Hutto Independent School District

Nadine Johnson Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: C



Mission Statement

At Nadine Johnson Elementary, we grow leaders in safe, inclusive, and collaborative learning environments where every student and staff member is seen, supported, and celebrated.

Vision

Nadine Johnson grounds every decision in what is best for all kids.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4
Demographics 4
Student Learning 4
Student Learning Summary 4
5
School Processes & Programs 5
School Processes & Programs Summary 5
Perceptions Summary 5
6
Demographic Strengths 6
Student Learning Strengths 6
School Processes & Programs Strengths 7
Perceptions Strengths 7
Priority Problem Statements 8
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation 9
Goals 10
Goal 1: Increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations. 10
Goal 2: Expand strategies that attract and retain high-performing talent. 23
Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact. 28
Goal 4: Optimize financial resources to achieve student outcomes. 34
Targeted Support Strategies 40
Additional Targeted Support Strategies 42
State Compensatory 44
Budget for Nadine Johnson Elementary School 44
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 45

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Nadine Johnson Elementary serves 554 students in Early Education through grade 5 as a Title I schoolwide campus. In 2026, 39.4% of students were economically disadvantaged, 9.2% were emergent bilingual, 20.4% received special education services, and the mobility rate was 10.2%; these rates sit within one point of the TEA comparison-group averages (39.7%, 8.6%, 20.7%, 9.9%). The 2026 attendance rate was 95.4% (second quartile statewide among comparison campuses). Of the 588 total STAAR tests in grades 3-5 (Math, RLA, + Science assessments taken,) 41% were taken by Hispanic students, 32% White, 15% African American, 8% Two or More Races and 3% Asian.

Student group	Size	STAAR Meets+ 2026 (all subjects)
All students	554 enrolled; 270 tested (gr 3-5)	43% (251 of 588 tests)
Economically disadvantaged	39.4% of enrollment	31% (73 of 237) vs 51% non-ED
Special education (current)	20.4% of enrollment; 71 tested	8% (13 of 153)
Special education (former)	10 tests	20% (2 of 10)
Section 504	29 tested	34% (RLA, all grades)
Gifted/Talented	31 tested	91% (63 of 69)
Emergent bilingual (current & monitored)	9.2% of enrollment; 46 took TELPAS	43% (21 of 49)
Students experiencing homelessness	11 tests	9% (1 of 11)
At-risk	108 of 270 tested (40%)	16% (RLA) vs 51% not at-risk
African American / Hispanic / White	88 / 244 / 189 tests	36% / 37% / 56%

TELPAS: 45% of current EBs (17 of 38) made a year of progress in 2026, above the 40% target and up from 43% in 2025. Eight of the 46 EB students tested on TELPAS also receive special education services.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

NJES earned an overall C (70) in 2026: Student Achievement C (72; STAAR component 43), School Progress D (Academic Growth 57 raw / 62 scaled; Relative Performance F, 58), and Closing the Gaps D (22 raw / 65 scaled). Math drove the decline: Meets fell from 44% to 37% and math growth fell from 68% to 52%, while RLA Meets held at 56%. No grade or subject reached the top quartile for any distinction indicator.

Measure (2026)	RLA	Math	Science (gr 5)
Approaches GL or above	75%	64%	59%

Measure (2026)	RLA	Math	Science (gr 5)
Meets GL or above (2025)	56% (55%)	37% (44%)	20%
Masters GL	24%	16%	8%
Academic Growth score (2025; 2026 target)	62% (73%; 64%)	52% (68%; 69%)	n/a
Accelerated Student Learning	6% (Q4)	23% (Q4)	n/a
Masters by grade 3 / 4 / 5	23% / 23% / 27%	16% / 19% / 14%	8%

- HB3 grade 3: RLA Meets 52%, Math Meets 33%.
- Special education Math Meets by grade: 4% (gr 3, 1 of 25), 5% (gr 4, 1 of 22), 4% (gr 5, 1 of 24); grade 5 dropped from 38% in 2024.
- Economically disadvantaged Math Meets: 26% gr 3, 33% gr 4, 22% gr 5.
- African American students' math growth score was 38%, the lowest of any evaluated group.
- NWEA MAP Reading (397 students, fall to spring 2025-26): median achievement rose from the 56th to the 57th percentile; median Conditional Growth Percentile 50. Classroom medians ranged from the mid-20s to the high-50s.
- K-2 foundation: mClass/DIBELS 8 and MAP BOY/MOY/EOY by classroom (files on hand for every K-2 teacher).

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

NJES runs its 2026-27 improvement work through three Big Rocks (Communication + Clarity with Presence; Campus and Community Culture of Collective Efficacy; Systems of Continuous Improvement) and a weekly cycle: grade-level PLCs (K-2 and 3-5) use DuFour's Four Critical Questions and common CFAs, Root Force One reviews PLC Pulse ratings and MAP/CFA trends every Thursday, and the Guiding Coalition meets every other Wednesday. Administrators complete 10+ Power Six walkthroughs a week with the Hutto Core Spot form and run 6-week coaching cycles assigned from MAP, CFA and walk data.

- **Master schedule:** every grade has a protected 60-minute GAME Time intervention block (K 30 minutes), a 60-minute specials rotation (Art, Library/Guidance, Music, PE) and daily recess (30 minutes grades 1-5; two 20-minute recesses in K). SpEd specialized instruction is moving out of Tier I core into GAME Time or push-in after the October 16 schedule audit.
- **Curriculum and assessment:** district YAG pacing calendars (K-2 RLA, 3-5, Math), Bluebonnet math, Eduphoria CFAs and Mastery Trackers K-5, mClass/DIBELS 8 (K-2), NWEA MAP BOY/MOY/EOY (K-5), lead4ward Aware standards reports.
- **Special programs:** co-teach/inclusion, resource and Functional Academics (K-2, 3-5) for SpEd; ESL for 46 EB students with LPAC led by the counselor; GT and dyslexia interventionists in GAME Time; 504 plans; HB 1416 accelerated instruction (currently grade 3).
- **Staff quality and evaluation:** T-TESS appraisal with monthly Principal/AP calibration walks; 2025-26 TIA calibration R-squared was .26 (target .46). The campus has had two Assistant Principal transitions and notable teacher turnover entering 2026-27.
- **Student support and behavior:** Leader in Me (7 Habits, Lighthouse Team, student-led conferences), Hippo Codes behavior protocol, Hippo Zone reset spaces, Interception Tracker (moving to a Google Form after the prior tracker stopped logging), counselor guidance in the specials rotation.
- **Safety and health:** monthly fire, lockdown and severe-weather drills logged to district Safety & Security within 48 hours; campus nurse; district Coordinated Health Program.
- **Title I:** schoolwide program with $24,896 budgeted for 2026-27 ($5,456 payroll 6100, $15,090 contracted services 6200, $4,350 supplies 6300), none of it yet assigned to a CIP strategy.

