Fort Stockton Independent School District

Lone Star Virtual Academy

Accountability Rating: A

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 26, 2026 at 04:25 PM

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 3

Demographics 4

Student Achievement 8

School Culture and Climate 12

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 15

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 18

Family and Community Engagement 22

School Organization 24

Priority Problem Statements 27

Data Documentation for CNA 30

Improvement Planning Data 31

Accountability Data 31

Student Data: Assessments 31

Student Data: Student Groups 32

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 33

Employee Data 33

Parent/Community Data 34

Support Systems and Other Data 34

Goals 35

Goal 1 : Goal 1: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will raise student perform... 36

Goal 2 : Goal 2: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will raise its Academic Gr... 37

Goal 3 : Goal 3: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will sustain College, Care... 38

Goal 4 : Goal 4: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will reduce the annual dr... 39

Goal 5 : Goal 5: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will exit Targeted Suppor... 40

Goal 6 : Goal 6: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will build the organizatio... 41

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 42

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Lone Star Virtual Academy served 5,498 students in the 2026 accountability subset across grades 9–12 as an alternative education, dropout-recovery campus within Fort Stockton ISD. The August 4, 2026 Ascender export shows 3,446 active enrollment records — 3,401 unique students — entering 2026–2027: 641 in grade 9, 860 in grade 10, 805 in grade 11, and 1,140 in grade 12. Seniors are 33% of the roster, a distribution that reflects the campus's function as a credit-recovery and graduation destination rather than a four-year progression.

Economic disadvantage is 67.7% in the accountability file and 66.3% on the current roster. Special populations are substantial: 561 students receive special education services (16.3%), 461 hold Section 504 plans (13.4%), and 477 are Emergent Bilingual (13.8%). Gifted and talented identification is 24 students, or 0.7%.

By race and ethnicity, the 6,755 tests administered in 2026 break out as Hispanic 3,161 (47%), White 1,747 (26%), African American 1,319 (20%), Two or More Races 321 (5%), Asian 143, American Indian 41, and Pacific Islander 23. The High Focus group — economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, special education, or highly mobile students — accounts for 5,218 of 6,755 tests, or 77% of all testing at the campus.

Mobility is the defining demographic fact. The annual dropout calculation for SY 2024–25 evaluated 10,114 students in grades 9–12 against an accountability enrollment of 5,498, and 1,264 of them dropped out for an annual dropout rate of 12.5%. Dropout rates by group were Emergent Bilingual 15.6%, Asian 14.8%, homeless 14.8%, highly mobile 14.7%, White 13.7%, Hispanic 12.5%, special education 12.3%, and African American 10.6%. In Closing the Gaps, 6,751 of 6,755 tests came from students classified as non-continuously enrolled — effectively the entire tested population changed schools within the accountability window.

Operationally, the weekly at-risk engine scored 8,261 students across the Stellar Virtual campuses in the week of August 17, 2026, and flagged 536 students as onboarding-overdue as of August 19, 2026 — students enrolled but not yet converted to active engagement heading into a September 9 first day.

Strengths

Demographic data at this campus is unusually well governed for a virtual charter operation. Ascender and ClassLink refresh weekly and daily respectively, and the SIS Audit Dashboard reconciles Ascender against Genius field by field — Bilingual, GT, 504, SPED, race and ethnicity, date of birth, name, and special education dates — which catches the specific drift patterns that cause TSDS submission failures before the submission window rather than after.

The campus serves the population it was designed for, and it serves it at scale. Seventy-seven percent of all tests came from High Focus students, and the campus accepts a continuous mid-year enrollment stream of students who left other schools. That is the mission, and the demographic profile confirms it is being executed.

Identification of special populations is active rather than passive. Special education identification at 16.3% and Section 504 at 13.4% are both substantial for a campus of this size, indicating that the campus identifies and serves students rather than under-referring them.

Reading/Language Arts participation was 98% overall and at or above 96% in every racial and ethnic group, including 98% for African American students, 98% for Hispanic students, 98% for White students, and 96% for American Indian students — a strong result for a campus whose students must travel to physical testing sites.

Every enrolled student carries a weekly risk score with a delta, drop streak, and zero streak, so demographic subgroups can be monitored as living cohorts rather than as annual snapshots.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The annual dropout rate for grades 9-12 is 12.5% -- 1,264 of 10,114 students -- which is the single largest demographic risk at the campus and the direct reason the Graduation Rate component scores only 37.5 of 100.	Students enroll mid-year with existing credit deficits and no residency-based attendance obligation, and there is no enrollment-stage triage that assigns a risk tier, a named coach, and a credit-recovery plan on day one. Students accumulate zero-progress weeks before anyone is accountable for reaching them; 536 students were flagged onboarding-overdue as of August 19, 2026.
2	Gifted and talented identification is 0.7% of the roster -- 24 of 3,446 enrollment records -- well below the rate typical of Texas campuses, and gifted and talented mathematics participation was only 63%.	No local screening window exists for mid-year enrollees. Identification depends entirely on records transferring from the sending district, and the campus assessment calendar contains no nomination or screening cycle, so a student identified as gifted elsewhere who arrives without paperwork is never re-identified.
3	Emergent Bilingual students have the highest dropout rate of any group at 15.6%, and they are 13.8% of the roster and 14.4% of tested students (974 of 6,755 tests).	LPAC and language-support processes are attached to enrollment paperwork rather than to instruction and retention. There is no bilingual onboarding sequence, no Emergent Bilingual-specific coach assignment at intake, and no verified count of Spanish-fluent coaches matched to the 477 Emergent Bilingual students on the roster.
4	The gap between the 10,114-student dropout denominator and the 5,498-student accountability enrollment indicates annual enrollment churn near double the reported enrollment, and 6,751 of 6,755 tests came from non-continuously enrolled students.	Retention is managed reactively through counselor caseload rather than proactively from the Withdrawal Risk Predictor. The predictive model produces a ranked departure-risk list, but that list is not the trigger for a required, documented intervention with a deadline, so the highest-risk students are contacted only when a counselor's own caseload review reaches them.
5	Section 504 identification is 13.4% at Lone Star Virtual Academy but only 6.1% at the district's sister virtual campus, indicating that identification practice depends on which campus a student happens to enroll in rather than on student need.	Section 504 referral and evaluation practice has not been calibrated across the two Stellar Virtual campuses, and no shared referral rate, screening protocol, or quarterly audit compares identification rates between them.

