Hutto Independent School District

Hutto Middle School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan



Mission Statement

Hippo Nation Inspires Excellence in Academics, Character, and Community!

Vision

Hutto ISD aspires to be a premier choice in education through innovation, leadership, and diversity.

Value Statement

1. Hutto ISD strives to be the best school district in Central Texas.
2. The safety and security of all is a top priority.
3. Every decision should be made in the best interest of students.
4. Success is possible for every student.
5. We recruit, develop, and retain exemplary staff.
6. The pursuit and acceptance of diversity are critical.
7. We will be responsible stewards of taxpayers' dollars.
8. All students are important, and the educational needs of each must be met.
9. Parents/guardians are vital to the success of our students.
10. Open two-way communication and transparency are imperative for a relationship-centered district.
11. Character is as important as academic achievement.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4
Demographics 4
Student Learning 7
School Processes & Programs 11
Perceptions 14
Priority Problem Statements 16
Goals 18
Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations. 18
Goal 2: Expand strategies that attract and retain high-performing talent. 24
Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact. 31
Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes. 38
State Compensatory 47
Budget for Hutto Middle School 47
Campus Funding Summary 48
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 50

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Hutto Middle School is proud to serve a vibrant and diverse student body of 766 students in grades 6 through 8 for the 2026–2027 academic year. Our campus is a reflection of the dynamic and growing community we are part of, with a balanced distribution of students across the grades: 262 in 6th grade, 257 in 7th grade, and 247 in 8th grade. This balance allows us to tailor our educational programs and resources effectively to meet the needs of each grade level.

Our student population is a rich tapestry of cultural and ethnic backgrounds, comprising 48.0% Hispanic/Latino, 26.9% White, 14.1% Black/African American, 5.2% Asian, 5.1% identifying as Two or More Races, and 0.4% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. This diversity enriches our school environment, fostering a culture of inclusivity and mutual respect among students and staff.

We are committed to supporting all students, including those who require specialized services. Notably, 22.2% of our students are enrolled in Special Education programs, ensuring they receive the tailored support they need to succeed. Additionally, 13.7% of our students are Emergent Bilingual/ELL, and we provide robust language support to help them achieve academic proficiency. With 40.9% of our students identified as Economically Disadvantaged, we strive to provide equitable access to resources and opportunities. Furthermore, 11.9% of our students are served under Section 504, receiving necessary accommodations to support their educational journey. Our commitment is to create an environment where every student can thrive and reach their full potential.

Demographic Group	Count / %
Total Active Enrollment	766
6th Grade	262 (34.2%)
7th Grade	257 (33.6%)
8th Grade	247 (32.2%)
Male	415 (54.2%)
Female	351 (45.8%)
Hispanic/Latino	368 (48.0%)
White	202 (26.9%)
Black/African American	106 (14.1%)
Asian	39 (5.2%)

Demographic Group	Count / %
Two or More Races	38 (5.1%)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	3 (0.4%)
Emergent Bilingual / ELL	105 (13.7%)
Special Education	170 (22.2%)
Section 504	91 (11.9%)
Economically Disadvantaged	313 (40.9%)
At Risk	411 (53.6%)
Gifted & Talented	44 (5.7%)

Demographics Strengths

Our diverse student population is a cornerstone of our educational environment, providing rich opportunities for culturally responsive instruction. This diversity allows us to tailor our teaching methods to meet the varied cultural backgrounds of our students, ensuring that our curriculum is inclusive and reflective of the global society. By aligning our instructional strategies with Hutto ISD's equity mission, we are committed to fostering an educational setting where every student feels valued and empowered to succeed.

The balanced grade distribution across our campus is instrumental in maintaining stable programming and resource allocation. This equilibrium ensures that each grade level receives the necessary attention and resources to thrive, allowing us to implement consistent and effective educational programs. It also facilitates smooth transitions between grades, supporting both students and teachers in achieving academic goals without disruption.

Our growing enrollment is a testament to the sustained community confidence in our campus. This increase in student numbers reflects the trust that families place in our ability to provide a high-quality education. It also signifies our role as a vital part of the community, where we continue to adapt and expand our facilities and programs to meet the needs of our growing student body. This growth not only strengthens our school but also enriches the educational experiences we offer.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: 22.2% of students are identified for Special Education -- above the district average of 18.2% -- creating high demand for specialized instructional support and co-teaching capacity.
Root Cause: High SpEd percentage may reflect both genuine service needs and identification gaps caused by insufficient Tier 1 differentiation, which pushes students toward referral.