Perceptions Summary

Students and families rate NJES higher than staff do. On the Spring 2026 Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment (MRA), family-rated Family Engagement rose 8 points to 83 and student Personal Development rose 21 points to 84, while staff-rated Staff Voice, Collective Efficacy and School Goals each declined. The Spring 2026 district Panorama staff survey (41 responses) named team collaboration and professional development as positives; its most frequent concerns were administrative support (11 comments), communication (10), student support needs, especially special education resources (7), and workload and after-hours meetings (6).

MRA measure (who answers)	Spring 2025	Spring 2026	Change
Family Engagement (families)	75	83	+8
School & Family Partnerships (teachers)	76	78	+2
Community Engagement (all)	71	68	-3
Student Personal Development (students/families)	63	84	+21
Student Interpersonal Development (students/families)	80	83	+3
School Climate (all)	83	82	-1
Staff Voice (staff)	83	80	-3
Collective Efficacy (teachers)	76	74	-2
Supportive Staff Environment (staff)	79	77	-2
Staff Interpersonal Effectiveness (staff)	79	73	-6
School Goals (teachers)	75	71	-4
Student-Led Practices (teachers/students)	74	73	-1

Family and community input used in this CNA: MRA family survey items (Family Engagement, Personal and Interpersonal Development); Fall and Spring Parent Perception Survey (response count and positive-response rate to be added); input collected at family events (Grandparents Day 9/11, Hispanic Heritage/Numeracy Night 10/8, Unity Day 10/21); PTA representative on the planning committee; Title I annual meeting feedback.

Safety perception: staff comments flagged that intercom announcements cannot be heard on the playground during lockdown and secure drills (see School Processes & Programs Problem Statement 3).

Demographics Strengths

Demographic Strengths

- Attendance held at 95.4%, at or above comparison campuses.
- EB students met the TELPAS progress target (45% vs 40%) and their Closing the Gaps scaled score (72) is the highest of any student group.
- Gifted/Talented students met grade level on 91% of STAAR tests.
- 98-100% STAAR participation for every student group.

Student Learning Strengths

- RLA Meets (56%) exceeded the 2026 Closing the Gaps target of 46% for all students and held steady year over year.
- 75% of RLA tests reached Approaches or above; 27% of grade 5 readers reached Masters.
- EB students' Closing the Gaps scaled score (72) and TELPAS progress (45%) exceeded targets.
- Campus MAP Reading median growth was at the national median (CGP 50).

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- A fixed weekly rhythm now exists: PLC to Root Force One (Thursday) to Guiding Coalition (every other Wednesday).
- GAME Time is scheduled for every grade at a different time of day, so interventionists can push into each block.
- Every K-5 teacher has MAP and mClass growth data by classroom to target coaching.
- Leader in Me structures (Lighthouse Team, student-led conferences) are in place for student voice.

Perceptions Strengths

- Families rate how the school includes them in learning at 83 (Effective), up 8 points.
- Students' personal leadership grew sharply (Personal Development 63 to 84).
- School Climate remains Effective at 82.
- Staff identify their grade-level teams and professional learning as what they value most.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Special Education (Current) is the only NJES student group below the Additional Targeted Support cut: 2026 Closing the Gaps scaled score 30 vs. the bottom-5% cut of 56. RLA Meets 11% (7/65; target 26%); Math Meets 5% (3/66; target 29%); STAAR component 13 (target 23).
Root Cause: Tier I and specially designed instruction are delivered inconsistently across SpEd service settings (co-teach/inclusion, resource, Functional Academics), and lesson internalization does not routinely plan for accommodations. Some service minutes are scheduled during Tier I core.

Problem Statement 2: Attendance is a required districtwide area; NJES 2025-26 attendance and chronic absence baselines, disaggregated for SpEd, are problematic, at 95.4% attendance rate and significant chronic absenteeism happening already in the 26-27 school year.
Root Cause: NJES weekly routine to check attendance data, send letters, and communicate with families is not impactful in curbing chronic absenteeism.

Problem Statement 3: Emergent Bilingual (Current) students made strong gains (RLA Meets 32% - 55%; Math Meets 23% - 40%; TELPAS progress 45%), but EB Math Meets remains below the 45% target.
Root Cause: Math lessons give EB students fewer structured opportunities for academic talk with language supports than RLA lessons, and EB results are not consistently disaggregated at every DDI cycle.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Special Education (Current) is the only NJES student group below the Additional Targeted Support cut: 2026 Closing the Gaps scaled score 30 vs. the bottom-5% cut of 56. RLA Meets 11% (7/65; target 26%); Math Meets 5% (3/66; target 29%); STAAR component 13 (target 23).

Root Cause 1: Tier I and specially designed instruction are delivered inconsistently across SpEd service settings (co-teach/inclusion, resource, Functional Academics), and lesson internalization does not routinely plan for accommodations. Some service minutes are scheduled during Tier I core.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: School Progress Academic Growth is 57 raw / 62 scaled (D), and Relative Performance is an F (58). MAP median CGP ranges from the mid-20s to the high-50s by classroom.

Root Cause 2: Tier I implementation and the use of student data vary by classroom; there is no common weekly process that makes every teacher act on CFA and MAP data, so growth depends on the room a student is in.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Walkthrough feedback and coaching are not consistently targeted by data or followed up, and coaching in SpEd settings has been limited.

Root Cause 3: Walkthroughs have not had a fixed weekly rhythm with 24-hour written feedback and a follow-up check, and coaching cycles have not been assigned from MAP, CFA, and walk data.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA.