★ = Priority

Student Achievement

Summary

Lone Star Virtual Academy earned an Overall A (90) in 2026. Student Achievement rated A (90) at 70% weight, built from a STAAR Performance component of 31 scaling to 81, a CCMR component of 93% scaling to 98, and a Graduation Rate component of 37.5 scaling to 40. Closing the Gaps rated A (90) from a raw score of 45 at 30% weight. School Progress rated C (77) — Academic Growth 57 scaling to 75, Retest Growth 41 scaling to 77 — and carries 0% weight under AEA provisions.

Despite the A, the campus is **identified for Targeted Support and Improvement** because student groups missed the same indicators for three consecutive years: Emergent Bilingual students missed 4 indicators, Hispanic students 3, economically disadvantaged students 3, Special Education (Current) 3, White 2, Two or More Races 2, African American 1, and Asian 1.

Overall STAAR results across all grades and subjects were 61% at Approaches, 24% at Meets, and 5% at Masters, against 2025 results of 64%, 28%, and 4%. Meets fell four points. In Reading/Language Arts, Approaches fell from 56% to 50% and Meets fell from 33% to 26% while the state rose from 54% to 56% Meets and held at 76% Approaches. In Mathematics, Approaches rose from 35% to 40% but Meets moved only from 4% to 5% against a state rate of 47%. Science reached 81% Approaches and 28% Meets; Social Studies reached 83% Approaches and 36% Meets.

End-of-course Meets rates against the state show the scale of the gap: Algebra I 5% versus 51%, English I 23% versus 53%, English II 29% versus 58%, Biology 28% versus 69%, and U.S. History 36% versus 69%.

Academic Growth scored 57 across 1,153 evaluated tests, of which 454 — 39% — earned zero growth points. The accelerated learning score was 24: of 489 students who did not meet standard the prior year, only 115 moved up a performance band. Retest Growth scored 41 across 2,279 retests, with 943 reaching Approaches. Retest success varied sharply by subject: Science 65%, Social Studies 69%, Mathematics 41%, Reading/Language Arts 35%.

Closing the Gaps components tell the clearest story about where the campus stands. Academic Achievement earned 9 of 28 available points (32.1%) at 50% weight. Growth Status earned 10 of 24 (41.7%) at 10% weight. English Language Proficiency Status earned 0 of 4 (0.0%) at 10% weight. School Quality — CCMR — earned 10 of 12 (83.3%) at 30% weight. TELPAS progress fell from 28% in 2025 to 17% in 2026 against a 28% target, producing the zero.

Against 2026 interim targets, the campus met CCMR (80% actual against a 63% all-students target) and missed everything else: Reading/Language Arts Meets 26% against 44%, Mathematics Meets 5% against 38%, Reading growth 57% against 69%, Mathematics growth 58% against 76%, Student Success 30 against 47, and English language proficiency 17% against 28%.

Subgroup Meets rates across all subjects were Asian 39%, White 29%, Two or More Races 26%, Pacific Islander 26%, Hispanic 22%, African American 22%, economically disadvantaged 21%, American Indian 20%, highly mobile 15%, special education current 13%, special education former 13%, and Emergent Bilingual 11%. Gifted and talented students reached 76%.

Mathematics participation was 92%, below the 95% federal floor, with White students at 90%, Asian at 86%, Two or More Races at 86%, and gifted and talented at 63%.

Strengths

College, Career and Military Readiness is the campus's strongest performance and it is genuinely strong. Of 553 adjusted graduates, 512 earned CCMR credit — 93%, scaling to a component score of 98. The Closing the Gaps School Quality component earned 10 of 12 available points, and the 80% all-students CCMR rate exceeded its 63% target, with every federally evaluated group beating its own group-specific target: African American 83% against 47%, Hispanic 78% against 60%, White 81% against 71%, and High Focus 80% against 56%.

Closing the Gaps rated A at 90. The campus outperforms on the domain that carries 30% of the overall rating and that most directly measures equity across groups.

Mathematics moved in the right direction at the Approaches band, rising from 35% to 40% — a five-point gain in a year when the state also rose, meaning the campus kept pace rather than drifting.

Science and Social Studies demonstrate that the instructional model works when content and assessment are tightly coupled. Science Approaches reached 81% against a state rate of 79%, and Social Studies reached 83% against 77% — both above state. Social Studies Meets at 36% and Science Meets at 28% exceeded the district rates of 29% and 26%.

Retest support is effective in discrete-content subjects: 65% of Science retests and 69% of Social Studies retests reached Approaches, evidence that targeted retest instruction produces results when the content is bounded and the assessment is predictable.

