Duncanville Independent School District

Acton Elementary School

2026-2027 Priorities/Goals/Strategies

Board Approval Date: October 19, 2026
Public Presentation Date: October 2, 2026

Mission Statement

Duncanville ISD: We engage, equip, and empower all scholars to achieve their unique potential.

Vision

Duncanville ISD: Where dreams are inspired and excellence is achieved.

Value Statement

We are D'Ville...

P - Professionalism

A - Accountability and excellence

N - Nurturing, safe environments

T - Transparent communication

H - Honesty, integrity, and ethics

E - Everyone contributing to student success

R - Relationships, equity, and inclusion

S - Students as our top priority

Table of Contents

Priorities 4
Priority 1: Student Academic Success 4
Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community 29
Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development 33
Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence 39

Priorities

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 1: By June 2027, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Reading at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 25% to 45% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR performance reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Strengthen Tier 1 Reading instruction through consistent lesson internalization, TEKS-aligned planning, explicit modeling, success criteria, checks for understanding, and data-driven small-group instruction to increase third-grade student mastery at the Meets level or above.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Kristina Johnson, Lucia Swinney, Payton Watkins, Kimetri Kirk

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Conduct weekly Reading PLCs focused on lesson internalization and TEKS rigor; use exit-ticket and assessment data to provide targeted WIN instruction; and monitor implementation through coaching, walkthroughs, and student progress data.	admin, IC, teachers	September through May	

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 1

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core reading instruction after the core lesson.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying comprehension skills (e.g., inferencing, summarizing, citing evidence) to STAAR-level texts.

At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Reading "Meets" standard will rise from 25% to 45% by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, IC, teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius passages/questions to match. Select 1 Sirius passages per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May	
2	After the core reading lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius passage/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teacher	weekly October through May	
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	Admin, IC	weekly October through May	
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use reading attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May	
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Admin, IC	weekly October through May	

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building
- Targeted Support Strategy

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 3

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 3: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2027, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 16% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment and IXL reports.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin, IC, teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, hands-on tool) will be used.	admin, IC	October and ongoing	
2	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October and ongoing	
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	IC, teachers	October and ongoing	

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using i-Ready teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October and ongong	
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October and ongong	
3	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	admin, IC	October and ongong	

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building
- **Targeted Support Strategy**

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 2

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2027, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 38% to 50% at the 50th percentile

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October and May	
2	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	IC, teachers	October and May	
3	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, hands-on tool) will be used.	admin, IC	October and May	

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 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	admin, IC	October through May	
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October through May	
3	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using i-Ready teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October through May	

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 2

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 4: By June 2027, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Math at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 33% to 45% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (APScheck, vocabulary supports, visual aids - place value chart, number line) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build fluency, problem-solving stamina.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	IC	October through May	
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all math classes.	Teachers	October through May	
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	Admin. IC	October through May	

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 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3, 4 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core math instruction after the core lesson.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying problem solving and math fluency skills to STAAR-level problems.

At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Math "Meets" standard will rise from 33% to 45% by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teacher, admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius word problems/ questions to match. Select 1-2 Sirius problem sets per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May	
2	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Admin, IC	weekly October through May	
3	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use math attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May	
4	After the core math lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius problem/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teachers	weekly October through May	
5	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, admin, IC	weekly October through May	

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
Problem Statement 3: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Campus instructional systems, including PLCs, lesson internalization, data analysis, and progress monitoring, are not implemented with consistent quality across all grade levels and classrooms. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have been established, but expectations for implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and accountability have not been consistently defined and reinforced

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2027, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Math testing will increase from 5% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October through May	
2	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, handson tool) will be used.	admin, IC	October through May	
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	IC, teachers	October through May	

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 1, 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using iReady teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teacher	October through May	
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October through May	
3	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	admin, IC	October through May	

Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.

Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Campus instructional systems, including PLCs, lesson internalization, data analysis, and progress monitoring, are not implemented with consistent quality across all grade levels and classrooms. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have been established, but expectations for implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and accountability have not been consistently defined and reinforced

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Math testing will increase from 5% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: students

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October through May	
2	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, handson tool) will be used.	admin, IC	October through May	
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	teachers, IC	October through May	

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using iReady teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October and ongong	
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October and ongong	
3	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	Johnson, Swinney, Watkins, Kirk	October and ongong	

Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 1, 2

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.

Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2027, student achievement on the state assessments in Reading will increase at approaches from 64% to 85%, meets from 31% to 45%, and masters from 10% to 35% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (sentence stems, vocabulary supports, visual aids) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build comprehension.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	admin, IC	October through May	
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all reading classes.	Teachers	October through May	
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	admin, IC	October through May	

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 3

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core reading instruction after the core lesson.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying comprehension skills (e.g., inferencing, summarizing, citing evidence) to STAAR-level texts. At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius passages/questions to match. Select 1-2 Sirius passages per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers, IC	weekly October through May	
2	After the core reading lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius passage/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teachers	weekly October through May	
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons	admin, IC	weekly October through May	
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use reading attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May	
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	admin, IC	weekly October through May	

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math

- ESF Levers:
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1, 2

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 3: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Campus instructional systems, including PLCs, lesson internalization, data analysis, and progress monitoring, are not implemented with consistent quality across all grade levels and classrooms. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have been established, but expectations for implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and accountability have not been consistently defined and reinforced
Problem Statement 2: Professional development, instructional coaching, and feedback have not consistently resulted in sustained changes in classroom instructional practices. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2027, student achievement on the state assessments in Math will increase at approaches from 57% to 85%, meets from 36% to 45%, and masters from 12% to 35% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (APScheck, vocabulary supports, visual aids - place value chart, number line) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build fluency, problem-solving stamina.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Kristina Johnson, Lucia Swinney, Payton Watkins, Kimetri Kirk

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will use the strategies in all math classes.	Watkins, Kirk	October PLC	
2	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	Teachers	October through May	
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	Johnson, Swinney, Watkins, Kirk	October through May	

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Incorporate IXL as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core math instruction after the core lesson.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying problem solving and math fluency skills to STAAR-level problems.
At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.
Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Math "Meets" standard will rise from 17% to 46% by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align IXL word problems/ questions to match. Select 1-2 IXL problem sets per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	Teachers	weekly October through May	
2	Collect and analyze IXL item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	Teachers, admin, IC	weekly October through May	
3	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Teachers, admin, IC	weekly October through May	
4	After the core math lesson, use IXL as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one IXL problem/ think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	Teachers	weekly October through May	
5	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use math attack strategies daily.	Teachers	weekly October through May	

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools
- ESF Levers:
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Campus instructional systems, including PLCs, lesson internalization, data analysis, and progress monitoring, are not implemented with consistent quality across all grade levels and classrooms. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have been established, but expectations for implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and accountability have not been consistently defined and reinforced

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2027, student achievement on the state assessments in Science will increase at approaches from 41% to 85%, meets from 12% to 45%, and masters from 2% to 35% on the STAAR test.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (CER, vocabulary supports, visual aids -graphic organizers, flow charts) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build fluency, problem-solving stamina.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	IC	October through May	
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all math classes.	teacher	October through May	
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	admin, IC	October through May	

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: Demographics 1, 3 - Student Learning 1, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core science instruction after the core lesson.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying science reasoning and science understanding skills to STAAR-level problems.
At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.
Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Science "Meets" standard will rise from 25% to 45% by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius science questions/ situations to match. Select 1-2 Sirius problem sets per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May	
2	After the core math lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius problem/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions including vocabulary defining.	teachers	weekly October through May	
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, admin, IC	weekly October through May	
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use science attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May	
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	teachers, admin, IC	weekly October through May	

ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 2

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
Problem Statement 3: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 4: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Student achievement in RLA, Math, and Science remains below campus performance targets, with the greatest needs in Math and Science. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction has not been consistently internalized and customized to the depth and rigor of the TEKS. Teachers have relied at times on curriculum as written rather than intentionally planning for the level of student thinking, explicit modeling, questioning, success criteria, and practice necessary for mastery.
Problem Statement 2: Students with unfinished learning are not consistently demonstrating the level of academic growth necessary to close achievement gaps and reach grade-level expectations, **Root Cause**: WIN and intervention time have not been consistently implemented as targeted, data-driven, teacher-led instruction based on specific student skill gaps. Implementation has varied across classrooms, with an overreliance on instructional software rather than consistent flexible grouping and direct teacher-led intervention
Problem Statement 3: Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, economically disadvantaged, and at-risk students demonstrate inconsistent achievement and academic growth, contributing to gaps in campus performance and Closing the Gaps outcomes. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have not consistently disaggregated and monitored assessment and progress-monitoring data by student group to ensure differentiation, targeted intervention, and timely instructional responses for students who are not on track.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Campus instructional systems, including PLCs, lesson internalization, data analysis, and progress monitoring, are not implemented with consistent quality across all grade levels and classrooms. **Root Cause**: Campus systems have been established, but expectations for implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and accountability have not been consistently defined and reinforced