Root Cause 4: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

The following data were used to verify the comprehensive needs assessment analysis:

Improvement Planning Data

- Campus goals
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Accountability Distinction Designations

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Local benchmark or common assessments data
- State-developed online interim assessments

Goals

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

Performance Objective 1: Student achievement for Hispanic, Emerging Bilingual (Current & Monitored), Special Education (Current), and Economically Disadvantaged student groups will increase to the 2026 Closing the Gaps targets in STAAR Mathematics Meets Grade Level and in Academic Growth in reading and mathematics (Domain 3) for the 2026-2027 school year, while RLA Meets Grade Level remains at or above target. Mathematics Meets: Hispanic 30% to 44%; Emerging Bilingual 40% to 45%; Economically Disadvantaged 27% to 40%; Special Education 5% to 15%. RLA Academic Growth: Hispanic 57% to 62%; Emerging Bilingual 54% to 62%; Economically Disadvantaged 51% to 60%; Special Education 33% to 50%. Mathematics Academic Growth: Hispanic 52% to 68%; Emerging Bilingual 63% to 69%; Economically Disadvantaged 44% to 65%; Special Education 31% to 45%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 2027 TEA Closing the Gaps report (Hispanic, EB Current & Monitored, SpEd Current, Econ Disadv)
* Spring 2027 STAAR, disaggregated by student group
* NWEA MAP BOY/MOY/EOY and mClass/DIBELS 8 (K-2), disaggregated by student group
* Spring 2027 TELPAS and TELPAS progress rate
* Eduphoria CFAs + Mastery Tracker (student-group filters)
* Hutto Core Spot + NJES SpEd Walk Tool data
* Calibration walk logs (campus + district; campus admin + district SpEd department; campus admin + campus SpEd department)
* Root Force One, Vertical Alignment Team, and Guiding Coalition minutes

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Strengthen high-quality Tier I instruction for Hispanic, Emerging Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged students. Tier I is the instructional focus for closing gaps. Every unit internalized in PLC names these student groups and plans for them before the lesson is taught: ELPS-aligned language objectives, sentence stems, and structured Academic Discourse for Emerging Bilingual students; IEP accommodations and specially designed instruction built into the lesson, not added after; and Problem Solving scaffolds and math vocabulary routines for all four groups (Power Six: High-Quality Tier I, Academic Discourse, Problem Solving). Unit CFAs are disaggregated by student group on Eduphoria Mastery Trackers, and reteach plans name students from each group. The LPAC Coordinator brings EB/TELPAS data to PLC each grading period. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 100% of internalized units show planned EB language supports and SpEd accommodations on PLC agendas; language supports and accommodations evident in 80% of Core Spot walks by May 2027; CFA results reviewed by student group every unit. Impact: Students in each group access grade-level mathematics in core instruction every day, closing the Mathematics Meets and Academic Growth gaps to the 2026 Closing the Gaps targets. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ISC/MTSS Coordinator; Counselor/LPAC Coordinator; Grade-Level PLC Teams; Guiding Coalition **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 **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy**				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Establish observation calibration systems that build one shared definition of high-quality Tier I and specially designed instruction. Three calibration structures run on a published calendar, each scoring the same classroom independently and reconciling before feedback is delivered. (1) Campus + District: campus administrators and district instructional leadership co-walk monthly with the Hutto Core Spot (T-TESS), calibrating on Tier I and the Power Six. (2) Campus Admin + District SpEd Department: campus administrators and the district Special Education department co-walk SpEd service settings every other week Oct-Dec and monthly Jan-Apr with the NJES SpEd Walk Tool, calibrating on accommodations, SDI, and the co-teach model. (3) Campus Admin + Campus SpEd Department: campus administrators and the campus special education team (case managers, R&I, and co-teach teachers) walk together monthly and calibrate on IEP goal alignment and accommodations in Tier I. Weekly Principal/Assistant Principal calibration walks continue in THE ROCK Monday rotation (Goal 2, PO 3). **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** : Result: 100% of scheduled calibration walks held across all three structures; observer ratings within one level on 80% of indicators by February 2027; administrative T-TESS calibration R-Squared moves from .26 toward .46. Impact: Every observer sees and names the same instruction for EB, SpEd, Hispanic, and Econ Disadv students, so teachers receive consistent feedback no matter who walks. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ILT **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 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Monitor Tier I implementation and student-group progress through the Instructional Leadership Team, Vertical Alignment Teams, and Guiding Coalition. Instructional Leadership Team (Root Force One): meets every Thursday after PLCs; reviews CFA/Mastery Tracker and walkthrough data disaggregated by Hispanic, EB, SpEd, and Econ Disadv; revisits the prior week's actions first and closes with 1-2 classroom-facing actions and owners. Vertical Alignment Teams: K-5 RLA and Mathematics teams meet monthly to review priority-standard progressions, YAG pacing, and student-group performance across grades, naming the foundational skill gaps K-2 must close before HB3 grades. Guiding Coalition: meets bi-weekly on Wednesdays; reviews walk trends and calibration outcomes, chooses one action per cycle to carry into PLCs, and serves as embedded coaching capacity in the classrooms with the widest student-group gaps. Each team reports progress at the November, February, and April formative reviews. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Root Force One reviews student-group data 100% of weeks; Vertical Alignment Teams meet 8 times Oct-May; Guiding Coalition completes one action per cycle; all three teams report at each formative review. Impact: Student-group gaps are seen and acted on every week at every level of the campus, keeping Tier I adjustments ahead of MOY and STAAR. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ILT, Vertical Alignment Committee, Guiding Coalition **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy**				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: School Progress Academic Growth is 57 raw / 62 scaled (D), and Relative Performance is an F (58). MAP median CGP ranges from the mid-20s to the high-50s by classroom. **Root Cause**: Tier I implementation and the use of student data vary by classroom; there is no common weekly process that makes every teacher act on CFA and MAP data, so growth depends on the room a student is in.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Walkthrough feedback and coaching are not consistently targeted by data or followed up, and coaching in SpEd settings has been limited. **Root Cause**: Walkthroughs have not had a fixed weekly rhythm with 24-hour written feedback and a follow-up check, and coaching cycles have not been assigned from MAP, CFA, and walk data.