Reading/Language Arts participation was 98% overall, and gifted and talented students reached 76% Meets and 92% Meets in Reading/Language Arts, showing the campus can produce high performance where students arrive with prerequisite skills intact.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Achievement Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Mathematics Meets is 5% against a 2026 Closing the Gaps target of 38% and a state rate of 47%. Algebra I Meets is 5% against 51% statewide -- a 46-point gap -- and no subgroup exceeds 13%. Economically disadvantaged students reached 4% and special education students 4%	Algebra 1 is delivered asynchronously to students with unaddressed pre-algebra gaps. While Bright Thinker and IXL accurately diagnose these gaps, the campus lacks a required synchronous small-group block for students below standard, leaving conceptual gaps unclosed.
2	Reading/Language Arts Meets fell seven points, from 33% to 26%, and Approaches fell six points, from 56% to 50%, while the state rose from 54% to 56% Meets and held at 76% Approaches. This is a decline in first instruction, not a failure of intervention.	Instructional emphasis shifted toward Approaches-band recovery for the 1,176 students retesting in Reading/Language Arts, and Meets-level cognitive demand disappeared from Tier 1 lessons. Walkthrough data is summarized monthly but is not aggregated and published by T-TESS domain against outcome movement, so leadership could not detect that the rigor of daily instruction had dropped until STAAR.
3	Thirty-nine percent of growth-evaluated tests -- 454 of 1,153 -- earned zero growth points, and the accelerated learning score is 24, meaning 374 of 489 students who failed to meet standard the prior year did not advance a performance band.	HB 1416 accelerated instruction is assigned as a roster but not verified as delivered dosage. There is no per-student record of accelerated-instruction hours attended, so the 30-hour requirement and the stated progress-monitoring cycles -- every 10 instructional days for Tier 2, every 5 for Tier 3 -- are planned in the TAP but not enforced by any system that flags non-delivery in time to correct it.
4	TELPAS progress fell from 28% to 17% against a 28% target, earning 0 of 4 English Language Proficiency points in Closing the Gaps. Sixty of 351 Emergent Bilingual students tested made progress	No named role owns language-proficiency growth with domain-specific TELPAS targets. EB supports are treated as general lesson scaffolds rather than targeted ELPS instruction, and no dashboard tracks interim domain progress to prevent undetected stagnation.
5	The campus is identified for Targeted Support and Improvement because Emergent Bilingual (4 indicators), Hispanic (3), economically disadvantaged (3), and Special Education (Current) (3) student groups missed the same indicators for three consecutive years -- a federal finding the A rating conceals.	Campus planning focuses on the overall rating-- where AEA rules weight School Progress at 0%-- masking weak growth behind CCMR and STAAR scores. Additionally, subgroup-by-indicator status is not routinely reviewed in recurring meetings, allowing groups to miss targets repeatedly without triggering escalation.

6 Mathematics participation is 92%, below the 95% federal floor, with White students at 90%, Asian at 86%, Two or More Races at 86%, and gifted and talented at 63%.

Test-day participation at a virtual campus requires students to travel to a physical testing site. The state testing support strategy runs confirmation and reminder campaigns, but participation is not tracked against a named-student confirmed-seat roster with mandatory escalation for non-confirmers in the final ten days before the window closes.

7 The 93% CCMR rate rests almost entirely on college-prep course credit -- 86.2% in Reading/ Language Arts and 84.1% in Mathematics -- while TSIA assessment criteria were met by 9.7% in RLA and 5.1% in Mathematics, AP/IB by 2.3%, dual credit by 6.5%, industry-based certification by 3.9%, associate degree by 0%, and military enlistment by 1.9%.

CCMR strategy relies entirely on the college-prep course pathway due to a lack of capacity for TSIA, dual credit, or industry certifications, leaving the campus's strongest domain resting on a single indicator.

8 Retest volume is concentrated exactly where retest success is lowest: 1,176 Reading/Language Arts retests at 35% success and 821 Mathematics retests at 41%, against 183 Science retests at 65% and 99 Social Studies retests at 69%.

Retest scheduling is driven by graduation requirements rather than by readiness, and no differentiated retest curriculum exists for students on a third or fourth attempt. A student who has failed English I three times receives the same review sequence as a first-time retester.

★ = Priority

School Culture and Climate

Summary

Culture and climate at a virtual dropout-recovery campus are measured primarily through engagement and persistence, and both are under strain. The annual dropout rate for grades 9–12 was 12.5% in SY 2024–25, and 6,751 of 6,755 tested students were non-continuously enrolled — the student body turns over almost completely within the accountability window.

The campus operates a weekly at-risk scoring engine that computes a score from All Passing, Core Passing, Attendance Hours, and Login Count, banded as 0 (withdrawal list), 1–10 high risk, 11–15 medium risk, 16–20 low risk, and 21 or above in good shape. In the run generated August 19, 2026 for the week of August 17, 8,261 students were scored across the Stellar Virtual campuses. That run falls in the summer window before the September 9 first day, so login and attendance minutes are near zero by design and the distribution should be read as a starting floor rather than a school-year measure; 87 students nonetheless carried a two-week or longer declining-score streak, and 536 were flagged onboarding-overdue.

Support structures are substantial. Twenty-five Student Success Coaches operate caseload portals in which they log calls, emails, texts, contact attempts, and attendance weekly in under five minutes, and that logging lands automatically in leadership dashboards. The Engagement Dashboard segments students into 3-day, 7-day, and 30-day inactive groups. The ROT Leadership Dashboard runs Restart-of-Track logic daily, issuing HOLD recommendations that require a principal conference for students in protected populations — special education, Section 504, homeless, dyslexia, and English learner — and START recommendations only for unprotected students passing zero courses. The Family Engagement Dashboard flags any student whose family has not been contacted in 14 or more days.

