Duncanville Independent School District

Central Fine Arts Academy

2026-2027 Priorities/Goals/Strategies

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 25
Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development 29
Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence 35

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 51% to 60% on the STAAR test.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reading, district assessments, common formative assessments, exit tickets, benchmarks, PLC documentation, STAAR Reading

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 and tutoring. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased reading growth and mastery of grade-level standards, resulting in increased performance at Meets and Masters on STAAR Reading. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will implement a systematic data-driven instructional cycle through weekly PLCs to analyze district assessments, common formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data; identify misconceptions; and plan targeted reteach and enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will respond more effectively to student learning needs, resulting in increased mastery of priority standards and improved STAAR Reading performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of campus administrators will conduct a minimum of five classroom walkthroughs per week to provide timely coaching and feedback to teachers. Evidence of implementation will be documented in Eduphoria with progress monitored during bi-weekly leadership check-ins. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will respond more effectively to student learning needs, resulting in increased mastery of priority standards and improved STAAR Reading performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, 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 1, 2				

Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 4: 100% of core teachers and campus administrators will implement targeted after-school and Saturday tutorials for students identified through Domain I (Student Achievement), Domain II (School Progress), and Domain III (Closing the Gaps) indicators. Student groups will be identified after each benchmark and interim assessment, with tutorial plans documented and adjusted quarterly. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result/Impact The percentage of students performing at Approaches, Meets, and Masters will increase from BOY through EOY. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.

Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.

Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2027, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 34% to 48% at the 50th percentile.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reading diagnostic and progress-monitoring data, district assessments, formative assessments, student work, PLC data, BOY/MOY/EOY data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Teachers will use i-Ready diagnostic data to provide targeted small-group reading instruction and differentiated learning opportunities during WIN time and tutoring. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** An increased percentage of first-grade students will meet or exceed expected annual growth and perform at or above grade level in reading. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford, classroom teachers **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, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2 - Perceptions 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will engage in weekly PLC data cycles to analyze foundational reading skills and plan targeted instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mastery of foundational literacy skills and improved performance from BOY to EOY. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford, classroom teachers **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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Parental participation in academic-focused events has been lower than desired, limiting opportunities for families to actively engage in and support student learning. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent communication, outdated contact information, and limited parent confidence in supporting academics have created barriers to family engagement.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2027, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 45%% to 48% at the 50th percentile.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reading, district assessments, formative assessments, student work, PLC documentation, BOY/MOY/EOY data

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:** Increased student performance from BOY to EOY in on grade or above grade level performance categories on iReady **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford, classroom teachers **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, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increased student performance from BOY to EOY in on grade or above grade level performance categories on iReady. Increased student performance percentages in meets and masters performance categories on assessments. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 4: By June 2026, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Math at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 73% to 80% on the STAAR test.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Math, district assessments, common formative assessments, exit tickets, benchmarks, PLC documentation, STAAR Math

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready and IXL to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time and tutoring. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mastery of prerequisite and grade-level mathematics skills, resulting in improved STAAR performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna PArker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will engage in weekly PLC data cycles using district assessments, common formative assessments, exit tickets, and student work to identify misconceptions and plan reteach and enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mastery of priority math standards and increased performance at Meets and Masters Grade Level. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of core teachers and campus administrators will implement targeted after-school and Saturday tutorials for students identified through Domain I (Student Achievement), Domain II (School Progress), and Domain III (Closing the Gaps) indicators. Student groups will be identified after each benchmark and interim assessment, with tutorial plans documented and adjusted quarterly. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** The percentage of students performing at Approaches, Meets, and Masters will increase from BOY through EOY. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.

Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.

Problem Statement 3: Limited Parent Engagement Among Economically Disadvantaged and Multilingual Families. **Root Cause**: Barriers such as language, transportation, and work schedules hinder consistent family participation in school activities.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.

