Hutto Independent School District

Lee Martinez Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: C



Mission Statement

At Lee Martinez, we learn, lead, and succeed.

Value Statement

Lee Martinez Elementary Staff Core Belief Statements

- We believe that all LMES students are OUR students, and we believe in building relationships with them. We go out of our way to make sure our students feel welcome, included, and valued as partners in their education.
- We believe that every students' educational needs are important and every decision should be made in the best interest of all students and their individual success.
- We believe that it takes a village for our students to be successful and parents/guardians and community involvement are vital to the success of our students.
- We believe in developing the whole child; that character, social-emotional well-being, health, physical safety and security are as important as academic achievement.
- We believe communication is a two-way process for the school-home learning connection as well as for delivery of information and application of content.
- We embrace a growth mindset and realize that giving and receiving honest, constructive feedback is how we grow as educators.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4
Demographics 4
Student Learning 6
School Processes & Programs 8
Perceptions 9
Priority Problem Statements 11
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. 24
Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact. 27
Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes. 31
Campus Funding Summary 33
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 35

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Lee Martinez Elementary completed its inaugural year in 2025–2026 and enters 2026– 2027 with its own campus data for the first time. The campus opened to relieve overcrowding at Veterans' Hill, Cottonwood Creek, and Hutto Elementary, and continued community growth is expected to increase enrollment. Lee Martinez Elementary 2026–2027 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Page 1 of 8 In 2026, the campus served 588 students in PK–5, close to the 25–26 projection of about 580.

2026 TEA Demographic Snapshot

Measure	2026 TEA Data
Total Students	578
Economically Disadvantaged	39.6%
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	23.7%
Mobility Rate	12.3%
Special Education	20.1%
Homeless	.3%
504	4%
Dyslexia	7%
At Risk	35.5%

Source: TEA 2026 Campus Comparison Group, Lee Martinez Elementary (246906109), released August 2026.

Special populations are larger than feeder data predicted in two key areas: special education (20.6% vs. 16–18% projected) and dyslexia (8.8% vs. about 5% projected). Emergent bilingual enrollment came in lower than projected. The growth in special education enrollment placed high caseloads on campus special education staff in 2025–2026. For 2026–2027, the campus has been allocated an additional R&I teacher and aide, and will add collaborative service models and quarterly caseload reviews. In 2025–2026, GT students received services only two days per week. For 2026–2027, the campus now has a full-time GT teacher, allowing a consistent schedule of at least four service opportunities per week.

Attendance for the 2025-2026 school year was reported at 94.2% and chronic absenteeism was reported at 4.7%.

Demographics Strengths

Enrollment met projections, confirming stable campus growth.

An additional R&I teacher and aide were allocated for 2026–2027 to address special education caseloads.

A full-time GT teacher now serves the campus, expanding GT access from two days to at least four opportunities per week.

First-year campus data now replaces feeder-campus estimates for planning.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: Current staffing levels for special education result in high caseloads.
Root Cause: High ratio of special education students to special education teachers and aides.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

The 2026 accountability cycle provides Lee Martinez Elementary with its first campus-specific state performance baseline. TEA assigned LMES an overall C rating with a score of 70. Student Achievement was C (73), School Progress was D (68), Academic Growth was D (68 scaled; component score 61), Relative Performance was F (59), and Closing the Gaps was D (64). The campus was not identified for comprehensive, targeted, or additional targeted support.

2026 TEA Accountability Snapshot

Domain / Component	Score	Rating
Overall Accountability	70	C
Student Achievement	73	C
STAAR Performance Component	45	Scaled to 73
School Progress	68	D
Academic Growth	68	D
Relative Performance	59	F
Closing the Gaps	64	D

Source: TEA 2026 Accountability Rating Overall Summary and Domain Overview, released August 2026.

2026 STAAR Performance

Subject	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
All Subjects	70%	45%	19%
Reading/Language Arts	71%	47%	22%
Mathematics	70%	43%	17%
Science	68%	43%	17%

Source: TEA 2026 STAAR Performance, updated September 2026.

