T-TESS, walkthrough, student-growth, and teacher self-reflection data to provide differentiated coaching and professional learning based on individual and campus instructional needs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will demonstrate measurable growth in identified instructional practices, with professional learning transferring more consistently into classroom implementation and student outcomes. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: HES will systematically identify and scale effective teacher practices through peer observations, learning walks, teacher-led professional development, mentoring, and opportunities for high-performing teachers to lead and support colleagues. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** High-impact practices demonstrated by effective teachers will be shared and replicated across classrooms, increasing consistency in instructional quality and building internal leadership capacity. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Teacher Leaders **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 3: Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters. **Root Cause**: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Staff feedback indicates that PLC and DDI processes are not consistently implemented across teams, resulting in inefficiencies in data analysis and inconsistent use of student performance data to guide instructional decisions. **Root Cause**: Campus data protocols, expectations, and accountability measures are not clearly defined or consistently monitored, limiting the effectiveness of PLC and DDI structures.

Goal 2: Expand strategies that attract and retain high-performing talent.

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of new teacher hires identified as highly qualified according to TEA data or TEA designation.

Evaluation Data Sources: New-hire highly qualified status per TEA data; TIA data (student growth measures); staff retention data; certification data; employee satisfaction/ culture survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Strengthen recruitment and selection practices by prioritizing candidates who meet TEA certification requirements and/or hold recognized TEA designations, while leveraging district recruitment efforts, professional networks, and campus strengths to attract high-performing educators. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** An increased percentage of new teacher hires will meet TEA highly qualified criteria or hold a recognized TEA designation, strengthening the quality of the instructional workforce and supporting improved student outcomes. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach, Mentors **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 3: Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters. **Root Cause**: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.

Goal 2: Expand strategies that attract and retain high-performing talent.

Performance Objective 3: Increase administrative T-TESS calibration, as measured by the TEA TIA data calibration R-Squared value, from a baseline of .16 to a target of .24 for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA TIA data calibration report (R-Squared value); calibration walk documentation; Learning Walk data aligned to T-TESS

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus leadership will use consistent selection criteria focused on instructional effectiveness and provide new teachers with structured mentoring, coaching, observation, and feedback during their first year. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Administrative calibration will increase from .16 to at least .24, resulting in greater consistency in T-TESS ratings, instructional expectations, and actionable teacher feedback. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Campus administrators will conduct regular calibration walks and collaborative walkthroughs to strengthen alignment in T-TESS scoring, instructional expectations, and actionable teacher feedback. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Campus administrators will demonstrate increased alignment when identifying evidence, assigning T-TESS ratings, and providing actionable instructional feedback. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 3: Students are not consistently demonstrating the depth of grade-level understanding required to progress from Approaches to Meets and Masters across content areas. While 77% of assessments are at Approaches or above, only 49% reach Meets and 23% reach Masters. **Root Cause**: Rigor, differentiation, and scaffolding in Tier 1 instruction are not consistently implemented or vertically aligned across grade levels, and effective instructional practices are not yet systematically shared and scaled through collaboration, peer observations, and targeted professional learning.

Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact.

Performance Objective 1: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, Hutto Elementary will increase family engagement and improve parent awareness of opportunities to participate in the school community, reducing the percentage of parents who report not knowing how to volunteer or being unsure of available opportunities from 41% to 25% or less.