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

Performance Objective 2: Student achievement at Meets Grade Level standard or above on STAAR in all subjects (Domain 1) will increase from 43% to 48%, and student achievement at Meets Grade Level standard or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 37% to 49%.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: * Spring 2027 STAAR (RLA, Math)
* 2027 TEA Closing the Gaps report, SpEd (Current)
* NWEA MAP BOY/MOY/EOY (SpEd disaggregated)
* mClass/DIBELS 8 BOY/MOY/EOY (K-2)
* Eduphoria CFAs + Mastery Tracker (SpEd filter)
* IEP progress reports (3-week checks)
* Core Spot + SpEd Walk Tool walk data (Goal Tracker)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Provide regular feedback, coaching, and administrative support through Power Six walkthroughs. Administrators complete 10+ walkthroughs a week with the Hutto Core Spot, rating Framing the Lesson and Exemplar Utilized every visit and logging student engagement look-fors (Turn & Learn, Student At-Bats). Every visit gets one observable next step in writing within 24 hours; the walk focus follows CFA results and support tiers. Bi-weekly walk trends and MRA engagement items are shared at Guiding Coalition to set the next focus. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 10+ walks/week; 90% of walks with 24-hour written feedback; Framing the Lesson and Exemplar Utilized rated Proficient in 80% of walks by May 2027. Impact: Consistent high-quality Tier I in every classroom, raising All Grades/All Subjects Meets from 43% to 48% and Math Meets from 37% to 49%. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** RFO (Root Force One, or Campus Instructional Leadership Team) **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June

Strategy 2: SpEd in every PLC and DDI cycle, with Specialized + designated instruction protected in GAME Time. SpEd teachers are standing members of grade-level PLCs (K-2 and 3-5) and bring their students' CFA and IEP progress data. Eduphoria Mastery Trackers carry a SpEd filter. Root Force One runs a 20-minute SpEd data review every other Thursday (SpEd RFO Protocol), closing with student-level actions and owners. Students receiving SpEd services are not pulled from Tier I core; designated specialized instruction happens in GAME Time (60 min; K 30 min) or through push-in. Every student receiving services has a 3-week progress check (IEP goal + CFA/Mastery Tracker; mClass/DIBELS for K-2) reviewed at PLC.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Result: SpEd staff attend [?]90% of PLCs; SpEd RFO review held 100% of scheduled (about 16 sessions Oct-May); zero core pulls after the Oct 16 schedule audit; 100% of students receiving SpEd services reviewed at least every 3 weeks.
Impact: SpEd students get full Tier I plus targeted SDI adjusted every 3 weeks, raising SpEd Meets to 20% RLA / 15% Math and the STAAR component to 20.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: RFO, Guiding Coalition, Grade Level + Dept Leads

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

- Targeted Support Strategy

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Provide regular feedback, coaching, and administrative support tied to student-group data. Every walk gets one observable next step in writing within 24 hours, and the next walk checks for it. Look-fors are set by student-group data: EB language supports and discourse, SpEd accommodations and SDI, and math Problem Solving for classrooms where Hispanic or Econ Disadv CFA/MAP results lag. Feedback is delivered by PvP coachability tier (Horn: Grades 1, 4, 5 + Specials; Kieffer: Grades K, 2, 3 + SpEd/R&I/ECSE). Classrooms where a student group trails the campus on MAP or CFA enter a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe). Feedback and follow-up are logged in the Goal Tracker. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 90% of visits with 24-hour written feedback; 100% of next steps checked on the following visit; every flagged classroom begins a coaching cycle within 2 weeks of the data release. Impact: Teachers act on specific, data-matched feedback, moving Tier I practice for each student group from one visit to the next. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ILT **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Special Education (Current) is the only NJES student group below the Additional Targeted Support cut: 2026 Closing the Gaps scaled score 30 vs. the bottom-5% cut of 56. RLA Meets 11% (7/65; target 26%); Math Meets 5% (3/66; target 29%); STAAR component 13 (target 23). **Root Cause**: Tier I and specially designed instruction are delivered inconsistently across SpEd service settings (co-teach/inclusion, resource, Functional Academics), and lesson internalization does not routinely plan for accommodations. Some service minutes are scheduled during Tier I core.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Walkthrough feedback and coaching are not consistently targeted by data or followed up, and coaching in SpEd settings has been limited. **Root Cause**: Walkthroughs have not had a fixed weekly rhythm with 24-hour written feedback and a follow-up check, and coaching cycles have not been assigned from MAP, CFA, and walk data.

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

Performance Objective 3: Students in grade 3 will increase from 35% to 42% of students achieving at 'meets' or higher on math STAAR assessments and from 54% to 59% on the reading STAAR assessment.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: * 2027 TEA Accountability report, Academic Growth domain
* NWEA MAP BOY/MOY/EOY by classroom (median CGP)
* mClass/DIBELS 8 (K-2)
* Eduphoria CFAs + Mastery Tracker
* PLC Pulse ratings (Data Analysis Cycle)
* Coaching cycle logs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Implement lesson internalization and targeted acceleration to build the HB3 foundation in reading and mathematics. Teams internalize and rehearse upcoming lessons in PLC using the Power Six (PLC Pulse Domain 4) and the YAG pacing calendar. 3rd grade RLA and Math priority standards are tracked on Eduphoria Mastery Trackers and lead4ward quintile data; students below grade level get targeted support in GAME Time and HB 1416 accelerated instruction. K-2 mClass/DIBELS 8 and MAP results are reviewed each benchmark window to build the HB3 foundation before 3rd grade. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Every grade-level team internalizes each unit before teaching it; 100% of 3rd graders below Meets on the MOY benchmark have an accelerated instruction plan. Impact: 3rd grade Reading Meets 54% to 59% and Math Meets 35% to 42% (HB3); all-student Meets rises to 48%. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ISC/MTSS Coordinator; Principal; Guiding Coalition **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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Data-targeted instructional coaching cycles. MAP BOY and MOY classroom CGP and CFA mastery decide where coaching goes: every classroom below a median CGP of 50 gets priority walkthroughs and a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe) focused on the Power Six move the data points to. GAME Time groups are regrouped from 3-week progress checks. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: every classroom below CGP 50 at BOY or MOY starts a coaching cycle within 2 weeks of the data release (DRAFT); coaching touchpoints logged weekly. Impact: the lowest-growth classrooms get the most support, moving every K-5 classroom to a MAP median CGP [?]50 in reading and math by May 2027. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal; Assistant Principal; ISC/MTSS Coordinator **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 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: School Progress Academic Growth is 57 raw / 62 scaled (D), and Relative Performance is an F (58). MAP median CGP ranges from the mid-20s to the high-50s by classroom. **Root Cause**: Tier I implementation and the use of student data vary by classroom; there is no common weekly process that makes every teacher act on CFA and MAP data, so growth depends on the room a student is in.