A recurring meeting architecture is defined and each meeting has its own action inbox: Daily Attendance Huddle, Weekly Cabinet, Weekly TAP Committee, Weekly PLC, Weekly RTI, Bi-weekly Special Populations, Monthly PEIMS, and Quarterly Equity Review. A three-phase escalation protocol exists — leadership coaching, targeted support deployment, and district intervention or resource reassignment.

Strengths

Every enrolled student carries a weekly numeric risk score with a change delta, a drop streak, and a zero streak, which means decline is visible as it happens rather than after withdrawal. This is a materially better early-warning posture than most campuses of any type operate.

Restart-of-Track logic is legally sound by design. Students in protected populations receive HOLD recommendations that require a principal meeting rather than automatic removal from a course track, so federal protections are enforced by the system rather than remembered by an individual.

Coach contact is measurable rather than anecdotal. A weekly log that takes under five minutes and flows automatically into leadership dashboards produces an honest contact-cadence record across 25 caseloads — the difference between knowing that outreach happened and believing that it did.

Family contact is monitored per student, not per event. The 14-day no-contact flag identifies specific families by name rather than reporting aggregate attendance at engagement nights.

Escalation authority is explicit and reaches the district. Phase 3 permits resource reassignment for persistent non-

compliance, which means a campus-level stall has a defined path to district intervention.

The meeting architecture assigns every action to a named recurring forum with an assignment date, a deadline, days remaining, and an overdue flag, so accountability for follow-through is structural rather than dependent on individual memory.

Problem Statements Identifying School Culture and Climate Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Twelve and a half percent of students in grades 9-12 dropped out in SY 2024-25, and 536 students were flagged onboarding-overdue in August 2026 -- students are enrolling and disengaging before the campus establishes meaningful contact.	Onboarding conversion has no owner with a deadline. The Onboarding Journey Tracker identifies students who never converted from enrolled to engaged, but that output is not assigned to a named coach with a required contact window and a documented escalation when contact fails, so the list is produced and read rather than worked.
2 ★	Risk scores are produced weekly but intervention outcomes are not systematically tied back to them. Eighty-seven students carried multi-week decline streaks in August 2026 with no rule requiring an action.	The intervention loop -- identify, act, log, review, escalate -- depends on the Weekly Cabinet and Weekly RTI meetings closing their action inboxes, and the TAP Action Hub tracks deadlines and overdue flags. But no automated rule converts a two-week decline streak into an assigned action, so escalation depends on a human noticing the streak in a table.
3	Culture and climate are measured almost entirely through behavioral proxies -- logins, minutes, passing rates, contact counts. The campus administers no student or family climate survey.	The Perceptions strand of the needs assessment has no instrument in the assessment calendar. Family feedback arrives from engagement-night attendees and Salesforce parent cases, which capture the already-engaged and the already-dissatisfied rather than a representative sample, so the campus cannot distinguish a student who is disengaged from one who is disaffected.
4	Emergent Bilingual, homeless, and highly mobile students drop out at 15.6%, 14.8%, and 14.7% respectively -- above the campus rate -- indicating that the students least anchored to the school are the least likely to be retained by it.	Belonging is not designed for at intake. There is no cohort, advisory, or peer structure assigned at enrollment; the Homeroom Dashboard exists as an advisor view but advisory assignment is not part of the onboarding sequence, so a mid-year enrollee's only relationship with the school is transactional.

★ = Priority

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Summary

Staffing at Lone Star Virtual Academy is administered through an external employer-of-record arrangement. A weekly employee census of roughly 726 employee records — spanning all Stellar Virtual states, not this campus alone — feeds the Master Access Roster, which combines with the master schedule and counselor assignments to generate the permission and scope layer for every dashboard in the system.

The teacher observation and evaluation pipeline runs as follows: observation notes are produced weekly through the employer-of-record, converted manually into T-TESS rubric scores in Eduphoria, exported weekly from Eduphoria, and loaded into the TTESS Observation Tracker and the Per-Teacher Effectiveness Snapshot. Eduphoria is the system of record for finished T-TESS data.

T-TESS structures are fully specified in the TAP. Leadership teams hold calibration sessions each semester with inter-rater reliability as the stated objective. Instructional coaches receive intensive training in feedback language aligned to T-TESS descriptors, with emphasis on Domain 2. Teachers complete T-TESS orientation and self-assessment tied to annual goal setting. Weekly walkthroughs use a standardized tool capturing all four domains with a four-point proficiency scale, a narrative evidence field, and a required "Next Coaching Steps" field. Coaching cycles run biweekly. Mid-year and end-of-year evaluations feed individualized PD plans.

Professional development is layered by role. The Principal Manager participates in district and ESC training on ESF implementation — particularly Lever 1, strong school leadership, and Lever 5, effective instruction — and then delivers monthly leadership training to campus principals on data analysis, instructional leadership, and TAP fidelity. Assistant principals and instructional coaches attend biweekly sessions on data-driven instruction, PLC facilitation, and Tier 2/Tier 3 progress monitoring. Teachers engage in weekly PD and PLC cycles. Special cohort groups — Emergent Bilingual teachers, inclusion co-teachers, and interventionists — attend an additional debrief after each PD session.

Quarterly staffing audits confirm that teaching assignments, intervention caseloads, and coaching supports remain equitable and aligned to milestone objectives. PD participation is tracked monthly through sign-in sheets, agendas, and evaluations.