Priority Student Group Context

Student Group	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
All Students	70%	45%	19%
Economically Disadvantaged	63%	35%	14%
Emergent Bilingual (Current)	73%	41%	17%

Student Group	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
Special Education (Current)	39%	18%	3%

The state data reinforce the need for consistent intervention, progress monitoring, and differentiated support. Economically disadvantaged students reached Meets or above on 35% of all-subject tests, while current special education students reached Meets or above on 18%.

Student Learning Strengths

Reading/Language Arts had the highest campus Meets-or-above rate among tested subjects at 47%.

The campus established a first-year state accountability baseline that can now be used for year-over-year growth monitoring.

TEA reports that LMES was not identified for comprehensive, targeted, or additional targeted support in 2026.

The CNA team connected state and local achievement data to clear systems-level needs in RTI/MTSS consistency and early literacy.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Approximately 50% of staff responses identified inconsistencies in RTI/MTSS implementation, including variation in intervention delivery, progress monitoring, and documented outcomes across grade levels.
Root Cause: Teachers are not aware of what resources are available and how to use them. Resources and implementation expectations are inconsistent across grade levels.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): MAP Reading data indicate early-grade variability, with Grade 1 achievement decreasing from the 58th percentile (fall) to the 51st percentile (winter) and 16% of students in the lowest band, indicating inconsistent early literacy development.
Root Cause: Students lack reading stamina (possibly due to technology, lack of initiative, behaviors, and/or limited exposure to physical texts). There is inconsistency in teacher standards, expectations, and goals.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

The spring 2026 CNA process identified two high-impact systems needs: student behavior systems that protect instructional time and staff workload systems that align campus expectations with available capacity. Discipline data show that disruption accounted for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounted for a combined 38%, concentrating 69% of referrals in these two categories. Staff also reported difficulty completing required work within contracted time and a need for stronger prioritization of initiatives.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

The campus has identified specific behavior categories driving the majority of discipline incidents, allowing targeted intervention and monitoring.

The CNA team identified concrete operational levers—parent communication, streamlined behavior documentation, campus/community partnerships, initiative prioritization, and staff voice—rather than relying on a single intervention.

Quarterly monitoring is embedded in several strategies, supporting continuous adjustment rather than end-of-year review only.

The campus has established measurable targets for discipline reduction and staff perceptions of manageable expectations.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time.
Root Cause: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

Problem Statement 2: Staff feedback indicates a misalignment between campus initiative expectations and available time, as evidenced by reported challenges in completing required tasks within contracted hours.
Root Cause: Lack of prioritizing initiatives that will have the biggest impact. Staff voice and needs are not truly heard at the district level.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Staff perception data identify two closely related climate priorities for 2026-2027: confidence in consistent discipline systems and sustainable workload expectations. Teachers reported concerns about administrative follow-through, differences in how discipline and consequences are viewed, and whether students are held to common standards. Staff also identified workload and burnout as factors affecting morale, retention, and performance. The resulting strategies emphasize common discipline protocols, PBIS calibration, transparency, teacher voice, autonomy, protected collaboration time, wellness, and recognition.

Panorama Survey Results indicate positive family experiences.

What is your race or ethnicity?	Unique Responses	Communication	Engagement	Overall Experience	Trust & Relationship
All Responses	95	96%	84%	98%	90%

Leader in Me MRA data shows high student, staff, and parental engagement. While there is room for growth, an average of a 76 on the MRA is above average for a first year school.



Perceptions Strengths

The CNA process captured specific staff perceptions and translated them into measurable targets for discipline confidence, retention, morale, and well-being.
Panorama/MRA surveys, discipline response tracking logs, PBIS fidelity checks, retention data, and staff feedback cycles provide multiple measures for monitoring progress.
The discipline strategies emphasize shared expectations and calibration between staff and administrators, directly addressing the communication root cause identified by staff.
The workload strategies protect collaboration and planning time while maintaining alignment to campus instructional priorities.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Inconsistent discipline systems and lack of administrative follow-through reduce teacher confidence in managing student behavior.
Root Cause: Lack of communication because administration and teachers have different perspectives of discipline and consequences. Not all teachers are following the campus discipline matrix with fidelity when responding to behaviors. Teachers feel that students are not held to the same high standard.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Teacher workload and burnout are high, impacting morale, retention, and performance.
Root Cause: Teachers enter to inspire students, but instructional time and adherence to schedules do not allow for flexibility. Time spent in meetings and work days is not consistently prioritized to allow team/campus collaboration to happen.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Approximately 50% of staff responses identified inconsistencies in RTI/MTSS implementation, including variation in intervention delivery, progress monitoring, and documented outcomes across grade levels.