Problem Statement 2: 40.9% of students are economically disadvantaged, creating resource equity challenges that directly impact academic access and outcomes.
Root Cause: Economic disadvantage correlates with higher mobility, reduced at-home academic support, and greater vulnerability to attendance and discipline disruptions.

Problem Statement 3: 13.7% of students are Emergent Bilingual, requiring language-accessible instruction and assessment supports not yet consistently embedded in Tier 1 delivery.

Root Cause: Limited language scaffolding in general education classrooms creates access gaps for EB students, particularly in math and science.

Problem Statement 4: 53.6% of students are identified as At Risk -- more than half the campus -- indicating widespread academic vulnerability requiring systemic Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.
Root Cause: At Risk concentration is likely driven by the compounding effects of economic disadvantage, prior-year academic failure in math, and attendance patterns.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

The student learning data from the 2025-2026 academic year highlights significant strengths in Reading Language Arts (RLA) and Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) assessments. These areas demonstrate our students' ability to excel in critical thinking and problem-solving skills, reflecting the dedication of our educators and the effectiveness of our curriculum in these subjects. However, this success is overshadowed by a pressing issue within our general mathematics pathway, which requires immediate attention and strategic intervention.

The most urgent concern on our campus is the performance in Grade 7 Math. This area has been identified as a critical point of failure, indicating a need for a comprehensive review of our instructional strategies and support systems. We must prioritize targeted interventions and resources to address the gaps in understanding and application of mathematical concepts at this grade level to ensure our students are adequately prepared for future academic challenges.

Furthermore, the Closing the Gaps component has experienced a significant decline, dropping from an A (91) to a D (66). This decline is primarily attributed to the achievement gap within our Special Education population. It is imperative that we implement inclusive teaching practices and provide additional support to ensure that all students, regardless of their learning needs, have equitable access to quality education and the opportunity to succeed.

The NWEA MAP Math projections have shown no upward trajectory across the Fall, Winter, or Spring assessment windows, indicating a stagnation in student growth in mathematics. This lack of progress calls for an urgent reevaluation of our instructional methods and the implementation of data-driven strategies to foster student growth. We must work collaboratively to identify and address the underlying causes of this stagnation to enhance our students' mathematical proficiency and overall academic achievement.

Assessment	Total Tests	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
Mathematics, Grade 6	242	71.5%	31.4%	12.4%
Mathematics, Grade 7	116	19.0%	**4.3%**	**0.0%**
Mathematics, Grade 8	286	61.2%	25.9%	4.5%
RLA, Grade 6	243	73.3%	50.6%	27.6%
RLA, Grade 7	232	72.4%	52.6%	31.0%
RLA, Grade 8	263	79.1%	52.1%	25.1%
Science, Grade 8	253	70.8%	50.2%	19.8%
Social Studies, Grade 8	265	55.1%	30.2%	16.2%
Algebra I EOC	95	98.9%	94.7%	74.7%
ALL ASSESSMENTS	**1,995**	**67.3%**	**41.8%**	**20.7%**

STAAR Meets+ by Student Group — All Assessments (2025-2026)

Student Group	n	Meets+
All Students	1,995	41.8%
Hispanic/Latino	155	47.1%
White	75	54.7%
Black/African American	36	44.4%
Asian	11	72.7%
Two or More Races	16	50.0%
Special Education	48	16.7%

NWEA MAP 2025-2026 — Projected Meets/Masters

Season	Subject	Total Tests	Avg RIT	Projected Meets/Masters
Fall	Math	715	218.3	32.2%
Fall	Reading	710	214.2	57.5%
Winter	Math	706	222.0	33.3%
Winter	Reading	707	214.8	55.3%
Spring	Math	706	226.8	28.0%
Spring	Reading	703	214.7	52.8%

TEA Accountability — Component Trend (Scaled Scores)

Component	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Overall Rating	C (78)	B (83)	B (85)	C (73)
Student Achievement	C (79)	B (80)	B (82)	C (76)
School Progress	C (76)	C (78)	B (83)	**D (67)**
Academic Growth	C (76)	C (78)	B (83)	**D (67)**
Relative Performance	C (75)	C (77)	C (77)	**F (59)**
Closing the Gaps	C (74)	A (90)	A (91)	**D (66)**

Student Learning Strengths

Our Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) results are a testament to the high-quality instruction and rigorous curriculum provided by our dedicated educators. With 94.7% of students meeting the standard and 74.7% achieving mastery, these results are the strongest on our campus. They exemplify the potential for student success when they are engaged in challenging coursework that is effectively taught.