Strengths

The observation-to-coaching chain is specified end to end with named artifacts and stated frequencies: walkthrough summaries, calibration logs, leadership reflections, and dashboard screenshots monthly for leadership; coaching logs, annotated lesson plans, and teacher reflection summaries weekly for coaches; lesson plans with reflections, student work samples, and peer feedback forms weekly for teachers. There is no ambiguity about what evidence a role owes or when.

Teacher effectiveness is connected to student outcomes in a live dashboard rather than living only in an evaluation file. The Per-Teacher Effectiveness Snapshot puts teacher-level student results in front of leadership alongside observation data.

PLC compliance is captured weekly through a form with a Friday end-of-day deadline, which makes non-participation visible in the same week it occurs rather than at a semester review.

Calibration is scheduled by semester with inter-rater reliability as the explicit measured objective, and leaders and

coaches maintain certification through TEA Learn virtual modules alongside local sessions.

The Master Access Roster ties identity, role, class rosters, and counselor caseloads together from authoritative HR and scheduling sources, so a teacher's dashboard scope always matches their actual assignment without hand maintenance.

Differentiated cohort debriefs for Emergent Bilingual teachers, inclusion co-teachers, and interventionists after every PD session give the staff serving the highest-need students a dedicated implementation-problem-solving forum.

Problem Statements Identifying Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Converting employer-of-record observation notes into T-TESS rubric scores in Eduphoria is a weekly manual task performed by a single individual, which makes the entire teacher-effectiveness data stream a single point of failure.	No integration exists between the employer-of-record's observation capture and the T-TESS system of record, and no staff member is cross-trained as a backup. The TAP identifies limited succession planning and leadership pipeline development as a root cause of campus fragility, but that remedy has not reached this process.
2 ★	With Mathematics Meets at 5% and 39% of growth-evaluated tests earning zero growth points, observation and coaching activity has not translated into changed instruction at scale.	Walkthrough data is not published by T-TESS domain against student outcomes, causing PD priorities to be set by trend impressions rather than where observed practice and results diverge, masking gaps like acceptable Domain 2 ratings paired with weak results.
3	Instructional coaching capacity is not sized to the instructional problem. Biweekly coaching cycles across a campus of 5,498 students, 1,460 mathematics tests, and 821 mathematics retests cannot generate weekly small-group instructional change in the subject with the largest gap.	Coach assignment is organized by campus and content area rather than by outcome triage. No rule routes additional coaching capacity to the teachers whose students hold the largest share of the 454 zero-growth tests, so coaching is distributed evenly across a problem that is distributed unevenly.
4	Nine of the fifteen TEA-reported TAP measures -- including coaching, HR, PD, walkthrough, assessment, reteach, and board measures -- remain hand-entered by cabinet roles into a manual input workbook and display as PENDING on the TEA Reporting Dashboard.	These measures have no designated system of record. They were accepted as manual placeholders during the v1 dashboard rollout, and no source system, owner, or build date has been assigned since, so staff-quality and PD reporting depends on cabinet recall and hand entry rather than on data.
5	Teacher retention and recruitment data is not among the fourteen defined data sources feeding the dashboard system, and no retention rate, vacancy rate, or time-to-fill measure appears in any leadership view.	The employer-of-record census feeds the permission engine -- determining who can log in and what they can see -- but is not repurposed as a workforce-analytics source. Retention is therefore managed as an HR function outside the improvement-planning data system.

★ = Priority

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Summary

Instruction is organized around the Bright Thinker model, a TEKS- and STAAR-aligned blended framework that combines asynchronous personalized coursework with synchronous instruction, adaptive practice through IXL, high-quality assessments through Sirius, TFAR resources, and HB 1416-aligned tutoring, all under continuous progress monitoring.

High-quality instructional materials are specified by content area: text-based reading and writing routines in ELA, conceptual and procedural tasks in Mathematics, HB 1416-aligned tutoring for intervention, and LMS-integrated digital tools for assignment and feedback. Teachers adapt HQIM for inclusion, differentiation, and engagement.

The assessment architecture includes redesigned unit tests, short-cycle "Zinger" assessments, two benchmark windows per year, exit tickets, and biweekly data reviews. The published data cycle for 2026–27 runs Benchmark 1 and personalization planning with predictive dashboards from October to December, Benchmark 2 and subgroup data analysis from January to March, and final STAAR review and sustainability evaluation from April to June, with named deliverables at each stage.

Response to Intervention is specified with intervals. Tier 2 students receive targeted small-group instruction at least three times weekly with brief progress checks every 10 instructional days using HQIM-embedded formative tasks, short-cycle assessments, and digital adaptive quizzes, reviewed in biweekly RTI/PLC meetings. Tier 3 students receive individualized instruction based on diagnostic screeners four to five times weekly with progress monitoring every 5 instructional days, validated by intervention specialists, with diagnostic reevaluation triggered by persistent non-growth.

PLCs are differentiated by purpose: Mathematics PLCs focus on reteaching and TEKS alignment, Reading/ELA PLCs on literacy development and differentiated comprehension, and campus-wide PLCs on aligning assessment and intervention systems to Domain III targets.

Lesson planning uses a T-TESS-aligned template with required fields for learning objective and TEKS standard, anticipatory scaffolding and access supports naming barriers for Emergent Bilingual, special education, and at-risk students, instructional sequence, guided practice and checks for understanding, differentiation strategies, assessment or exit ticket, student engagement routine, and reflection with next steps. The instructional sequence taught in PD and looked for in walkthroughs is Introduce the Skill, Review Academic Vocabulary, Front-Load Foundational Knowledge, Model the Skill.