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

Performance Objective 4: The percentage of students who meet projected growth on grade-level screeners in reading and mathematics will increase 5% across all screeners (NWEA MAP K-5; mClass/DIBELS 8 K-2), raising the TEA Academic Growth domain scaled score from 62 to 70 and every K-5 classroom to a MAP median Conditional Growth Percentile of 50 or higher.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: * Spring 2027 STAAR (grades 3-5, RLA, Math, Science)
* 2027 TEA Accountability report, Student Achievement domain
* lead4ward Aware quintile/standards reports
* District benchmarks (MOY)
* Eduphoria unit CFAs + Mastery Tracker
* mClass/DIBELS 8 and MAP (K-2 foundation for HB3)
* Core Spot / Nexus walk data
- PK Circle CLI Data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Implement a coached weekly DDI cycle in every grade-level PLC. Every grade-level PLC (K-2 and 3-5) runs one shared process each week: DuFour's Four Critical Questions, a common CFA, and the team data protocol (trends - root cause - decision - monitor), ending with a reteach plan and owners. The ISC/MTSS Coordinator and Principal coach the protocol in the room and rate it on PLC Pulse; Root Force One reviews team ratings and MAP/CFA trends every Thursday. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 100% of grade-level teams complete the weekly DDI cycle; PLC Pulse Data Analysis Cycle look-fors average Proficient (3) or higher for every team by May 2027. Impact: Reteach and GAME Time decisions are made from current data every week, narrowing the classroom CGP gap and moving Academic Growth from 62 to 70. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal; Assistant Principal **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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Provide data-targeted instructional coaching cycles. MAP BOY and MOY classroom CGP and CFA mastery decide where coaching goes: every classroom below a median CGP of 50 gets priority walkthroughs and a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe) focused on the Power Six move the data points to. GAME Time groups are regrouped from 3-week progress checks. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Every classroom below CGP 50 at BOY or MOY starts a coaching cycle within 2 weeks of the data release; coaching touchpoints logged weekly. Impact: The lowest-growth classrooms get the most support, moving every K-5 classroom to a MAP median CGP of 50 in reading and math by May 2027. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ISC/MTSS Coordinator; Guiding Coalition; Assistant Principal **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Every classroom below CGP 50 at BOY or MOY starts a coaching cycle within 2 weeks of the data release; coaching touchpoints logged weekly. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** The lowest-growth classrooms get the most support, moving every K-5 classroom to a MAP median CGP of 50 in reading and math by May 2027. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Administration, (Principal, AP, ISC, Dean) **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 4: Provide regular feedback, coaching, and administrative support in SpEd service settings. The Principal walks SpEd service settings (co-teach/inclusion, resource, Functional Academics K-2 and 3-5) at least 3 times a week inside the 10x/week walkthrough rhythm, using the Hutto Core Spot and the NJES SpEd Walk Tool. Every visit gets one observable next step in writing within 24 hours, and the next walk checks for it. The look-for is set by SpEd CFA/Mastery Tracker and IEP progress data. SpEd staff are placed in the PvP coachability tiers with SpEd-specific look-fors. Every co-teach pair and resource teacher completes one 6-week coaching cycle per semester (co-plan - observe - model/co-teach - feedback - re-observe), anchored in the NJES co-teaching model and Power Six Key Moves 1 and 3. The district SpEd department co-walks every other week Oct-Dec to calibrate **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 3 SpEd-setting walks/week; 90% of visits with 24-hour written feedback; accommodations evident in 60% of SpEd-setting walks by Dec 2026 and 80% by May 2027; 100% of co-teach/resource teachers complete a cycle each semester (Cycle 1 Oct 12-Nov 20; Cycle 2 Jan 11-Feb 19). Impact: Consistent Tier I and SDI for students with IEPs, moving SpEd growth to 50% RLA / 45% Math and SpEd MAP median CGP to 50. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, AP, Dean **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 5 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 5: Monitor SpEd student progress in every PLC and DDI cycle, with specially designed instruction protected in GAME Time. SpEd teachers are standing members of grade-level PLCs (K-2 and 3-5) and bring their students' CFA and IEP progress data. Eduphoria Mastery Trackers carry a SpEd filter. Root Force One runs a 20-minute SpEd data review every other Thursday (SpEd RFO Protocol), closing with student-level actions and owners. Students receiving SpEd services are not pulled from Tier I core; designated specialized instruction happens in GAME Time (60 min; K 30 min) or through push-in. Every student receiving services has a 3-week progress check (IEP goal + CFA/Mastery Tracker; mClass/ DIBELS for K-2) reviewed at PLC. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: SpEd staff attend 90% of PLCs; SpEd RFO review held 100% of scheduled (about 16 sessions Oct-May); zero core pulls after the Oct 16 schedule audit; 100% of students receiving SpEd services reviewed at least every 3 weeks. Impact: SpEd students get full Tier I plus targeted SDI adjusted every 3 weeks, raising SpEd Meets to 20% RLA / 15% Math and the STAAR component to 20. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Instructional Leadership Team **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 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **- Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Special Education (Current) is the only NJES student group below the Additional Targeted Support cut: 2026 Closing the Gaps scaled score 30 vs. the bottom-5% cut of 56. RLA Meets 11% (7/65; target 26%); Math Meets 5% (3/66; target 29%); STAAR component 13 (target 23). **Root Cause**: Tier I and specially designed instruction are delivered inconsistently across SpEd service settings (co-teach/inclusion, resource, Functional Academics), and lesson internalization does not routinely plan for accommodations. Some service minutes are scheduled during Tier I core.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: School Progress Academic Growth is 57 raw / 62 scaled (D), and Relative Performance is an F (58). MAP median CGP ranges from the mid-20s to the high-50s by classroom. **Root Cause**: Tier I implementation and the use of student data vary by classroom; there is no common weekly process that makes every teacher act on CFA and MAP data, so growth depends on the room a student is in.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Walkthrough feedback and coaching are not consistently targeted by data or followed up, and coaching in SpEd settings has been limited. **Root Cause**: Walkthroughs have not had a fixed weekly rhythm with 24-hour written feedback and a follow-up check, and coaching cycles have not been assigned from MAP, CFA, and walk data.

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

Performance Objective 1: Retain 100% of NJES teachers achieving 80% student growth or higher (NWEA MAP / mClass) for the 2026-2027 school year.