In Reading Language Arts (RLA), we have maintained consistent performance across all three grades, with Meets+ rates ranging from 50% to 52%. This consistency, coupled with Approaches+ rates between 72% and 79%, highlights the solid foundation in literacy that our students are building. It reflects our commitment to ensuring that students develop essential reading and writing skills that are critical for their academic journey.

Our Grade 8 Science results, with a Meets+ rate of 50.2%, indicate a solid mid-tier performance. This demonstrates that our students are gaining a substantial understanding of scientific concepts and are prepared to build on this knowledge as they advance in their studies.

The NWEA Fall and Winter Reading projections, at 57.5% and 55.3% respectively, show a stable diagnostic positioning for reading across our campus. These projections provide valuable insights into our students' reading abilities and help us tailor our instructional strategies to meet their needs effectively.

With an overall STAAR Approaches+ rate of 67.3%, it is clear that most of our students are reaching the minimum threshold. However, our ongoing challenge is to elevate more students to the Meets and Masters levels. This will require a focused effort on enhancing instructional practices and providing targeted support to help students achieve higher levels of academic excellence.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus.
Root Cause: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway.
Root Cause: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66).
Root Cause: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses.
Root Cause: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

Problem Statement 5: RLA Meets+ (50-52%) remains below the 60% campus goal; Spring NWEA Reading projected Meets/Masters declined to 52.8%.
Root Cause: Approaches+ rates are strong (72-79%) but Meets+ stalls near 52%, suggesting students reach a basic comprehension threshold but lack higher-order skills (synthesis, evidence-based writing) required for grade-level mastery.

Problem Statement 6: NWEA Math projected Meets/Masters declined from Fall (32.2%) to Spring (28.0%) -- no upward growth trajectory was established during 2025-2026.

Root Cause: NWEA projections declined from Fall to Spring, indicating in-year instruction did not produce measurable acceleration. Intervention intensity and differentiation are insufficient.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

The process data from the 2025-2026 academic year highlights our campus's active engagement with digital intervention tools, specifically IXL. This platform has been integrated into our curriculum to support student learning and provide personalized educational experiences. However, while the usage of such tools is robust, we must evaluate their effectiveness in achieving desired academic outcomes, particularly in mathematics, where current intervention programs are not yielding the necessary acceleration in student performance.

Our discipline data reveals a significant volume of incidents, suggesting that our current behavioral systems require refinement. The inconsistency in preventing repeat offenses indicates a need for a more cohesive and proactive approach to behavior management. It is imperative that we develop strategies that not only address immediate disciplinary issues but also foster a positive school culture that discourages recurrent misbehavior.

Attendance patterns have shown a concerning trend of high unexcused absence rates. Despite the implementation of attendance intervention programs, there has been little impact on reducing chronic absenteeism. This calls for a reassessment of our strategies to engage students and families more effectively, ensuring that attendance is prioritized and barriers to regular school attendance are identified and addressed.

IXL Practice Report — 2025-2026

Subject	Skills Practiced	Skills Mastered	Time (min)
Math	60,178	20,511	663,333
ELA	37,904	8,436	505,356
Science	3,308	1,547	52,837
Social Studies	3,323	817	76,988

Discipline Summary — 2025-2026

Metric / Offense	Count
Total Referrals	**570**
Unique Students with Referrals	**219**
Insubordination	129
Physical Aggression	85
Disruption of Learning Env.	65
Bus Referrals	43
Horseplay	36
Inappropriate Language	25
Cut Class	19

Metric / Offense	Count
Threat / Harassment (Student)	18
Teacher Referral	18
Fighting / Mutual Combat	18

Attendance Summary — 2025-2026

Metric	Value
Total Students in Data	772
Average Days Possible	159.2
Average Total Absences	12.3
Average Excused Absences	4.1
Average Unexcused Absences	8.2

School Processes & Programs Strengths

The extensive usage of IXL Math during the 2025-2026 academic year, with a remarkable 663,333 minutes logged and 20,511 skills mastered, highlights our students' strong engagement with digital learning tools. This level of interaction not only reflects the effectiveness of our digital intervention strategies but also underscores our commitment to fostering a robust mathematical foundation through innovative educational technology.

Similarly, the substantial engagement with IXL ELA, evidenced by 505,356 minutes of usage and 8,436 skills mastered, demonstrates our dedication to enhancing students' reading and language abilities through structured digital practice. This significant usage indicates that our students are actively participating in and benefiting from a comprehensive digital curriculum that supports their literacy development.