Supporting dashboards include the TEKS Mastery Heatmap, RTI Leadership Dashboard, RTI Intervention Tracker, RTI Teacher Friday Input, Intervention Outcomes Dashboard, Lincoln IXL Placement Dashboard, Credit Accrual Dashboard, and EOC Performance Dashboard.

Strengths

The instructional model is specified at the lesson level with an observable sequence, and the walkthrough tool is crosswalked to T-TESS Domains 1 through 4. What is taught in professional development is what is looked for in classrooms and what is scored in evaluation — a coherence most systems claim and few document.

Anticipatory scaffolding is a required lesson-plan field rather than optional guidance. Teachers must name where Emergent Bilingual, special education, and at-risk students will struggle and specify the support before

instruction, which moves differentiation from reaction to design.

Progress-monitoring intervals are explicit, differentiated by tier, and tied to a defined escalation. Ten instructional days for Tier 2, five for Tier 3, with diagnostic reevaluation on persistent non-growth and revision of individualized tutoring plans under HB 1416 protocols.

An Intervention Outcomes Dashboard asks the accountability question directly — did the intervention move the score — rather than reporting intervention volume. Pre- and post-intervention analysis is built into the system's design.

Science and Social Studies results validate the model where content and assessment are tightly coupled: 81% and 83% at Approaches, both above state, with Science Meets at 28% and Social Studies Meets at 36%, both above district.

Retest instruction works in bounded content: 65% of Science retests and 69% of Social Studies retests reached Approaches.

The assessment calendar is published with windows, focus, and deliverables, so benchmark timing, reteach planning, and corrective action revision are scheduled rather than improvised.

Problem Statements Identifying Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Algebra I Meets is 5% against a state rate of 51%, and All-Grades Mathematics Meets is 5% against a 38% Closing the Gaps target. No subgroup exceeds 13%; economically disadvantaged students reached 4% and special education students 4%.	The mathematics pathway lacks required synchronous conceptual instruction for students below Approaches, relying instead on adaptive practice that assigns more exercises on unmastered concepts rather than re-teaching prerequisites.
2 ★	The accelerated learning score is 24. Of 489 students who did not meet standard the prior year, only 115 advanced a performance band; 374 did not.	HB 1416 accelerated instruction is tracked as an assignment roster rather than as delivered dosage. No per-student record of accelerated-instruction hours attended exists, so under-delivery against the 30-hour requirement is invisible until STAAR results return, at which point the year is over.
3	Reading/Language Arts Meets declined seven points and Approaches declined six points while the state held steady -- a Tier 1 first-instruction problem, not an intervention problem	Reteach planning and PLCs focus on past missed items rather than auditing upcoming Tier 1 lessons for Meets-level cognitive demand, causing instruction to drift toward the Approaches band.
4	Of 2,279 retests, 1,176 were in Reading/Language Arts at 35% success and 821 in Mathematics at 41%, while Science at 65% and Social Studies at 69% accounted for only 282 combined. The retest population is concentrated where retest instruction is least effective.	Retest scheduling is driven by graduation requirements rather than by readiness, and no differentiated retest curriculum exists for a student on a third or fourth attempt. Repeat testers receive the same review sequence as first-time retesters, so the intervention that failed is repeated.
5	Assessment and instructional data enters through eight separate daily or weekly source exports merged in a browser tool, and the system tolerates only a one-week delay before instructional dashboards show stale data.	There is no automated monitoring or alerting on export delivery. Source ownership is documented in a summary file rather than enforced by a scheduler, so when a source slips two cycles, instructional decisions in PLCs and RTI meetings revert to teacher judgment without anyone flagging that the data is missing.

6	Instructional platform data -- IXL, Bright Thinker, Sirius, Lincoln Learning -- is not joined to STAAR growth outcomes, so platform usage cannot be evaluated against the 24 accelerated-learning score or the 454 zero-growth tests.	Platform exports are not among the fourteen defined data sources. Only the Lincoln IXL Placement Dashboard bridges a single platform to tier assignment, and no usage-to-outcome analysis is scheduled, so the campus spends on adaptive practice without evidence of its return.

★ = Priority

Family and Community Engagement

Summary

The campus operates a bilingual, culturally responsive engagement system designed for accessibility across time and language. Monthly virtual family sessions focus on data literacy, curriculum, and college and career readiness, with translation, accessible materials, and recordings for families who cannot attend live. A quarterly advisory board of parents, students, staff, and partners reviews progress and provides feedback to leadership. Partner memoranda of understanding with higher-education institutions, workforce entities, and community organizations define timelines, deliverables, and accountability. Communication standards require all materials to be bilingual, written in plain language, and posted in the LMS.

Campus Improvement Teams and advisory committees meet bi-monthly to review summary progress reports and provide input on equity and communication strategy. Quarterly Family Engagement Nights present TAP progress visually using dashboards and translated summaries, and feedback collected from families and community partners informs the following quarter's strategy and corrective action plan adjustments. Family Engagement Logs document participation in family nights, workshops, and bilingual information sessions, and attendance data and surveys are analyzed quarterly with specific attention to Emergent Bilingual and special education families.

Data infrastructure supports this work directly. The Family Engagement Dashboard tracks parent-contact cadence per student and flags any student whose family has not been contacted in 14 or more days. The Parent Concerns Dashboard tracks parent cases on a Salesforce schema with a daily refresh — the fastest feedback loop in the data system. Twenty-five Student Success Coach portals log calls, emails, texts, and contact attempts weekly. The Weekly Student Report Generator produces automated parent-facing progress reports.

Strengths

Contact cadence is measured per student rather than per event. A family that has heard nothing from the school in two weeks is identifiable by name, which converts family engagement from an attendance count into an operational list.