Evaluation Data Sources: * NWEA MAP and mClass teacher-level growth reports (2025-26)
* District intent-to-return and staff retention data
* TIA data (student growth measures)
* Spring 2027 Leader in Me MRA (Collective Efficacy, Staff Voice, School Goals)
* Staff and SpEd team pulse (every 6 weeks)
* GAME Time Formative Surveys

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Recognize and celebrate teachers achieving high student growth, and conduct stay interviews before the spring intent-to-return window. Conduct structured stay interviews with every teacher whose students met 80%+ growth on MAP/ mClass the prior year, before the district's spring intent-to-return window. Recognize high-growth teachers publicly and create opportunities for them to share successful practices in PLC and Guiding Coalition. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 100% of 80%+ growth teachers complete a stay interview before the intent-to-return window. Impact: Retention risks (schedule, workload, recognition) surface while there is still time to act, rather than after a resignation is final. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal; Counselor; Guiding Coalition **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 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Conduct stay interviews with all teachers whose students met 80%+ growth on MAP/mCLASS the prior year, before the district's spring intent-to-return window. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Structured stay interviews surface retention risks (schedule, workload, recognition) while there is still time to act, rather than learning of a resignation after the decision is final. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Kieffer **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: Strengthen staff belonging, collaboration, and campus culture through Communication + Clarity with Presence. Leadership commitments are tracked weekly. Staff and the SpEd team complete a pulse every 6 weeks; the Principal shares back what changed within one week. Pulse, Panorama, and MRA items go to the Guiding Coalition, which chooses one action per cycle and reports progress to staff. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Pulse every 6 weeks with a shared-back response within 1 week; commitments tracked weekly; one Guiding Coalition action per cycle. Impact: Staff see their feedback acted on, lifting Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice over the 2026 MRA and moving MRA School Goals from 71 to 75 and Student-Led Practices from 73 to 74. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** ILT **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **- Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Prioritize certified, in-field candidates in every posted vacancy, with Horn and Kieffer personally screening finalist candidates for grade levels/subjects tied to identified achievement gaps (Grade 3 Math, Special Education). **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Filling the campus's highest-need vacancies - i.e. Grade 3 Math and Special Education, the two areas driving the campus's ATS identification - with certified, in-field teachers directly targets the root cause of the campus's lowest STAAR data points. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Kieffer **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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 .26 to a target of .46 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: Conduct joint Horn/Kieffer calibration walks monthly - the Calibration Walk segment already built into THE ROCK's Monday rotation - scoring the same classroom independently against T-TESS rubric language before comparing and reconciling scores. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Monthly, structured calibration practice directly targets the R2 gap between Horn's and Kieffer's observation scores, which is what the TIA calibration metric measures - this is the single highest-leverage action for moving .16 toward .24. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Kieffer **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Debrief calibration walk score discrepancies at THE ROCK's Admin-Only segment each Monday, documenting the specific rubric language driving any scoring gap and adjusting look-fors before the next walk. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Naming the specific rubric dimensions where Horn and Kieffer diverge, rather than just the overall score gap, makes the next round of calibration walks measurably more precise. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Kieffer **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Walkthrough feedback and coaching are not consistently targeted by data or followed up, and coaching in SpEd settings has been limited. **Root Cause**: Walkthroughs have not had a fixed weekly rhythm with 24-hour written feedback and a follow-up check, and coaching cycles have not been assigned from MAP, CFA, and walk data.

Goal 3: Establish strategic partnerships to mobilize collective impact.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the number of parent respondents above the 2024-25 baseline (32) 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: Distribute the Fall and Spring Parent Perception Survey at every signature family event on the LIM calendar - Grandparents Day (9/11), Hispanic Heritage/Numeracy Night (10/8), Unity Day (10/21) - with paper and translated options available on-site, not only a digital link sent home. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Multiple in-person collection points at events families already attend directly addresses the Community Engagement sub-measure decline (71-68 on the Spring 2026 MRA) and should raise response counts. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Payne **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 PTA and parent leaders to include parents in campus planning and decision-making. Recruit the NJES PTA to serve on the CIP/SBDM committee and to promote the survey through their own family and community networks before each administration window. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Peer-to-peer promotion from a seated parent and community representative reaches families that campus-generated communication alone does not, particularly among historically under-responding groups. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** RFO **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 3: Maintain consistent two-way communication with families through Leader in Me. Student leadership and ownership are observed on walks (Student At-Bats, student-led practices); Leader in Me family communication goes out weekly on ParentSquare; IEP progress is shared with families each reporting period by case managers. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Weekly Leader in Me family communication on ParentSquare; IEP progress to 100% of families each reporting period. Impact: Students lead more of their own learning and families stay connected, moving MRA Student-Led Practices from 73 to 74. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal; SpEd case managers **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Administer the Student Experience Survey campus-wide in Fall 2026 to establish the baseline, then again in Spring 2027, with the Lighthouse Team reviewing item-level results alongside the MRA School Climate sub-measure. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Pairing the new Student Experience Survey with the campus's existing MRA data (School Climate 83-82, a slight decline) gives leadership two independent, cross-validated readings on student experience rather than one survey in isolation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Payne, Lighthouse Team **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Use Leader in Me student-led conferences and Lighthouse Team student-voice channels to act on survey findings each semester, with at least one student-identified action item implemented per grading period. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Visibly acting on student feedback, not just collecting it, is what moves a satisfaction survey from a compliance exercise to a genuine measure of school belonging. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Payne, Lighthouse Team **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Formalize NJES's Career Day (5/14) business-partner list into a standing community-partnership roster, and recruit at least one new business or community partner per grading period to speak, sponsor, or volunteer. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** A standing, actively-grown partner roster, rather than a one-time annual event list, is what produces year-over-year growth in the partnership count this objective measures. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Payne, Team Leaders **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Engage partners in programs, events, mentoring, and volunteering. Connect newly recruited business and community partners to event roles so partnerships translate into direct student experiences, not just sponsorships. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Every new partner matched to at least one campus event or student experience. Impact: Partnerships tied to recurring campus presence last longer than one-time sponsorships, sustaining growth in the active-partnership count. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn **TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: School Progress Academic Growth is 57 raw / 62 scaled (D), and Relative Performance is an F (58). MAP median CGP ranges from the mid-20s to the high-50s by classroom. **Root Cause**: Tier I implementation and the use of student data vary by classroom; there is no common weekly process that makes every teacher act on CFA and MAP data, so growth depends on the room a student is in.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Ensure all NJES campus-level purchasing, activity fund, and Title I budget documentation is submitted complete and on-time to the district's Business Office each reporting cycle, with Resendiz (Campus Admin Assistant) reconciling the campus ledger monthly against the district's system. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Clean, on-time campus-level records are a precondition for the district's clean audit opinion and Superior FIRST rating -- a single campus's documentation gaps can create an audit finding at the district level. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Resendiz **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Connect each purchase to a measurable student outcome. Tie every campus-level Title I and local budget line directly to a CIP strategy (GAME Time staffing, coaching stipends, family-engagement event costs) so every dollar the campus controls maps to a named strategy and metric in this plan. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** A CIP-to-budget line-item map makes the campus's contribution to the district's resource-allocation index immediately auditable and ensures spending is defensibly tied to the achievement gaps (Grade 3 Math, Special Education) this plan is built to close. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Resendiz **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials **- Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Review spending and student progress each grading period. Review campus Title I and local spend against CIP strategy usage each grading period at Root Force One, reallocating unused funds (for example, an under-enrolled intervention block) before year-end rather than at final close-out. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Spend-to-strategy review completed every grading period; reallocations documented. Impact: Mid-year review catches underused resources, such as a GAME Time block running below capacity, early enough to redirect funds to a higher-need strategy the same year. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** RFO, NJES CAC **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials **- Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2 - Perceptions 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Walkthrough feedback and coaching are not consistently targeted by data or followed up, and coaching in SpEd settings has been limited. **Root Cause**: Walkthroughs have not had a fixed weekly rhythm with 24-hour written feedback and a follow-up check, and coaching cycles have not been assigned from MAP, CFA, and walk data.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Practice emergency procedures through drills and staff refreshers. Maintain the NJES documented monthly safety drill calendar (fire, lockdown, severe weather) with parent notification for intruder drills, and submit completed drill logs to the district Safety & Security office within 48 hours of each drill. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: 100% of monthly drills completed and logged within 48 hours. Impact: A complete, on-time campus drill record allows the district to certify NJES compliance within the Tri-annual and TEA Safety Audit windows. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Kieffer **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