Our campus is equipped with multiple intervention programs tailored for At Risk, Special Education (SpEd), and Emerging Bilingual (EB) students, showcasing our commitment to inclusivity and personalized education. The existing infrastructure provides a solid foundation that can be further refined and intensified to better meet the diverse needs of our student population, ensuring that every learner has the opportunity to succeed.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses.
Root Cause: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve.
Root Cause: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not

being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Problem Statement 3: Despite significant IXL Math usage (663,333 minutes), NWEA Math projections declined from Fall to Spring -- indicating digital practice alone is not producing the diagnostic growth needed to move students toward Meets.
Root Cause: Digital practice tools may not be targeted specifically at the TEKS gaps students need most. Time on platform does not translate to growth if the skills practiced are not aligned to the student's most critical instructional gaps.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

The Panorama survey data has provided us with valuable insights into the perceptions of our school community. It is heartening to see that family satisfaction is very high, indicating that our efforts to engage and communicate effectively with families are being recognized and appreciated. This strong family satisfaction is a testament to the collaborative environment we strive to maintain, ensuring that families feel welcomed and involved in their children's education.

However, the data also highlights areas that require our immediate attention. While there is emerging staff confidence in serving all learners, it is crucial that we continue to support our educators in this journey. We must provide them with the necessary resources and training to enhance their skills and confidence further, ensuring that they can meet the diverse needs of all students effectively.

A critical area of concern is the low sense of belonging among our students. The social-emotional data from 2024-2025 indicates that many students do not feel they belong and regularly witness unkindness. This is an urgent issue that we must address to foster a more inclusive and supportive campus culture. We need to implement strategies that promote kindness, respect, and a sense of community among students, ensuring that every student feels valued and included.

Additionally, there is a significant concern among staff regarding the quality of professional learning. It is imperative that we evaluate and enhance our professional development programs to ensure they are relevant, effective, and aligned with the needs of our educators. By doing so, we can empower our staff with the tools and knowledge they need to excel in their roles and contribute positively to our school environment.

Respondent	Topic	Score	Survey Year
Family	Overall Experience	97	2025-2026
Family	Communication	81	2025-2026
Family	Trust & Relationship	80	2025-2026
Family	Engagement	71	2025-2026
Staff	Safety	83	2025-2026
Staff	Educating All Students	75	2025-2026
Staff	School Leadership	72	2025-2026
Staff	Well-Being	65	2025-2026
Staff	Professional Learning	44	2025-2026
Staff	Grit	41	2025-2026
Students	Teacher Cares	80	2024-2025
Students	Classmates Fit	80	2024-2025
Students	School Confidence	78	2024-2025
Students	Activities/Events Inclusion	83	2024-2025
Students	Belonging	35	2024-2025
Students	Witnessed Unkindness	26	2024-2025

Perceptions Strengths

The Family Overall Experience score of 97, being the highest perception score on our campus, underscores the robust foundation of our school-family relationship. This high score reflects the mutual respect and collaboration between our school and the families we serve, ensuring that our educational environment is supportive and inclusive for all students.

Our Family Communication score of 81 and Trust & Relationship score of 80 highlight our commitment to maintaining consistent and effective outreach to parents. These scores demonstrate our dedication to fostering open lines of communication and building trust with families, which are essential components in creating a cohesive and supportive educational community.

The Staff Safety score of 83 is a testament to the secure and welcoming physical environment we have cultivated on campus. This score indicates that our educators feel safe, which is crucial for them to focus on delivering high-quality education and for students to learn in a secure setting.

The significant rise in the Staff Educating All Students score to 75 in the 2025-2026 academic year, up from 57 in the previous year, reflects a growing confidence among our teachers in their ability to effectively serve diverse learners. This positive trend is indicative of our ongoing efforts to provide professional development and resources that empower our educators to meet the needs of all students.

Students reporting that teachers care, with a score of 80, and that they fit with classmates, also scoring 80, indicate the presence of strong individual relational bonds at our school. These scores suggest that our students feel valued and supported by their teachers and peers, fostering a positive and inclusive school culture where every student can thrive.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense).
Root Cause: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning.
Root Cause: Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math.
Root Cause: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data.
Root Cause: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus.

Root Cause 1: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66).

Root Cause 2: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses.

Root Cause 3: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses.

Root Cause 4: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve.

Root Cause 5: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense).

Root Cause 6: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 7: Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning.

Root Cause 7: Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 8: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math.

Root Cause 8: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 9: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data.

Root Cause 9: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 10: Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway.