Problem Statement 2: Although multiple assessment tools and data-analysis processes were utilized, there was a continued need to ensure that assessment data consistently resulted in timely instructional adjustments, intervention, acceleration, and enrichment. **Root Cause**: Data-analysis systems were not consistently translated into specific instructional actions, including reteaching plans, flexible student groupings, targeted interventions, progress monitoring, and enrichment opportunities.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Math testing will increase from 50% to 60% at the 50th percentile.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Math, district assessments, common formative assessments, student work, exit tickets, BOY/MOY/EOY data

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 and/or tutoring. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate measurable growth in foundational mathematics skills and increased grade-level proficiency. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mathematical reasoning, problem-solving skills, and mastery of grade-level standards. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
Problem Statement 3: Limited Parent Engagement Among Economically Disadvantaged and Multilingual Families. **Root Cause**: Barriers such as language, transportation, and work schedules hinder consistent family participation in school activities.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Math testing will increase from 41% to 52% at the 50th percentile.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Math, district assessments, formative assessments, student work, PLC documentation, BOY/MOY/EOY data

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:** An increased percentage of students will perform on or above grade level by EOY. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna PArker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mastery of grade-level math standards and improved performance across assessment cycles. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools **- 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:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.
Problem Statement 2: Although multiple assessment tools and data-analysis processes were utilized, there was a continued need to ensure that assessment data consistently resulted in timely instructional adjustments, intervention, acceleration, and enrichment. **Root Cause**: Data-analysis systems were not consistently translated into specific instructional actions, including reteaching plans, flexible student groupings, targeted interventions, progress monitoring, and enrichment opportunities.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data indicated a continued need for systematic intervention and progress-monitoring processes to ensure students who were not demonstrating expected academic growth received timely and targeted support. **Root Cause**: Intervention practices, progress-monitoring expectations, and documentation processes required greater consistency to ensure that student response to intervention was regularly evaluated and instructional supports were adjusted based on evidence of growth.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Reading will increase at approaches from 61% to 85%, meets from 38% to 45%, and masters from 11% to 35% on the STAAR test.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: By June 2027, student achievement on STAAR Reading will increase at Approaches, Meets, and Masters Grade Level.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will receive consistent, rigorous Tier I reading instruction, resulting in increased performance across all STAAR achievement levels. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use assessment data to identify students requiring reteach, intervention, acceleration, or enrichment and provide targeted instruction during WIN or tutoring. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Achievement gaps will decrease and the percentage of students achieving Approaches, Meets, and Masters will increase. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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 - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
Problem Statement 3: Limited Parent Engagement Among Economically Disadvantaged and Multilingual Families. **Root Cause**: Barriers such as language, transportation, and work schedules hinder consistent family participation in school activities.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Math will increase at approaches from 82% to 85%, meets from 59% to 60%, and masters from 32% to 35% on the STAAR test.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Math, i-Ready Math, district assessments, common formative assessments, exit tickets, student work, PLC documentation, walkthrough data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use assessment data to provide targeted reteach, intervention, acceleration, and enrichment during WIN or tutoring. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** The percentage of students performing at Approaches, Meets, and Masters will increase from BOY through EOY. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **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, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Result/Impact The percentage of students performing at Approaches, Meets, and Masters will increase from BOY through EOY. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
Problem Statement 3: Limited Parent Engagement Among Economically Disadvantaged and Multilingual Families. **Root Cause**: Barriers such as language, transportation, and work schedules hinder consistent family participation in school activities.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Science will perform at approaches 85%, meets 45%, and masters 35% on the STAAR test.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Science, district assessments, common formative assessments, exit tickets, student work, PLC documentation, walkthrough data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will implement standards-aligned science instruction that includes hands-on investigations, academic vocabulary, student discourse, and opportunities to apply scientific practices. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mastery of priority science standards and improved STAAR Science performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- 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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 3rd- 5th grade teachers will analyze district and formative assessment data during PLCs to identify science standards requiring reteach, spiraling, and enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will demonstrate increased mastery of priority science standards and improved STAAR Science performance. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- 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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1, 2, 3 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Historical 2024-2025 PEIMS data indicate that 49.67% of students were identified as Emergent Bilingual, demonstrating a significant need for systematic language development to ensure equitable access to grade-level Tier I instruction. **Root Cause**: The high concentration of Emergent Bilingual students required consistent implementation of language-rich instructional practices, including purposeful language objectives, academic vocabulary development, structured opportunities for student discourse, and differentiated linguistic supports across all content areas.
Problem Statement 2: Historical data indicate that 85.56% of students were economically disadvantaged, representing a potential barrier to equitable access to academic resources, enrichment opportunities, and supports necessary for sustained academic success. **Root Cause**: A high concentration of economically disadvantaged students increased the need for campus-based systems that provided equitable access to instructional resources, targeted intervention, enrichment opportunities, family supports, and extended learning experiences regardless of students' socioeconomic circumstances.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data demonstrate a wide range of specialized learning needs, including 13.35% of students receiving Special Education services, 8.97% identified as Gifted and Talented, 7.88% with an intervention indicator, and 2.63% identified with dyslexia, requiring differentiated systems of support across the campus. **Root Cause**: The diversity of student learning needs required stronger systems for early identification, progress monitoring, differentiated Tier I instruction, targeted intervention, enrichment, and collaboration among general education, special education, intervention, and advanced academic staff.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
Problem Statement 3: Limited Parent Engagement Among Economically Disadvantaged and Multilingual Families. **Root Cause**: Barriers such as language, transportation, and work schedules hinder consistent family participation in school activities.