Root Cause 1: Teachers are not aware of what resources are available and how to use them. Resources and implementation expectations are inconsistent across grade levels.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: MAP Reading data indicate early-grade variability, with Grade 1 achievement decreasing from the 58th percentile (fall) to the 51st percentile (winter) and 16% of students in the lowest band, indicating inconsistent early literacy development.

Root Cause 2: Students lack reading stamina (possibly due to technology, lack of initiative, behaviors, and/or limited exposure to physical texts). There is inconsistency in teacher standards, expectations, and goals.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time.

Root Cause 3: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: Teacher workload and burnout are high, impacting morale, retention, and performance.

Root Cause 4: Teachers enter to inspire students, but instructional time and adherence to schedules do not allow for flexibility. Time spent in meetings and work days is not consistently prioritized to allow team/campus collaboration to happen.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 5: Inconsistent discipline systems and lack of administrative follow-through reduce teacher confidence in managing student behavior.

Root Cause 5: Lack of communication because administration and teachers have different perspectives of discipline and consequences. Not all teachers are following the campus discipline matrix with fidelity when responding to behaviors. Teachers feel that students are not held to the same high standard.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Perceptions

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: Implement and monitor the Hutto ISD Power 6 instructional practices--framing the lesson, use of exemplars, Turn and Learn, student At-Bats, academic monitoring, and effective pacing/closure--in all core instructional classrooms through professional learning, PLC lesson internalization, walkthroughs, feedback, and administrative calibration. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased fidelity of Tier 1 instruction across all classrooms, resulting in higher levels of student engagement, academic discourse, task completion, mastery of grade-level TEKS, and student achievement on campus and state assessments. Walkthrough data will demonstrate increased implementation of the six identified instructional practices. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, ISC, Grade-Level Team Leaders **Title I:** 2.52 - **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 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Implement the LMES Mastery Tracker in grades 2-5 to monitor student performance on unit, scope, and common assessments; identify priority standards; determine student misconceptions; and develop grade-level, classroom, and student action steps following each assessment cycle. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will consistently use assessment results to identify standards requiring reteach, intervention, or extension. Student performance on priority standards will improve from initial assessment to reassessment, contributing to increased STAAR Meets+ performance and academic growth. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Grade-Level Teachers, Instructional Coaches/ Interventionists **Title I:** 2.51, 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				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Teachers will implement standards-aligned small-group instruction during GAME TIME using a consistent campus lesson-plan process. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will receive targeted instruction based on demonstrated academic need, resulting in increased mastery of priority standards, improved screener growth, and a reduction in the percentage of students performing below grade level. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Classroom Teachers, Special Education Teachers, Interventionists/Instructional Coaches **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 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4: Implement vertically aligned academic goal setting at the campus, grade-level, classroom, and individual student levels so students and teachers regularly monitor progress toward achievement and growth goals. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students and staff will demonstrate increased ownership of academic growth through regular goal setting and progress monitoring. Campus, grade-level, classroom, and student goals will be aligned, resulting in improved performance on screeners, common assessments, and STAAR. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Classroom Teachers, Grade-Level Team Leaders **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Approximately 50% of staff responses identified inconsistencies in RTI/MTSS implementation, including variation in intervention delivery, progress monitoring, and documented outcomes across grade levels. **Root Cause**: Teachers are not aware of what resources are available and how to use them. Resources and implementation expectations are inconsistent across grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: MAP Reading data indicate early-grade variability, with Grade 1 achievement decreasing from the 58th percentile (fall) to the 51st percentile (winter) and 16% of students in the lowest band, indicating inconsistent early literacy development. **Root Cause**: Students lack reading stamina (possibly due to technology, lack of initiative, behaviors, and/or limited exposure to physical texts). There is inconsistency in teacher standards, expectations, and goals.