Root Cause 10: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Problem Statement 10 Areas: Student Learning

Goals

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

Performance Objective 1: Student achievement at Meets Grade Level standard or above on STAAR in all subjects (Domain 1) will increase to 52%.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Strengthen PLC planning and assessment Prepare the Guiding Coalition through three Solution Tree PLC at Work sessions to coach professional learning communities (PLCs). Apply the four PLC questions to essential standards, daily and weekly formative assessments, intervention, and enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased mastery of essential standards supports the goal of 52% at STAAR Meets Grade Level or above. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Guiding Coalition, Department Heads, Instructional Coach **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 - Perceptions 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Strengthen instruction through MS CLASS and the Power Six Implement the MS CLASS Critical Thinking pathway through Learning Leader coaching, instructional practice, and analysis of student work. General education, special education, and ESL teachers will collaboratively plan accommodations, language supports, and Honors enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Improved access to grade-level instruction and stronger reasoning increase mastery toward 52% at STAAR Meets Grade Level or above. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Improved access to grade-level instruction and stronger reasoning increase mastery toward 52% at STAAR Meets Grade Level or above. **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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 1, 2, 3, 4 - Perceptions 3 **Funding Sources:** - Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials - $3,031				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Strengthen math instruction through Carnegie coaching Provide LASO 4 LIFT Carnegie Learning coaching in lesson preparation, modeling, rehearsal, and feedback. Coordinate general and special education support for grades 6-8, including current Grade 8 students affected by prior-year staffing disruptions. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Improved math mastery contributes to the 52% all-subject STAAR Meets or above target. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Math Teachers, Math Department Head, Instructional Coach, Carnegie Coach **Title I:** 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4: Address the Holdsworth mathematics problem of practice Use the Holdsworth Campus Leadership Program to study mathematics learning among Grade 7 Hispanic students identified as economically disadvantaged. Confirm baseline performance, implement instructional adjustments, and analyze student work and feedback to refine or expand effective practices. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Improved mathematics mastery from a verified baseline for the identified student group contributes to the campus STAAR achievement objective. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Holdsworth Campus Leadership Team, Math Department Head **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 3, 4				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus. **Root Cause**: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.

Problem Statement 2: Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway. **Root Cause**: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66). **Root Cause**: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

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

Performance Objective 2: 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: Deliver targeted intervention and accelerated instruction Provide teacher-led WIN Time, after-school tutorials, and in-class small groups targeting identified skill gaps, including at-risk students and students who did not meet passing standards on STAAR. Coordinate MiNGA Flex Time assignments, targeted practice, feedback, and reassessment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students close skill gaps and meet projected growth, supporting the 3% increase and NWEA reading 64% and math 57% targets. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Content, Inclusion and ESL Teachers; Instructional Coach **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 **Funding Sources:** - Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs - $3,500, - Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials - $3,339				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Use assessment data to adjust instruction Analyze matched NWEA reading and mathematics growth alongside classroom evidence to adjust intervention, inclusion support, and enrichment. Disaggregate results for Emergent Bilingual, special education, at-risk, and Honors students; evaluate achievement projections and growth attainment separately. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** More students meet projected growth, supporting the 3% increase and NWEA reading 64% and math 57% targets. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Instructional Coach, Department Heads, Teachers **Title I:** 2.51, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Align student goals through Leader in Me 4DX Implement Leader in Me's Four Disciplines of Execution (4DX) to align campus, classroom, and individual Wildly Important Goals (WIGs). Students will monitor learning actions, review progress, and identify next steps with teachers and families. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students monitor academic progress and apply feedback to increase attainment of projected reading and mathematics growth. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, Adult and Student Lighthouse Teams, Leader in Me Coordinator **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 **Funding Sources:** - Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services - $16,940				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus. **Root Cause**: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.

Problem Statement 2: Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway. **Root Cause**: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66). **Root Cause**: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

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

Performance Objective 1: Retain teachers achieving 80% student growth or higher.

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: Strengthen teacher retention through targeted support Conduct fall and spring retention conferences with teachers meeting the district's 80% student-growth criterion to address workload, planning time, coaching, recognition, and leadership opportunities. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers achieving 80% student growth or higher remain on staff, supported by documented responses to identified needs. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Heads; District HR **Title I:** 2.53 **- 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 4 - Perceptions 3, 4				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Design compensated teacher leadership roles As one of four Pipeline to Leadership campuses, develop compensated leadership roles outside administration for Exemplary/Master teachers during the design year. Establish role descriptions, selection criteria, and impact measures within the three-year implementation process. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Role and compensation proposals submitted for district review support teacher retention and expanded instructional leadership. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Teacher Design Team, Department Heads; District HR and Grant Leads **Title I:** 2.53 **- 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 1, 4 - Perceptions 3, 4				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Provide targeted professional learning and coaching Provide two campus professional learning conferences aligned with T-TESS, the Power Six, Leader in Me, and family engagement. Include role-specific paraprofessional learning, campus leadership summer training, modeling, and coaching to support classroom implementation. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Staff apply targeted instructional practices and report improved professional support, contributing to retention of teachers meeting the student-growth criterion. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Instructional Coach, Department Heads, ESL and Special Education Leads **Title I:** 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - Perceptions 3, 4 **Funding Sources:** - Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs - $5,000				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus. **Root Cause**: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.
Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.
Problem Statement 4: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data. **Root Cause**: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