Parent cases refresh daily from Salesforce, giving families the shortest path in the entire data system between raising a concern and having it appear in a leadership view.

Bilingual delivery is a standard applied across all materials, with translation, recording, and asynchronous access designed into every session so that a working parent and a Spanish-speaking parent both have real access rather than nominal access.

Automated weekly parent-facing progress reports remove the dependency on individual teacher outreach, so every family receives the same baseline information regardless of which teacher their student has.

Family engagement data is disaggregated for Emergent Bilingual and special education families specifically and reviewed quarterly, which means equity of engagement is measured rather than assumed.

Partner relationships are formalized through MOUs with defined timelines, deliverables, and accountability rather than maintained as informal goodwill, and the quarterly advisory board gives families a scheduled seat at a decision-making table.

Problem Statements Identifying Family and Community Engagement Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Family engagement is measured by contact volume and event attendance rather than by whether contact changed a student outcome. In August 2026, 536 students were onboarding-overdue and 87 carried multi-week decline streaks, with no evidence available on whether family contact was the intervention that moved any of them.	The Family Engagement Dashboard and the at-risk tier engine are separate views. A parent contact is not recorded as an intervention event against the student's risk score, so pre- and post-contact outcome analysis -- which the system already performs for the Arizona mental-health program -- is unavailable for the Texas campuses.
2 ★	Emergent Bilingual students are 13.8% of the roster and have the highest dropout rate of any group at 15.6%, so bilingual engagement has not translated into Emergent Bilingual retention.	Bilingual communication is a materials standard, not a staffing standard. There is no verified count of Spanish-fluent Student Success Coaches matched to the 477 Emergent Bilingual students, so translated documents reach families who still cannot have a live conversation about their child in their home language.
3	No representative family or student climate survey is administered. Feedback comes from engagement-night attendees, advisory board members, and Salesforce complaint cases.	No survey instrument, administration window, or response-rate target exists in the assessment calendar. The Perceptions strand of the needs assessment therefore has no primary data source, and family satisfaction is inferred from the subset of families already in contact with the school.
4	CCMR performance depends on college-prep course credit for 86% of graduates while dual credit reaches 6.5%, AP/IB 2.3%, industry-based certification 3.9%, and associate degree 0% -- indicating that community and higher-education partnerships are documented but not producing student-level credentials at scale.	Partner MOUs define timelines and deliverables at the institutional level but are not tied to enrollment targets for specific students. No dashboard tracks the pipeline from partner agreement to student enrollment to credential earned, so a signed MOU and an unused MOU look identical in reporting.

★ = Priority

School Organization

Summary

Governance is layered and non-overlapping. The Fort Stockton ISD Board of Trustees holds quarterly progress reviews, each including a formal presentation of milestone attainment, disaggregated student data, and budget alignment. FSISD hosts quarterly superintendent-level review meetings, and the superintendent serves as oversight lead. District personnel hold monthly data meetings with Stellar Virtual staff, and the Superintendent and Cabinet receive monthly reports from district academic leadership summarizing trends, identifying gaps, and proposing corrective actions.

At the campus level, principals drive TAP implementation, facilitating weekly PLCs and biweekly RTI meetings and monitoring instruction through walkthroughs aligned to TAP Look-Fors. Evidence — lesson plans, walkthrough notes, intervention logs — is submitted to district leadership for validation. The Chief Academic Officer and Heads of Schools review each campus's milestone progress monthly and verify evidence from PLCs, assessments, and RTI logs.

The operating rhythm is defined as a set of recurring meetings, each with its own action inbox: Daily Attendance Huddle, Weekly Cabinet, Weekly TAP Committee, Weekly PLC, Weekly RTI, Bi-weekly Special Populations, Monthly PEIMS, and Quarterly Equity Review. The TAP Action Hub aggregates recommended next steps across 32 dashboards into a single ranked action list sorted by the meeting each action belongs to, showing assignment date, deadline, days remaining, and an overdue flag. Every action carries a TAP indicator code in TAP-X.Y-NNN format, making the line from a dashboard finding to a state indicator traceable without manual crosswalking.

Escalation runs in three phases: leadership coaching and collaborative problem solving; targeted support deployment with progress tracking; and district intervention or resource reassignment for persistent non-compliance. A central Turnaround Evidence Archive holds walkthrough and observation logs, PLC and RTI agendas, intervention trackers and data action logs, family engagement rosters, staffing and budget reports, corrective action plans, and TEA progress submission evidence.

Budget oversight includes an annual resource review led by FSISD and Stellar Virtual leadership, quarterly financial audits and allowability checks against TEA and ESSA requirements, a dedicated contingency fund, and quarterly verification that expenditures match TAP categories — staffing, professional development, instructional materials, and special populations.

For 2026–2027, the first day of school is September 9, 2026. As of July 30, 2026, 5,909 students were approved or re-registered, including 5,161 re-registrations.

Strengths

Every action in the system belongs to a named recurring meeting with a deadline and an overdue flag, which makes accountability structural rather than personal. A leader who leaves does not take the follow-through with them.

Actions carry TAP indicator codes, so the path from a dashboard observation to a state indicator to a corrective action plan is traceable end to end without a manual crosswalk — and an auditor can follow it in the same direction.

Escalation is defined in three phases with district-level authority to reassign resources at Phase 3, which means a

campus-level stall has a real remedy rather than a stronger memo.

Governance cadence is layered by altitude and does not duplicate: weekly at the campus, monthly at the district, quarterly at the board and to TEA. Each level receives what it can act on.

A single Turnaround Evidence Archive is specified with a defined contents list, which converts compliance reporting from an audit scramble into a retrieval task.