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

Performance Objective 2: Students in grade 3 will increase from 47% to 53% of students achieving at 'meets' or higher on math STAAR assessments and from 54% to 58% on the reading STAAR assessments.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Implement flexible reading and mathematics groups based on current student assessment data. Flex groups will operate in three-week cycles and include targeted 20-minute flex-group instruction and 40-minute intervention opportunities, followed by required post-assessments to measure mastery. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Flexible grouping will provide students with timely targeted intervention or extension based on current data. Students participating in GAME Time groups will demonstrate measurable improvement between pre-assessment and post-assessment results. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers, Special Education Teachers, Interventionists **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: In Grade Level PLCs, teams will collaboratively internalize lessons and interventions with the content teacher leading planning, actively include special education teachers in the planning process, and utilize teacher dress rehearsals/ instructional At-Bats to strengthen delivery of priority standards. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will demonstrate greater consistency in lesson delivery, questioning, modeling, pacing, and response to student misconceptions. Increased instructional preparedness will result in stronger Tier 1 instruction and improved student mastery. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Supervising Assistant Principal, Team Leader, Instructional Coaches/ Interventionists **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Provide tutoring opportunities for At-Risk students in Grades 3-5 to prepare them for the STAAR assessment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased number of students achieving a Meets designation on the STAAR assessment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach, and Teachers **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 **Funding Sources:** STAAR Tutoring - Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs - $2,950				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Approximately 50% of staff responses identified inconsistencies in RTI/MTSS implementation, including variation in intervention delivery, progress monitoring, and documented outcomes across grade levels. **Root Cause**: Teachers are not aware of what resources are available and how to use them. Resources and implementation expectations are inconsistent across grade levels.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: MAP Reading data indicate early-grade variability, with Grade 1 achievement decreasing from the 58th percentile (fall) to the 51st percentile (winter) and 16% of students in the lowest band, indicating inconsistent early literacy development. **Root Cause**: Students lack reading stamina (possibly due to technology, lack of initiative, behaviors, and/or limited exposure to physical texts). There is inconsistency in teacher standards, expectations, and goals.

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: Conduct monthly grade-level MTSS meetings to review universal screener, classroom intervention, and progress-monitoring data; identify students requiring additional support; determine research-based interventions; assign responsibility; and document student response to intervention. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students requiring additional academic or behavioral support will be identified earlier and receive timely, documented interventions. Progress-monitoring data will be reviewed consistently, resulting in more responsive instructional decisions and increased student growth. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, MTSS Coordinator/Interventionists, Classroom Teachers, Special Education Staff **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 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Strengthen PK-2 literacy instruction through consistent instructional expectations, targeted small-group instruction, reading-stamina development, and regular monitoring of mCLASS/MAP data to address the early-grade variability identified in the CNA. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** PK-2 students will demonstrate increased foundational reading skills, reading stamina, and growth on mCLASS/MAP measures. Variability in early-grade literacy performance will decrease through consistent instructional expectations and targeted intervention. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, PK-2 Supervising Assistant Principals, PK-2 Teachers, Reading Interventionists/Instructional Coaches **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Approximately 50% of staff responses identified inconsistencies in RTI/MTSS implementation, including variation in intervention delivery, progress monitoring, and documented outcomes across grade levels. **Root Cause**: Teachers are not aware of what resources are available and how to use them. Resources and implementation expectations are inconsistent across grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: MAP Reading data indicate early-grade variability, with Grade 1 achievement decreasing from the 58th percentile (fall) to the 51st percentile (winter) and 16% of students in the lowest band, indicating inconsistent early literacy development. **Root Cause**: Students lack reading stamina (possibly due to technology, lack of initiative, behaviors, and/or limited exposure to physical texts). There is inconsistency in teacher standards, expectations, and goals.

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

Performance Objective 4: The percentage of students obtaining their CCMR indicator will increase 4% to an overall score of 86%.