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: Recruit and support highly qualified teachers Recruit teachers using a common interview rubric and evidence of instructional effectiveness. District HR will verify qualifications and designations; new hires will receive mentoring, campus orientation, and 30-, 60-, and 90-day support reviews. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** The percentage of verified highly qualified new hires increases over the prior hiring cycle, and new teachers demonstrate readiness to meet campus expectations. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Heads, Mentors; District HR **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - Perceptions 3, 4				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 4: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data. **Root Cause**: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

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: Strengthen leaders through role-specific coaching Provide Holdsworth executive coaching for the principal, Pipeline to Leadership coaching from Joe Maniscalo/Marzano Research for assistant principals and department heads, and LASO 4 LIFT Carnegie leadership coaching for math instructional leadership. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Leaders provide specific instructional feedback and monitor implementation, supporting improved instruction and progress toward the .24 calibration target. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Department Heads; Program Coaches **Title I:** 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - Perceptions 3, 4				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Calibrate T-TESS observation evidence and ratings Authorized appraisers will independently score common lessons, compare evidence with T-TESS descriptors, and resolve rating differences monthly. Department heads will strengthen evidence collection and coaching practices within their assigned roles. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** More consistent ratings support improvement in the official TEA TIA R-Squared value from .16 to .24. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Authorized Appraisers; District T-TESS/TIA Leads **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - Perceptions 3, 4				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes. **Problem Statement 4**: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data. **Root Cause**: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the number of parent respondents above the 2024-25 baseline of 928 responses, for the 2026-2027 school year.

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: Maintain weekly family communication Provide weekly campus newsletters, student MiNGA summaries, and teacher-issued Skyward progress reports. Ensure communications are accessible and provide families opportunities to discuss student progress. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Families receive timely academic information and accessible opportunities for communication, supporting greater engagement and survey participation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Families receive timely academic information and accessible opportunities for communication, supporting greater engagement and survey participation. **Title I:** 2.51, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Partner with families in academic progress planning Conduct student-led progress conferences each grading period to review a WIG and work sample, incorporate family input, and establish next steps. Provide flexible participation options and language support. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** More families participate in academic decisions, with documented goals and next steps that support student progress and family engagement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, Counselors, ESL Teacher, Family Engagement Designee **Title I:** 2.51, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Engage families in Title I planning Conduct the annual Title I meeting and review the family engagement policy and school-parent compact with families. Incorporate family input on campus priorities, supports, and resources, and communicate resulting actions. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Families contribute to schoolwide planning and understand their roles in supporting student learning and campus improvement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Family Engagement Designee, Campus Advisory Council **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4: 4 Increase parent survey participation Promote fall and spring parent surveys through campus communications and events. Review response rates by grade and student group, provide accessible participation options, and conduct targeted outreach to underrepresented families. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Parent responses exceed the 928 baseline using consistent, verified reporting criteria and reflect broader family participation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Family Engagement Designee, Counselors, Office Staff; Principal **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning. **Root Cause**: Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact.

Performance Objective 2: Establish a baseline and increase the percentage of students scoring satisfactory on the Student Experience Survey for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: Student experience survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Embed Leader in Me and student leadership Implement Leader in Me coaching and Integrated Approaches to embed the 7 Habits. Adult and Student Lighthouse teams will develop classroom and campus leadership roles, student-led events, and fall and spring campus WIGs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students experience greater belonging and meaningful leadership, supporting increased satisfactory Student Experience Survey responses. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Leader in Me Coordinator, Lighthouse Teams, Teachers; Principal **Title I:** 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1, 2 **Funding Sources:** - Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services - $16,940				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Recognize campus values through MiNGA Use MiNGA Praises and points to recognize observable Leader in Me Habit behaviors aligned with Ownership, Collaboration, and Contribution. Establish consistent recognition criteria and monitor equitable access across student groups. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students understand recognition criteria and experience greater inclusion, contributing to improved Student Experience Survey results. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Teachers, MiNGA Lead, Adult and Student Lighthouse Teams **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Use student feedback to improve campus experience Establish a Student Experience Survey baseline and conduct student listening sessions. Engage students in identifying responses to campus concerns and evaluating their effectiveness. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Satisfactory survey responses increase from baseline, and student feedback informs documented campus improvements. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Counselors, Student Lighthouse Sponsors, Assistant Principals **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses. **Root Cause**: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 2: Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve. **Root Cause**: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense). **Root Cause**: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Problem Statement 2: Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning. **Root Cause** : Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact.