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 measure at 70%.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Fall/Spring Climate Survey, family engagement attendance, TalkingPoints communication data, parent feedback, newsletters/communication logs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: By May 2027, CFAA will provide at least 2 family engagement opportunities focused on academic expectations, student progress, fine arts programming, college/career awareness, and strategies families can use to support learning at home. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Families will report increased understanding of academic expectations and greater confidence in the school's commitment to preparing students for future success. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Laretha Davis **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 6 - Perceptions 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: By May 2027, the campus will implement consistent, multilingual communication at least monthly, through campus newsletters, TalkingPoints, parent conferences, social media, and other communication platforms to increase family awareness and engagement. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Families will receive timely and accessible information, resulting in increased engagement and improved stakeholder perceptions. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Laretha Davis, Brandy Williams **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 5, 6 - Perceptions 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 5: Barriers such as transportation challenges, family circumstances, inconsistent routines, and limited understanding of attendance expectations may contribute to chronic absenteeism and prevent students from attending school consistently. **Root Cause**: Individual attendance barriers are not consistently identified early enough to connect students and families with targeted supports and resources.
Problem Statement 6: Family engagement in academic learning and campus programs is inconsistent, limiting opportunities for families to actively support student success. **Root Cause**: Families have not consistently received structured opportunities, resources, and guidance to understand academic expectations, monitor student progress, and support learning at home.