Evaluation Data Sources: TSI, AP exams, Dual Credit Completion, Associate's Degree attainment, Industry-based certification numbers, CTE program of study completion, Military enlistment, Work force readiness IEP completion.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Provide developmentally appropriate college and career awareness experiences for PK-5 students through community partnerships, guest speakers, career exploration activities, and opportunities that connect classroom learning to future educational and career pathways. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** PK-5 students will increase awareness of college, career, and postsecondary opportunities through developmentally appropriate experiences connecting classroom learning to future pathways. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Counselor, Classroom Teachers, Campus Leadership Team **Title I:** 2.52 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time. **Root Cause**: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

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

Performance Objective 5: An increase in student utilization of wrap-around services will result in measurable improvements in academics, attendance, behavior, and well-being.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Implement the PBIS rewards system, including clear expectations, recognition systems, and data-driven behavior monitoring across all grade levels. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Consistent implementation of behavioral expectations and positive reinforcement will decrease disruptive and aggressive behaviors, increase positive student behavior, and protect instructional time. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, PBIS Committee/Action Team, Classroom Teachers **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1 **Funding Sources:** PBIS Rewards software - Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials - $3,500				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Implement Leader in Me lessons to explicitly teach the 7 Habits, character development, leadership, responsible citizenship, relationship skills, and anti-bullying expectations. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased leadership, responsibility, positive citizenship, conflict-resolution skills, and ownership of their behavior, contributing to improved student climate and reduced discipline incidents. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Leader in Me Lighthouse Team, Classroom Teachers, Counselor **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1 **Funding Sources:** Student Curriculum Guides - Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials - $4,954.94, Leader in Me Membership Fee - Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services - $6,600, Leader in Me Coaching Day - Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services - $3,420				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Ensure students receive required physical activity minutes through scheduled PE and other qualifying structured physical activities, monitor schedules for compliance. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase student participation in physical activity, promote healthy behaviors, and physical fitness. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, PE Teachers, and Nurse **Title I:** 2.51 **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time. **Root Cause**: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Inconsistent discipline systems and lack of administrative follow-through reduce teacher confidence in managing student behavior. **Root Cause**: Lack of communication because administration and teachers have different perspectives of discipline and consequences. Not all teachers are following the campus discipline matrix with fidelity when responding to behaviors. Teachers feel that students are not held to the same high standard.

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: Protect designated planning and collaboration time by prioritizing high-impact instructional initiatives and limiting campus requirements that do not directly contribute to student achievement, instructional quality, or campus improvement priorities. Additionally, provide teachers an opportunity to plan before school begins so they are prepared to receive students on day 1. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will have increased protected time for lesson preparation, collaboration, data analysis, and intervention planning, resulting in improved perceptions of workload manageability, morale, instructional effectiveness, and retention. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Campus Leadership Team **Title I:** 2.52 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math - **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2 **Funding Sources:** Summer Teacher Planning sessions - Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs - $4,000				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Implement systematic recognition of staff accomplishments, instructional growth, student outcomes, leadership contributions, and campus service in order to strengthen morale and retain high-performing staff. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Staff members will experience increased recognition for performance and contributions, resulting in improved morale, belonging, job satisfaction, and retention of high-performing teachers. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Campus Leadership Team **Title I:** 2.52 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Provide differentiated, job-embedded professional learning, instructional coaching, peer observation, collaborative planning, and feedback based on staff needs and student data, with emphasis on the Power 6, small-group instruction, MTSS, and data-driven instruction. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers and paraprofessionals will increase instructional capacity in identified campus priorities, resulting in stronger classroom implementation of the Power 6, MTSS, small-group instruction, and data-driven practices and improved student growth. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches/Interventionists, Grade-Level Team Leaders **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4: Campus administration will regularly review campus initiatives to ensure staff time and resources are concentrated on the instructional practices and systems identified as having the greatest impact on student outcomes. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Campus initiatives and staff responsibilities will be more clearly prioritized and aligned to the CIP, decreasing unnecessary workload and increasing staff capacity to focus on high-impact instructional practices. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Campus Leadership Team **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 5 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 5: Provide opportunities for high-performing teachers to mentor and grow apprentices, resident teachers, and new teachers to the profession. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Retention of high performing teachers and building capacity in new teachers. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** LMES Administrators **Title I:** 2.52 **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Teacher workload and burnout are high, impacting morale, retention, and performance. **Root Cause**: Teachers enter to inspire students, but instructional time and adherence to schedules do not allow for flexibility. Time spent in meetings and work days is not consistently prioritized to allow team/campus collaboration to happen.