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: Establish consistent response procedures for safety and operational concerns. Review the Climate Survey's safety- and operations-related items alongside the Spring 2026 MRA Supportive Staff Environment (79-77) and School Climate (83-82) sub-measures at Guiding Coalition, since both independently show a downward trend. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result: Joint Climate Survey/MRA review at Guiding Coalition after each administration. Impact: Reading district Climate Survey and campus MRA data together gives leadership a corroborated picture of which safety and operations concerns are driving both declines. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Horn, Kieffer, Guiding Coalition **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Feb	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Clearly communicate safety procedures to students, staff, and families. Close the loop publicly on Climate Survey findings each semester - naming at least one specific operational change made in direct response to staff/family safety feedback - at a full-staff meeting and in family communication. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Visibly acting on climate feedback is what rebuilds the trust reflected in a declining Supportive Staff Environment score; a survey with no visible follow-through reinforces the decline rather than reversing it. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Kieffer, Horn **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: Staff Collective Efficacy and Staff Voice declined on the MRA. **Root Cause**: Staff have not consistently seen their feedback acted on, and communication and clarity of expectations have been uneven (Big Rock 1: Communication + Clarity with Presence).

Targeted Support Strategies

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	2	1	Provide regular feedback, coaching, and administrative support through Power Six walkthroughs. Administrators complete 10+ walkthroughs a week with the Hutto Core Spot, rating Framing the Lesson and Exemplar Utilized every visit and logging student engagement look-fors (Turn & Learn, Student At-Bats). Every visit gets one observable next step in writing within 24 hours; the walk focus follows CFA results and support tiers. Bi-weekly walk trends and MRA engagement items are shared at Guiding Coalition to set the next focus.
1	2	2	SpEd in every PLC and DDI cycle, with Specialized + designated instruction protected in GAME Time. SpEd teachers are standing members of grade-level PLCs (K-2 and 3-5) and bring their students' CFA and IEP progress data. Eduphoria Mastery Trackers carry a SpEd filter. Root Force One runs a 20-minute SpEd data review every other Thursday (SpEd RFO Protocol), closing with student-level actions and owners. Students receiving SpEd services are not pulled from Tier I core; designated specialized instruction happens in GAME Time (60 min; K 30 min) or through push-in. Every student receiving services has a 3-week progress check (IEP goal + CFA/Mastery Tracker; mClass/DIBELS for K-2) reviewed at PLC.
1	3	1	Implement lesson internalization and targeted acceleration to build the HB3 foundation in reading and mathematics. Teams internalize and rehearse upcoming lessons in PLC using the Power Six (PLC Pulse Domain 4) and the YAG pacing calendar. 3rd grade RLA and Math priority standards are tracked on Eduphoria Mastery Trackers and lead4ward quintile data; students below grade level get targeted support in GAME Time and HB 1416 accelerated instruction. K-2 mClass/DIBELS 8 and MAP results are reviewed each benchmark window to build the HB3 foundation before 3rd grade.
1	3	2	Data-targeted instructional coaching cycles. MAP BOY and MOY classroom CGP and CFA mastery decide where coaching goes: every classroom below a median CGP of 50 gets priority walkthroughs and a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe) focused on the Power Six move the data points to. GAME Time groups are regrouped from 3-week progress checks.
1	4	1	Implement a coached weekly DDI cycle in every grade-level PLC. Every grade-level PLC (K-2 and 3-5) runs one shared process each week: DuFour's Four Critical Questions, a common CFA, and the team data protocol (trends - root cause - decision - monitor), ending with a reteach plan and owners. The ISC/MTSS Coordinator and Principal coach the protocol in the room and rate it on PLC Pulse; Root Force One reviews team ratings and MAP/CFA trends every Thursday.
1	4	5	Monitor SpEd student progress in every PLC and DDI cycle, with specially designed instruction protected in GAME Time. SpEd teachers are standing members of grade-level PLCs (K-2 and 3-5) and bring their students' CFA and IEP progress data. Eduphoria Mastery Trackers carry a SpEd filter. Root Force One runs a 20-minute SpEd data review every other Thursday (SpEd RFO Protocol), closing with student-level actions and owners. Students receiving SpEd services are not pulled from Tier I core; designated specialized instruction happens in GAME Time (60 min; K 30 min) or through push-in. Every student receiving services has a 3-week progress check (IEP goal + CFA/Mastery Tracker; mClass/DIBELS for K-2) reviewed at PLC.
2	1	3	Strengthen staff belonging, collaboration, and campus culture through Communication + Clarity with Presence. Leadership commitments are tracked weekly. Staff and the SpEd team complete a pulse every 6 weeks; the Principal shares back what changed within one week. Pulse, Panorama, and MRA items go to the Guiding Coalition, which chooses one action per cycle and reports progress to staff.

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
4	2	1	Connect each purchase to a measurable student outcome. Tie every campus-level Title I and local budget line directly to a CIP strategy (GAME Time staffing, coaching stipends, family-engagement event costs) so every dollar the campus controls maps to a named strategy and metric in this plan.
4	2	2	Review spending and student progress each grading period. Review campus Title I and local spend against CIP strategy usage each grading period at Root Force One, reallocating unused funds (for example, an under-enrolled intervention block) before year-end rather than at final close-out.