Evaluation Data Sources: Fall and Spring Parent Perception Survey (response rate and positive-response percentage)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: HES will implement a consistent, centralized communication system for campus expectations, events, volunteer opportunities, and participation procedures to ensure families receive timely and accessible information. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Families will receive more consistent and accessible information regarding campus expectations, events, volunteer opportunities, and participation procedures, reducing confusion and increasing engagement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Secretary, Counselor **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1, 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: HES will provide varied opportunities for families to participate in academic, leadership, volunteer, and community-building activities and will monitor participation and perception data to identify and reduce barriers to engagement. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Family participation in academic, leadership, volunteer, and community-building activities will increase, and identified barriers to participation will be addressed based on stakeholder feedback. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Counselor, Secretary, Family Engagement Team **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1, 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: HES will establish campuswide communication expectations and protocols for staff and family communication to increase consistency in how campus expectations, procedures, instructional information, events, and opportunities are communicated across classrooms, grade levels, and programs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Staff and families will demonstrate increased understanding of campus expectations, procedures, events, and opportunities, with fewer communication gaps across classrooms, grade levels, and programs. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Grade-Level Chairs, Secretary **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Parent perception data indicate that some families are unaware of available volunteer opportunities and campus involvement options, limiting participation in school activities and partnerships. Approximately 41% of surveyed parents reported they either did not know how to volunteer or were unsure of available opportunities. **Root Cause**: Campus systems for communicating volunteer opportunities, family engagement events, and participation procedures are not consistently communicated through a centralized and accessible process.
Problem Statement 2: Stakeholder feedback identified communication gaps related to campus expectations, procedures, and opportunities for involvement, resulting in inconsistent understanding among staff and families. **Root Cause**: Communication practices vary across classrooms, grade levels, and campus programs, limiting stakeholder access to timely and consistent information.

Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact.

Performance Objective 2: By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, HES will establish a baseline and increase positive student and family perception results related to belonging, communication, safety, and consistent expectations from fall to spring.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student experience survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Staff will consistently implement and reinforce campuswide behavior expectations, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) practices, violence and bullying prevention strategies, and established disciplinary procedures to promote a safe, positive, and supportive learning environment. Campus leadership will monitor implementation, analyze discipline referrals and behavioral trends across grade levels, and identify opportunities for targeted interventions and proactive prevention efforts. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Positive student and family perception results related to belonging, communication, safety, and consistent expectations will increase from fall to spring, while behavior and engagement data demonstrate a more consistent campus experience. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Counselor, PBIS Team/Lighthouse Team **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Hutto Elementary will promote student health and wellness by providing opportunities for daily physical activity through physical education, recess, and classroom movement breaks. The campus will utilize FitnessGram assessment data, where applicable, to monitor student physical fitness and identify opportunities to strengthen health and wellness practices. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will have consistent opportunities to engage in physical activity throughout the school day, supporting physical fitness, student engagement, and overall well-being. FitnessGram results will provide data to monitor student fitness levels and inform campus wellness initiatives. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, PE Teacher, Campus Nurse, Counselor **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback and implementation data indicate inconsistent implementation of campus initiatives, including Leader in Me and Summit K12, resulting in varying levels of student engagement and instructional effectiveness across classrooms. **Root Cause**: Professional learning, coaching, and implementation support for campus initiatives lack a consistent structure for training, monitoring, and follow-up, resulting in varying levels of teacher implementation.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage alignment between budget allocations and student outcomes, as measured by the district resource-allocation index, for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: District budget-to-outcome alignment index; grant tracking records; Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) budget alignment data; Usage Reports, Cost per student.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Strategically align campus financial resources with identified student needs and high-impact instructional priorities by using student outcome data to guide budget decisions, monitor the effectiveness of funded programs and resources, and adjust allocations throughout the year to maximize student achievement. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Budget allocations demonstrate a clear connection to CIP priorities and student needs; funded resources have defined student outcome measures; progress is reviewed throughout the year; and resource decisions are adjusted based on evidence of effectiveness **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Instructional Support Coach, Secretary **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student groups are not achieving at the same rate as the campus overall on STAAR. While 49% of all students achieved Meets or above, performance was lower for Special Education (23%), African American (37%), Economically Disadvantaged (42%), and EB/EL students (42%), with Special Education students demonstrating the largest gap at 26 percentage points below the campus rate. **Root Cause**: Differentiated, explicit, and scaffolded Tier 1 instructional practices are not consistently embedded across grade levels and content areas, resulting in varied access to grade-level learning for students requiring additional support.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 2: The district will complete all required Tri-annual Safety Audits and TEA Safety Audits and present results to the Board of Trustees within the required timeline for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: Tri-annual Safety Audit report; TEA Safety Audit (Sentinel reporting); Board presentation records