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: Provide family-learning opportunities (2 Parent University events) that equip parents with information and resources to support student academics, attendance, behavior, and well-being while strengthening shared accountability between home and school. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Parents will increase their understanding of academic expectations, assessment data, behavior expectations, attendance, and resources available to support their children, resulting in stronger family involvement in student success. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Counselor, Instructional Staff, Family Engagement/Action Team **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:** School Processes & Programs 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time. **Root Cause**: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

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: Implement common campus expectations for classroom-managed and administrator-managed behaviors, consequences, documentation, communication, and administrative follow-through so students experience consistent behavioral expectations across settings. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students and staff will experience greater consistency in expectations, consequences, and administrative response. Discipline referrals will decrease and student/staff perceptions of fairness, safety, and consistency will improve. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, PBIS Committee, Classroom Teachers **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Use Student Experience Survey results and structured student feedback opportunities to identify strengths and areas for improvement in belonging, safety, relationships, engagement, and school climate. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will report increased confidence that their perspectives are valued. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Counselor, Junior Lighthouse Team Sponsors **Title I:** 2.52 **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time. **Root Cause**: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Inconsistent discipline systems and lack of administrative follow-through reduce teacher confidence in managing student behavior. **Root Cause**: Lack of communication because administration and teachers have different perspectives of discipline and consequences. Not all teachers are following the campus discipline matrix with fidelity when responding to behaviors. Teachers feel that students are not held to the same high standard.

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 partnerships with organizations capable of providing academic, behavioral, attendance, family, and wellness resources to increase access to wrap-around supports. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students and families will have increased access to academic, behavioral, attendance, wellness, and community resources, resulting in improved student attendance, behavior, academic performance, and family engagement. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Counselor, Assistant Principals, MTSS Team **Title I:** 2.52 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time. **Root Cause**: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

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: Align campus funds, grants, supplemental resources, and purchasing decisions to identified CNA priorities and CIP strategies, with priority given to students not meeting performance targets. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** A greater percentage of campus expenditures will directly support identified CNA needs and CIP priorities, ensuring financial resources are targeted toward strategies most likely to improve student outcomes. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Campus Secretary/Bookkeeper, Campus Leadership Team **Title I:** 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Discipline data indicate that disruption accounts for 31% of incidents and physical aggression accounts for a combined 38%, suggesting that a majority of behavior referrals are concentrated in these two categories and are impacting instructional time. **Root Cause**: Lack of teacher to parent communication leads to lack of parent involvement and accountability. Teachers find it difficult to document daily behaviors for intervention purposes. Some teachers struggle with classroom management.

Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes.

Performance Objective 2: 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: Review staff and family feedback QUARTERLY related to campus safety and operational systems during established formative review periods and adjust procedures, supervision plans, communication, and resources based on identified needs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Staff and family feedback will be reviewed throughout the year and used to make timely adjustments to supervision, safety procedures, operational systems, and communication. Positive Climate Survey responses related to safety and operations will increase. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principals, Campus Safety Team, Campus Leadership Team **Title I:** 2.52 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Inconsistent discipline systems and lack of administrative follow-through reduce teacher confidence in managing student behavior. **Root Cause**: Lack of communication because administration and teachers have different perspectives of discipline and consequences. Not all teachers are following the campus discipline matrix with fidelity when responding to behaviors. Teachers feel that students are not held to the same high standard.

Campus Funding Summary

Title I, Part A - (6100) Payroll Costs					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	2	3	STAAR Tutoring		$2,950.00
2	1	1	Summer Teacher Planning sessions		$4,000.00
				Sub-Total	$6,950.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$6,950.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00

Title I, Part A - (6200) Contracted Services					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	5	2	Leader in Me Coaching Day		$3,420.00
1	5	2	Leader in Me Membership Fee		$6,600.00
				Sub-Total	$10,020.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$10,020.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00

Title I, Part A - (6300) Supplies and Materials					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	5	1	PBIS Rewards software		$3,500.00
1	5	2	Student Curriculum Guides		$4,954.94
				Sub-Total	$8,454.94
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$11,954.94
				+/- Difference	$3,500.00

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
				Grand Total Budgeted	$28,924.94

Title I, Part A - (6400) Operating Cost					
Goal	**Objective**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
				Grand Total Spent	$25,424.94
				+/- Difference	$3,500.00

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