Additional Targeted Support Strategies

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	Strengthen high-quality Tier I instruction for Hispanic, Emerging Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged students. Tier I is the instructional focus for closing gaps. Every unit internalized in PLC names these student groups and plans for them before the lesson is taught: ELPS-aligned language objectives, sentence stems, and structured Academic Discourse for Emerging Bilingual students; IEP accommodations and specially designed instruction built into the lesson, not added after; and Problem Solving scaffolds and math vocabulary routines for all four groups (Power Six: High-Quality Tier I, Academic Discourse, Problem Solving). Unit CFAs are disaggregated by student group on Eduphoria Mastery Trackers, and reteach plans name students from each group. The LPAC Coordinator brings EB/TELPAS data to PLC each grading period.
1	1	2	Establish observation calibration systems that build one shared definition of high-quality Tier I and specially designed instruction. Three calibration structures run on a published calendar, each scoring the same classroom independently and reconciling before feedback is delivered. (1) Campus + District: campus administrators and district instructional leadership co-walk monthly with the Hutto Core Spot (T-TESS), calibrating on Tier I and the Power Six. (2) Campus Admin + District SpEd Department: campus administrators and the district Special Education department co-walk SpEd service settings every other week Oct-Dec and monthly Jan-Apr with the NJES SpEd Walk Tool, calibrating on accommodations, SDI, and the co-teach model. (3) Campus Admin + Campus SpEd Department: campus administrators and the campus special education team (case managers, R&I, and co-teach teachers) walk together monthly and calibrate on IEP goal alignment and accommodations in Tier I. Weekly Principal/Assistant Principal calibration walks continue in THE ROCK Monday rotation (Goal 2, PO 3).
1	1	3	Monitor Tier I implementation and student-group progress through the Instructional Leadership Team, Vertical Alignment Teams, and Guiding Coalition. Instructional Leadership Team (Root Force One): meets every Thursday after PLCs; reviews CFA/Mastery Tracker and walkthrough data disaggregated by Hispanic, EB, SpEd, and Econ Disadv; revisits the prior week's actions first and closes with 1-2 classroom-facing actions and owners. Vertical Alignment Teams: K-5 RLA and Mathematics teams meet monthly to review priority-standard progressions, YAG pacing, and student-group performance across grades, naming the foundational skill gaps K-2 must close before HB3 grades. Guiding Coalition: meets bi-weekly on Wednesdays; reviews walk trends and calibration outcomes, chooses one action per cycle to carry into PLCs, and serves as embedded coaching capacity in the classrooms with the widest student-group gaps. Each team reports progress at the November, February, and April formative reviews.
1	2	1	Provide regular feedback, coaching, and administrative support through Power Six walkthroughs. Administrators complete 10+ walkthroughs a week with the Hutto Core Spot, rating Framing the Lesson and Exemplar Utilized every visit and logging student engagement look-fors (Turn & Learn, Student At-Bats). Every visit gets one observable next step in writing within 24 hours; the walk focus follows CFA results and support tiers. Bi-weekly walk trends and MRA engagement items are shared at Guiding Coalition to set the next focus.
1	2	3	Provide regular feedback, coaching, and administrative support tied to student-group data. Every walk gets one observable next step in writing within 24 hours, and the next walk checks for it. Look-fors are set by student-group data: EB language supports and discourse, SpEd accommodations and SDI, and math Problem Solving for classrooms where Hispanic or Econ Disadv CFA/MAP results lag. Feedback is delivered by PvP coachability tier (Horn: Grades 1, 4, 5 + Specials; Kieffer: Grades K, 2, 3 + SpEd/R&I/ECSE). Classrooms where a student group trails the campus on MAP or CFA enter a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe). Feedback and follow-up are logged in the Goal Tracker.

Goal	Objective	Strategy	Description
1	3	1	Implement lesson internalization and targeted acceleration to build the HB3 foundation in reading and mathematics. Teams internalize and rehearse upcoming lessons in PLC using the Power Six (PLC Pulse Domain 4) and the YAG pacing calendar. 3rd grade RLA and Math priority standards are tracked on Eduphoria Mastery Trackers and lead4ward quintile data; students below grade level get targeted support in GAME Time and HB 1416 accelerated instruction. K-2 mClass/DIBELS 8 and MAP results are reviewed each benchmark window to build the HB3 foundation before 3rd grade.
1	3	2	Data-targeted instructional coaching cycles. MAP BOY and MOY classroom CGP and CFA mastery decide where coaching goes: every classroom below a median CGP of 50 gets priority walkthroughs and a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe) focused on the Power Six move the data points to. GAME Time groups are regrouped from 3-week progress checks.
1	4	1	Implement a coached weekly DDI cycle in every grade-level PLC. Every grade-level PLC (K-2 and 3-5) runs one shared process each week: DuFour's Four Critical Questions, a common CFA, and the team data protocol (trends - root cause - decision - monitor), ending with a reteach plan and owners. The ISC/MTSS Coordinator and Principal coach the protocol in the room and rate it on PLC Pulse; Root Force One reviews team ratings and MAP/CFA trends every Thursday.
1	4	2	Provide data-targeted instructional coaching cycles. MAP BOY and MOY classroom CGP and CFA mastery decide where coaching goes: every classroom below a median CGP of 50 gets priority walkthroughs and a 6-week coaching cycle (co-plan - observe - model - feedback - re-observe) focused on the Power Six move the data points to. GAME Time groups are regrouped from 3-week progress checks.
1	4	3	Every classroom below CGP 50 at BOY or MOY starts a coaching cycle within 2 weeks of the data release; coaching touchpoints logged weekly.
2	1	1	Recognize and celebrate teachers achieving high student growth, and conduct stay interviews before the spring intent-to-return window. Conduct structured stay interviews with every teacher whose students met 80%+ growth on MAP/mClass the prior year, before the district's spring intent-to-return window. Recognize high-growth teachers publicly and create opportunities for them to share successful practices in PLC and Guiding Coalition.
3	1	3	Maintain consistent two-way communication with families through Leader in Me. Student leadership and ownership are observed on walks (Student At-Bats, student-led practices); Leader in Me family communication goes out weekly on ParentSquare; IEP progress is shared with families each reporting period by case managers.
4	4	2	Clearly communicate safety procedures to students, staff, and families. Close the loop publicly on Climate Survey findings each semester - naming at least one specific operational change made in direct response to staff/family safety feedback - at a full-staff meeting and in family communication.

State Compensatory

Budget for Nadine Johnson Elementary School

Total SCE Funds: $38,135.00
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

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