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 1: By June 2027, stakeholder's beliefs as measured on the Spring Climate Survey "in our commitment to prepare our students for college career readiness" will increase from 78% to 80%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Leader in Me MRA spring survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Implement a campuswide college awareness initiative in which the school counselor highlights a different college or university during daily announcements by sharing age-appropriate facts, traditions, locations, programs, and other information to increase students' knowledge of postsecondary opportunities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased awareness of colleges and universities and begin developing an understanding of postsecondary opportunities.This will be reflected in higher levels of stakeholder participation in readiness events and an improvement in the Spring Climate Survey results, moving toward the 80% target.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Librarian

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The counselor will feature colleges and universities during daily announcements. Each Friday, students will have an opportunity to answer questions based on colleges highlighted during the week. Students who demonstrate their learning will earn a "CALA Now, College Later" wristband and social media post for parents to see their student as recognition and reinforcement.	counselor	October through May	

ESF Levers:
Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1, 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Create a college-going culture by providing students with consistent formal and informal exposure to colleges and universities throughout the school environment.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will increase their familiarity with a variety of colleges and universities and make connections between education, future goals, and college and career readiness.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Librarian

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Each teacher will display their college or university affiliation outside their classroom, including a photo and fun facts about the institution. Displays will provide ongoing exposure to a variety of postsecondary institutions and create opportunities for teachers and students to engage in conversations about college experiences, future aspirations, and educational pathways.	Counselor, Librarian		

TEA Priorities:
Connect high school to career and college
- ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building
Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback indicates a need for more consistent campus communication, expectations, and follow-through across the organization. **Root Cause**: Communication systems and accountability processes have not been consistently implemented across all teams, resulting in differences in how information, expectations, and campus procedures are understood and carried out.
Problem Statement 2: Parent and family engagement is not yet consistent across all grade levels and campus activities. **Root Cause**: The campus has not consistently implemented multiple, ongoing opportunities for families to engage in their child's learning, campus programs, and two-way communication with the school.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 2: The average student attendance will increase from 93% to 95% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: PEIMS Report

Strategy 1 Details

Strategy 1: Launch an attendance awareness campaign

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strengthen Student & Family Engagement in Attendance

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: AP, Attendance clerk, counselor

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Launch a monthly attendance recognition program (certificates, shout-outs, incentives for students/classes with highest attendance).	AP, Attendance clerk, counselor	October and monthly	

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Reviews

Formative			Summative
Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details

Strategy 2: Early Identification & Intervention

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: provide targeted support for at-risk student

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: AP, Attendance clerk, counselor

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Use attendance data to flag students with 3+ absences per month and assign them a mentor (teacher, counselor, or administrator) for weekly check-ins.	AP, Attendance clerk, counselor		

ESF Levers:
Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 3

Reviews

Formative			Summative
Nov	Jan	Apr	June

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Student attendance remains below the campus target, limiting consistent access to Tier 1 instruction, intervention, and other academic supports, particularly for students who are at risk of chronic absenteeism. **Root Cause**: Family communication and early-warning systems have not consistently identified and addressed attendance patterns before students become chronically absent.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 3: Student attendance remains below the campus target, limiting consistent access to Tier 1 instruction, intervention, and other academic supports, particularly for students who are at risk of chronic absenteeism. **Root Cause**: Family communication and early-warning systems have not consistently identified and addressed attendance patterns before students become chronically absent.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2027, the number of teachers meeting "accomplished" or higher on T-TESS will increase from 25% to 35%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Eduphoria Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Targeted Professional Development Aligned to T-TESS Dimensions in PLC and staff meetings.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve TTESS ratings