Performance Objective 3: Increase the number of active CTE and community business partnerships by 5% over the prior-year count for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: Partnerships: Knowledge, Technical, Trade, Professional, Program
Experiences: Classroom Support, Field Experience, Student Internships, CTE Events, Program Sponsor, Advisory Boards, Program Advisor

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Expand active community and career partnerships Develop partnerships that support career exploration, mentoring, classroom projects, service, and approved WIN enrichment. Designate a campus liaison and a student-focused contribution for each partnership, consistent with district active-partner criteria. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Active partnerships increase by 5% over the verified prior-year count, expanding student access to career and community learning. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Counselors, CTE/Elective Teachers, Student Lighthouse Sponsors; District CTE **Title I:** 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense). **Root Cause**: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 1: The district will receive a clean, unmodified opinion on the annual financial audit and earn a Superior Rating on the Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: Annual Financial Report (independent audit/AFR); TEA FIRST Rating report

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Maintain accurate campus financial records Follow district purchasing, payroll, receiving, deposit, and inventory procedures. Reconcile campus accounts monthly, resolve discrepancies, and retain documentation by funding source without duplicate charges. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Complete, timely campus records support the district's clean, unmodified audit opinion and Superior FIRST rating. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Bookkeeper/Office Designee; District Finance and Federal Programs **Title I:** 2.51, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1, 2, 3, 4				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus. **Root Cause**: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.
Problem Statement 2: Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway. **Root Cause**: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66). **Root Cause**: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses. **Root Cause**: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 2: Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve. **Root Cause**: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense). **Root Cause**: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Problem Statement 2: Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning. **Root Cause** : Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

Problem Statement 4: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data. **Root Cause**: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 2: 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: Evaluate spending against student outcomes Align each budgeted resource with an identified need, strategy, and expected outcome. Review resource use and student outcomes each grading period; obtain district approval for any budget adjustments. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Improved alignment of resource allocation and student outcomes supports an increase in the district resource-allocation index. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Bookkeeper, Instructional Coach, Strategy Leads, Campus Advisory Council **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1, 2, 3, 4				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus. **Root Cause**: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.
Problem Statement 2: Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway. **Root Cause**: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66). **Root Cause**: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses. **Root Cause**: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 2: Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve. **Root Cause**: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense). **Root Cause**: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Problem Statement 2: Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning. **Root Cause** : Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

Problem Statement 4: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data. **Root Cause**: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 3: 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: Maintain campus safety and complete corrective actions Implement campus emergency procedures, drills, staff training, access checks, and supervision protocols and records. Maintain audit documentation and monitor repairs and corrective actions through completion within district timelines. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Documented campus implementation supports completion of required Tri-annual and TEA safety audits and timely reporting to the Board. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Campus Safety Team; District Safety/Operations **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1, 2, 3, 4				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Grade 7 Math STAAR Meets+ is 4.3% and Masters is 0.0% -- the single most urgent academic failure on campus. **Root Cause**: Students entering 7th grade from a 6th grade cohort where only 31.4% met grade level are already significantly behind. All four STAAR Math reporting categories showed weakness, indicating broad conceptual gaps across the full curriculum -- not isolated skills.
Problem Statement 2: Grade 6 (31.4%) and Grade 8 (25.9%) Math Meets+ also fall well below expectations, indicating a systemic math failure across the entire middle school pathway. **Root Cause**: Instructional pacing, TEKS alignment, and Tier 2 intervention intensity in the general math pathway are insufficient to move students from Approaches to Meets at the required rate.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66). **Root Cause**: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

Problem Statement 4: Relative Performance dropped from C (77) to F (59), indicating HMS is underperforming against demographically comparable campuses. **Root Cause**: A systemic decline in instructional quality and coherence -- evidenced by walk data and survey results -- is likely the primary driver of the campus falling below comparable schools.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses. **Root Cause**: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 2: Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve. **Root Cause**: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense). **Root Cause**: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

Problem Statement 2: Family Engagement (71) is the lowest family metric -- families are informed but not yet active partners in academic and intervention planning. **Root Cause** : Communication is strong but engagement in academic data conversations, intervention planning, and learning partnerships is limited. Families are informed receivers, not yet active co-educators.