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Parental participation in academic-focused events has been lower than desired, limiting opportunities for families to actively engage in and support student learning. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent communication, outdated contact information, and limited parent confidence in supporting academics have created barriers to family engagement.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 2: By June 2027, ADA will increase from 91% to 95%.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: ADA reports, daily/weekly attendance reports, chronic absenteeism data, parent contact logs, attendance conference records, incentive participation data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Bi-weekly, the campus will implement a tiered attendance-monitoring system that includes weekly attendance reviews, timely parent contact, attendance conferences, and individualized interventions for students demonstrating patterns of absenteeism. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Chronic absenteeism will decrease and ADA will increase toward the 95% campus goal. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Laretha Davis, Brandy Williams **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 4, 5				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: CFAA will implement monthly schoolwide attendance incentives and recognition systems for students, classrooms, and grade levels demonstrating strong or improved attendance. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students and families will demonstrate increased awareness of the importance of daily attendance, resulting in improved attendance rates. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Laretha Davis, Brandy Williams **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 4, 5				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 4: Campus ADA is currently 91%, which is 4 percentage points below the campus goal of 95%. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent monitoring and early intervention have limited the campus's ability to identify and address patterns of student absenteeism in a timely manner.
Problem Statement 5: Barriers such as transportation challenges, family circumstances, inconsistent routines, and limited understanding of attendance expectations may contribute to chronic absenteeism and prevent students from attending school consistently. **Root Cause**: Individual attendance barriers are not consistently identified early enough to connect students and families with targeted supports and resources.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2027, the number of teachers meeting proficient or higher on T-TESS will be 80% by June 2027.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: T-TESS observations, walkthrough data, coaching logs, professional learning documentation, teacher goal-setting data, student performance data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus administrators will conduct at least 5 weekly instructional walkthroughs and provide timely, actionable feedback aligned to T-TESS and campus instructional priorities. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will demonstrate measurable improvement in instructional practices and increased performance at Proficient or higher on T-TESS. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- 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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: The Instructional Coach will provide weekly differentiated coaching, modeling, co-planning, and professional learning based on walkthrough data, student achievement data, and individual teacher needs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will strengthen Tier I instruction, lesson internalization, differentiation, student engagement, and data-driven instructional practices. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: By June 2027, 100% of teachers will participate in at least one targeted district, regional, state, or national professional development conference or learning opportunity. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 90% of faculty and staff will improve instructional practices as measured by formal observation tools. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna parker **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1, 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.
Problem Statement 2: Although multiple assessment tools and data-analysis processes were utilized, there was a continued need to ensure that assessment data consistently resulted in timely instructional adjustments, intervention, acceleration, and enrichment. **Root Cause**: Data-analysis systems were not consistently translated into specific instructional actions, including reteaching plans, flexible student groupings, targeted interventions, progress monitoring, and enrichment opportunities.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data indicated a continued need for systematic intervention and progress-monitoring processes to ensure students who were not demonstrating expected academic growth received timely and targeted support. **Root Cause**: Intervention practices, progress-monitoring expectations, and documentation processes required greater consistency to ensure that student response to intervention was regularly evaluated and instructional supports were adjusted based on evidence of growth.

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.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Certification records, HR reports, teacher certification progress, staffing reports, hiring records

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus leadership will monitor certification status monthly and collaborate with district Human Resources to identify certification requirements and provide support to teachers working toward certification. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** More teachers will successfully complete certification requirements, increasing the percentage of appropriately certified staff. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Campus leadership will prioritize the recruitment and selection of qualified, certified candidates for available instructional positions. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** New hires will strengthen the percentage of certified teachers and contribute to a highly qualified instructional staff. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

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

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Staff climate surveys, retention data, exit data, teacher attendance, coaching/mentoring logs, professional learning participation

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus leadership will implement systems for monthly staff recognition, ongoing feedback, collaborative decision-making, and opportunities for teacher leadership. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Staff members will report increased job satisfaction, belonging, and professional value, contributing to improved teacher retention. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: New and developing teachers will receive monthly differentiated support through mentoring, instructional coaching, professional learning, and regular check-ins. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teachers will receive timely professional and instructional support, increasing teacher effectiveness and retention. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker, Jessica Safford **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.

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.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Campus budget reports, Function 11 expenditure reports, purchase records, CIP budget reviews, instructional resource inventories