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Systematically review and report safety audit findings, identify campus safety needs, and communicate identified concerns to appropriate district personnel to support informed resource allocation and maintain a safe and secure learning environment for students and staff. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Campus safety needs are accurately identified, documented, and communicated to district leadership, providing the information necessary for the district to prioritize resources and make informed decisions regarding campus safety. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Campus Officer, Assistant Principal, Secretary **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Stakeholder feedback identified communication gaps related to campus expectations, procedures, and opportunities for involvement, resulting in inconsistent understanding among staff and families. **Root Cause**: Communication practices vary across classrooms, grade levels, and campus programs, limiting stakeholder access to timely and consistent information.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 3: Increase the percentage of positive responses on the annual Climate Survey related to safety and operations for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: Annual Climate Survey (Fall and Spring administrations); safety- and operations-related survey items

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Annual Climate Survey results show an increase in positive responses related to safety and operations, while campus documentation demonstrates that identified needs and stakeholder concerns are consistently reviewed, communicated, and monitored. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Campus leadership uses stakeholder feedback and operational data to clearly identify and communicate safety and resource needs, supporting informed district resource-allocation decisions while improving stakeholder confidence in the safety and effectiveness of the learning environment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Parent perception data indicate that some families are unaware of available volunteer opportunities and campus involvement options, limiting participation in school activities and partnerships. Approximately 41% of surveyed parents reported they either did not know how to volunteer or were unsure of available opportunities. **Root Cause**: Campus systems for communicating volunteer opportunities, family engagement events, and participation procedures are not consistently communicated through a centralized and accessible process.
Problem Statement 2: Stakeholder feedback identified communication gaps related to campus expectations, procedures, and opportunities for involvement, resulting in inconsistent understanding among staff and families. **Root Cause**: Communication practices vary across classrooms, grade levels, and campus programs, limiting stakeholder access to timely and consistent information.

Campus Funding Summary

Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
					$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$5,000.00
				+/- Difference	$5,000.00

Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	3	1	Summit K12		$8,805.60
				Sub-Total	$8,805.60
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$6,553.00
				+/- Difference	-$2,252.60

Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	3	2	Word Origin		$4,780.00
				Sub-Total	$4,780.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$16,300.00
				+/- Difference	$11,520.00

Title I, Part A - (6400) Operating Cost					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
					$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$500.00
				+/- Difference	$500.00
				Grand Total Budgeted	$28,353.00
				Grand Total Spent	$13,585.60
				+/- Difference	$14,767.40

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

The following policies, procedures, and requirements are addressed in the District Improvement Plan. District addressed Policies, Procedures, and Requirements will print with the Improvement Plan:

Title	Person Responsible	Review Date	Addressed By	Addressed On
Bullying Prevention	Kyle Ruggirello	5/25/2023	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Child Abuse and Neglect	Kyle Ruggirello	2/26/2026	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Coordinated Health Program	Chris Zito	11/4/2025	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Technology Integration	Kelly Hong	11/4/2025	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Decision-Making and Planning Policy Evaluation	Jason McAuliffe	5/25/2023	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	Kyle Ruggirello	11/16/2023	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Dropout Prevention	Elva Torres	11/4/2025	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Dyslexia Treatment Program	Victoria Linzenmeyer	11/4/2025	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Title I, Part C Migrant	Elva S. Torres	11/4/2025	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Pregnancy Related Services	Kyle Ruggirello	4/1/2005	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Post-Secondary Preparedness	Tonesha Holland	11/4/2025	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Recruiting Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Gaye Rosser	1/25/2024	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Student Welfare: Crisis Intervention Programs and Training	Kyle Ruggirello	5/25/2023	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Student Welfare: Discipline/Conflict/Violence Management	Kyle Ruggirello	2/26/2026	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Texas Behavior Support Initiative (TBSI)	Kyle Ruggirello		Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026
Job Description for Peace Officers, Resource Officers & Security Personnel	Chief William Edwards	2/26/2026	Audrey Corporon	9/15/2026