Problem Statement 3: Staff Professional Learning score of 44 indicates teachers do not feel they are receiving sufficient or high-quality professional development -- directly correlated with instructional stagnation in math. **Root Cause**: Professional development may be delivered in compliance-oriented formats rather than embedded, coaching-based cycles directly connected to classroom data and student outcomes.

Problem Statement 4: Staff Grit score of 41 is the lowest staff metric and signals that the campus culture does not yet sufficiently support teacher persistence and resilience in the face of challenging data. **Root Cause**: Grit scores suggest teachers are experiencing a disconnect between sustained effort and visible results.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 4: 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: Implement consistent behavior and safety procedures Implement consistent MiNGA Hall Pass, Tardies, Guidance, and Flex Time/WIN procedures. Reinforce behavior expectations, bullying prevention, conflict resolution, and reporting through supervision, family communication, reteaching, and appropriate restorative responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Reduced repeat incidents and instructional time loss contribute to improved safety and operations Climate Survey responses. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Assistant Principals, Dean of Student Support, Counselors, Teachers, MiNGA Lead **Title I:** 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Strengthen early intervention and dropout prevention Review attendance, behavior, and course performance weekly to identify dropout risk. Assign a staff liaison and coordinate family support plans, check-ins, tutoring, and wraparound services, including the homeless liaison when appropriate. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Targeted support improves student attendance and course progress, contributing to stronger engagement and more positive perceptions of campus safety and operations. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Counselors, Attendance Staff, Assistant Principals, Dean of Student Support **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Coordinate school health and physical activity services Coordinate nursing, counseling, nutrition, health education, and physical activity services. Review schedules and accommodations with district staff to ensure required physical activity is provided and participation barriers are addressed. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students receive coordinated services that address health barriers and support access to required physical activity, contributing to improved safety and operations Climate Survey responses. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Nurse, Counselors, PE/Athletics Staff, Assistant Principals; District Health Services **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3 - School Processes & Programs 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Special Education students achieved only 16.7% Meets across all assessments, a 25-point gap below campus average, directly causing Closing the Gaps to drop from A (91) to D (66). **Root Cause**: Co-teaching fidelity, IEP goal alignment to TEKS, and Tier 1 access to grade-level content are inconsistent. Students with disabilities are not receiving sufficient access to rigorous instruction.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: 570 discipline referrals involving 219 unique students in 2025-2026 indicate that behavioral systems were not producing consistent redirection. Insubordination (129) and physical aggression (85) were the top offenses. **Root Cause**: Absence of a structured campus-wide restorative practices framework and inconsistent application of the consequence matrix result in repeat offenders cycling through referrals without individualized behavior support.

Problem Statement 2: Students averaged 12.3 total absences with 8.2 unexcused across 159 possible days. Unexcused absences representing 66.7% of all absences signals a disengagement and compliance concern that existing intervention protocols did not resolve. **Root Cause**: Unexcused absence intervention is triggered late or inconsistently. Underlying causes -- economic disadvantage, transportation barriers, family instability -- are not being addressed through coordinated wrap-around services.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Student Belonging score of 35 is critically low. Witnessed Unkindness (26) confirms a peer culture where exclusion and conflict are common. These scores directly connect to the discipline data (570 referrals; physical aggression the #2 offense). **Root Cause**: Discipline data and peer unkindness survey scores confirm a campus culture where conflict is normalized. Without structured PBIS, restorative practices, and intentional belonging-building, students -- particularly those from marginalized groups -- do not experience HMS as a safe social environment.

State Compensatory

Budget for Hutto Middle School

Total SCE Funds: $10,080.00
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Campus Funding Summary

Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	2	1			$3,500.00
2	1	3			$5,000.00
				Sub-Total	$8,500.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$8,500.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00

Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	2	3			$16,940.00
3	2	1			$16,940.00
				Sub-Total	$33,880.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$16,940.00
				+/- Difference	-$16,940.00

Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	2			$3,031.00
1	2	1			$3,339.00
				Sub-Total	$6,370.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$6,371.00
				+/- Difference	$1.00

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	$0.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00

SCE - (6100) Payroll Costs: Salaries					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
					$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$2,517.00
				+/- Difference	$2,517.00

SCE - (6100) Payroll Costs: Extra Duty					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
					$0.00
				Sub-Total	$0.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$7,563.00
				+/- Difference	$7,563.00
				Grand Total Budgeted	$41,891.00
				Grand Total Spent	$48,750.00
				+/- Difference	-$6,859.00

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