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus leadership will prioritize monthly budget allocations for high-quality instructional materials, intervention resources, technology, fine arts integration, and professional learning directly connected to student achievement. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** A greater percentage of campus resources will directly support classroom instruction and identified student learning needs. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, 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 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Budget expenditures will be reviewed monthly against CIP priorities and student achievement data to ensure resources are strategically allocated to high-impact instructional needs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Campus expenditures will demonstrate stronger alignment between financial resources, instructional priorities, and student outcomes. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, 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 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Minimal Gains Across All Grade Levels in Core Content. **Root Cause**: The implementation of a new curriculum and led to inconsistent implementation of aligned curriculum and Tier 1 instructional best practices throughout the year.
Problem Statement 2: Insufficient Enrichment for GATE-Identified Students. **Root Cause**: Focus on remediation during core instructional time overshadows opportunities for accelerated, differentiated activities.
Problem Statement 3: Limited Parent Engagement Among Economically Disadvantaged and Multilingual Families. **Root Cause**: Barriers such as language, transportation, and work schedules hinder consistent family participation in school activities.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.
Problem Statement 2: Although multiple assessment tools and data-analysis processes were utilized, there was a continued need to ensure that assessment data consistently resulted in timely instructional adjustments, intervention, acceleration, and enrichment. **Root Cause**: Data-analysis systems were not consistently translated into specific instructional actions, including reteaching plans, flexible student groupings, targeted interventions, progress monitoring, and enrichment opportunities.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 3: Historical data indicated a continued need for systematic intervention and progress-monitoring processes to ensure students who were not demonstrating expected academic growth received timely and targeted support. **Root Cause**: Intervention practices, progress-monitoring expectations, and documentation processes required greater consistency to ensure that student response to intervention was regularly evaluated and instructional supports were adjusted based on evidence of growth.

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.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Budget reports, purchasing records, audit findings, financial compliance reports, district fiscal reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: CFAA will adhere to district purchasing, budgeting, documentation, and internal-control procedures to ensure fiscal compliance and responsible stewardship of campus funds through monthly budget meetings. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Campus financial transactions will remain compliant with district and state requirements and contribute to strong fiscal accountability. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 4, 5				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Campus leadership will conduct monthly reviews of budget balances, purchase orders, expenditures, and documentation to identify and correct discrepancies. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Accurate and timely financial management will support district fiscal accountability and operational efficiency. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2, 3				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Although multiple assessment tools and data-analysis processes were utilized, there was a continued need to ensure that assessment data consistently resulted in timely instructional adjustments, intervention, acceleration, and enrichment. **Root Cause**: Data-analysis systems were not consistently translated into specific instructional actions, including reteaching plans, flexible student groupings, targeted interventions, progress monitoring, and enrichment opportunities.
Problem Statement 3: Historical data indicated a continued need for systematic intervention and progress-monitoring processes to ensure students who were not demonstrating expected academic growth received timely and targeted support. **Root Cause**: Intervention practices, progress-monitoring expectations, and documentation processes required greater consistency to ensure that student response to intervention was regularly evaluated and instructional supports were adjusted based on evidence of growth.
Problem Statement 4: Campus ADA is currently 91%, which is 4 percentage points below the campus goal of 95%. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent monitoring and early intervention have limited the campus's ability to identify and address patterns of student absenteeism in a timely manner.
Problem Statement 5: Barriers such as transportation challenges, family circumstances, inconsistent routines, and limited understanding of attendance expectations may contribute to chronic absenteeism and prevent students from attending school consistently. **Root Cause**: Individual attendance barriers are not consistently identified early enough to connect students and families with targeted supports and resources.

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.

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Staffing allocation reports, payroll reports, overtime reports, vacancy reports, enrollment data, district financial reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Campus leadership will monitor staffing allocations, vacancies, supplemental duties, and overtime bi-weekly to ensure personnel resources remain aligned with enrollment and instructional needs. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Staffing resources will be utilized efficiently while maintaining appropriate instructional and student-support services. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Campus leadership will review staffing structures and personnel utilization with district departments to identify opportunities for operational efficiency without compromising student services. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Personnel allocations will remain aligned with campus needs while supporting district efforts to reduce payroll expenditures. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Ayanna Parker **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, 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, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy** **Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Historical campus processes included multiple curriculum resources, professional development opportunities, and instructional supports; however, consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instructional practices across classrooms remained an area for continued improvement. **Root Cause**: Teachers required continued coaching, collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and actionable feedback to ensure consistent implementation of district curriculum, differentiated instruction, student engagement strategies, and rigorous grade-level instruction.