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Establish a peer observation program where teachers visit classrooms of high-performing colleagues, use T-TESS "look-for" rubrics, and debrief in PLCs to strengthen instructional practices.	Admin, IC	October through May	
2	Provide ongoing PD sessions and coaching cycles focused on key T-TESS areas where teachers score lowest (e.g., differentiation, data-driven instruction, classroom culture).	admin, IC	October through May	

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2 - Perceptions 1

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Professional development, instructional coaching, and feedback have not consistently resulted in sustained changes in classroom instructional practices. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback indicates a need for more consistent campus communication, expectations, and follow-through across the organization. **Root Cause**: Communication systems and accountability processes have not been consistently implemented across all teams, resulting in differences in how information, expectations, and campus procedures are understood and carried out.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 2: The percentage of teachers holding a valid Texas Certification will increase from 85% to 88% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR & TEAL Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Strengthen Certification Support & Accountability Systems

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: More certified teachers in every classroom

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Maintain a quarterly certification audit of all teaching staff to identify those with expiring, pending, or alternative certifications, and provide individualized support for renewal or completion.	Admin, HR	October and throughout	
2	Offer district-supported test prep workshops and explore stipends or reimbursements for teachers pursuing certification exams or renewal requirements.	HR	October and throughout	

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2 - Perceptions 1

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Professional development, instructional coaching, and feedback have not consistently resulted in sustained changes in classroom instructional practices. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback indicates a need for more consistent campus communication, expectations, and follow-through across the organization. **Root Cause**: Communication systems and accountability processes have not been consistently implemented across all teams, resulting in differences in how information, expectations, and campus procedures are understood and carried out.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 3: The retention rate of "certified teachers" will increase from 79% to 82% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR documentation on teacher retention.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Mentoring & Coaching for Teacher Growth

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strengthen teacher support and recognition systems.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin, IC

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Pair new and struggling teachers with trained mentor teachers and provide monthly coaching cycles focused on instructional needs and classroom management.	admin	October and monthly	
2	Implement a teacher recognition program (monthly shout-outs, teacher of the month, wellness check-ins, small incentives) to boost morale and acknowledge contributions.	Leadership team	October and monthly	

TEA Priorities:
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

- ESF Levers:
Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2 - Perceptions 1

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Professional development, instructional coaching, and feedback have not consistently resulted in sustained changes in classroom instructional practices. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback indicates a need for more consistent campus communication, expectations, and follow-through across the organization. **Root Cause**: Communication systems and accountability processes have not been consistently implemented across all teams, resulting in differences in how information, expectations, and campus procedures are understood and carried out.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 1: The amount of funds spent on "instructional expenditures (Function 11)" will increase from 52.74% to 60% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: Financial Reports from District

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation
toward instruction once a month.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Balanced budget

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, secretary

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	Meet with Secretary monthly to review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11.	Principal, secretary		
2	Meet with grade level team leads to see what instructional materials are needed each month per grade level.	admin		

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback indicates a need for more consistent campus communication, expectations, and follow-through across the organization. **Root Cause**: Communication systems and accountability processes have not been consistently implemented across all teams, resulting in differences in how information, expectations, and campus procedures are understood and carried out.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 2: The district will improve the School FIRST rating from an A-90 to A-94 by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: Maintain responsible campus financial practices by following district purchasing procedures, monitoring campus budgets, maintaining accurate documentation, and ensuring expenditures are allowable and aligned with district and campus priorities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Balanced budget

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal and campus secretary will routinely monitor budgets, purchase orders, expenditures, and required documentation to ensure compliance with district financial procedures.	Principal		

TEA Priorities:
Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Staff feedback indicates a need for more consistent campus communication, expectations, and follow-through across the organization. **Root Cause**: Communication systems and accountability processes have not been consistently implemented across all teams, resulting in differences in how information, expectations, and campus procedures are understood and carried out.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 3: The district will reduce payroll expenditures by 5% from 85.36% to 80.36% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 1: The principal will work with Human Resources to prioritize campus staffing based on student needs and instructional
priorities to reduce expenditures at campus leveling and the district budgeting at district level and the district annual budget review.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase staff retention

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: admin

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Complete
1	The principal will regularly review staffing allocations and personnel needs with district leadership and strategically utilize existing staff before requesting additional personnel or supplemental staffing.	Principal		

TEA Priorities:
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

- ESF Levers:
Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Professional development, instructional coaching, and feedback have not consistently resulted in sustained changes in classroom instructional practices. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.