Budget review is quarterly and tied to TAP expenditure categories rather than to general fund lines, with allowability checks against both TEA and ESSA requirements and a contingency fund for staffing and technology shocks.

Re-registration is tracked as an operational funnel — applications, document submission, approval, re-registration — with weekly counts, giving leadership visibility into next year’s enrollment before the year begins.

Problem Statements Identifying School Organization Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The campus was identified for Targeted Support and Improvement despite an A rating, and no meeting in the recurring cadence owns subgroup-indicator status as a standing agenda item.	The Quarterly Equity Review is the only forum where subgroup performance is the agenda, and quarterly is too infrequent to interrupt a three-year pattern. Closing the Gaps indicator status by student group is not produced as a weekly or monthly artifact, so a group can miss the same indicator for twelve consecutive quarters without any meeting being required to act.
2	The entire data system depends on nine IT exports a week, two of which run daily. The design explicitly tolerates one week of delay and states that two-week delays begin to degrade decisions, yet staleness is reported as a per-dashboard badge rather than escalated.	Data freshness is monitored per board by the TAP System Health Check rather than enforced centrally. No automated alert notifies IT or cabinet when a source misses two consecutive cycles, so degradation is discovered by a user who happens to notice a badge.
3	Nine of fifteen TEA measures remain PENDING and hand-entered, so the TEA Reporting Dashboard cannot produce a complete state-facing picture without cabinet recall.	Manual measures were accepted as a version-one compromise during rollout and never assigned a source system, an owner, or a build date. What began as a temporary gap has become the permanent method.
4	Scorecard reporting lacks re-registration breakdowns and grade-level snapshots ahead of the school year, with multiple missing weekly submissions that require verification against the live board.	Scorecard reporting is a manual weekly submission with no required fields and no completeness validation, so missing weeks and missing breakdowns pass silently and leadership plans the year on partial enrollment information.
5	Under AEA provisions School Progress carries 0% weight, and the campus's improvement structures have organized around the domains that carry weight -- with the result that Academic Growth (57) and Retest Growth (41) receive no structural attention despite being the strongest predictors of next year's Closing the Gaps performance.	The milestone calendar and monitoring cadence are keyed to the overall rating rather than to leading indicators. No recurring meeting owns Academic Growth as its measure, so the 454 zero-growth tests have no forum in which they are anyone's standing responsibility.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The annual dropout rate for grades 9-12 is 12.5% -- 1,264 of 10,114 students -- which is the single largest demographic risk at the campus and the direct reason the Graduation Rate component scores only 37.5 of 100.	Students enroll mid-year with existing credit deficits and no residency-based attendance obligation, and there is no enrollment-stage triage that assigns a risk tier, a named coach, and a credit-recovery plan on day one. Students accumulate zero-progress weeks before anyone is accountable for reaching them; 536 students were flagged onboarding-overdue as of August 19, 2026.
2 ★	Mathematics Meets is 5% against a 2026 Closing the Gaps target of 38% and a state rate of 47%. Algebra I Meets is 5% against 51% statewide -- a 46-point gap -- and no subgroup exceeds 13%. Economically disadvantaged students reached 4% and special education students 4%	Algebra 1 is delivered asynchronously to students with unaddressed pre-algebra gaps. While Bright Thinker and IXL accurately diagnose these gaps, the campus lacks a required synchronous small-group block for students below standard, leaving conceptual gaps unclosed.
3 ★	Risk scores are produced weekly but intervention outcomes are not systematically tied back to them. Eighty-seven students carried multi-week decline streaks in August 2026 with no rule requiring an action.	The intervention loop -- identify, act, log, review, escalate -- depends on the Weekly Cabinet and Weekly RTI meetings closing their action inboxes, and the TAP Action Hub tracks deadlines and overdue flags. But no automated rule converts a two-week decline streak into an assigned action, so escalation depends on a human noticing the streak in a table.
4 ★	With Mathematics Meets at 5% and 39% of growth-evaluated tests earning zero growth points, observation and coaching activity has not translated into changed instruction at scale.	Walkthrough data is not published by T-TESS domain against student outcomes, causing PD priorities to be set by trend impressions rather than where observed practice and results diverge, masking gaps like acceptable Domain 2 ratings paired with weak results.
5 ★	The accelerated learning score is 24. Of 489 students who did not meet standard the prior year, only 115 advanced a performance band; 374 did not.	HB 1416 accelerated instruction is tracked as an assignment roster rather than as delivered dosage. No per-student record of accelerated-instruction hours attended exists, so under-delivery against the 30-hour requirement is invisible until STAAR results return, at which point the year is over.

6 ★

Emergent Bilingual students are 13.8% of the roster and have the highest dropout rate of any group at 15.6%, so bilingual engagement has not translated into Emergent Bilingual retention.

Bilingual communication is a materials standard, not a staffing standard. There is no verified count of Spanish-fluent Student Success Coaches matched to the 477 Emergent Bilingual students, so translated documents reach families who still cannot have a live conversation about their child in their home language.

7 ★

The campus was identified for Targeted Support and Improvement despite an A rating, and no meeting in the recurring cadence owns subgroup-indicator status as a standing agenda item.

The Quarterly Equity Review is the only forum where subgroup performance is the agenda, and quarterly is too infrequent to interrupt a three-year pattern. Closing the Gaps indicator status by student group is not produced as a weekly or monthly artifact, so a group can miss the same indicator for twelve consecutive quarters without any meeting being required to act.

8 ★

With 13.8% of students Emergent Bilingual and TELPAS progress at 17%, no dashboard tracks TELPAS domain-level progress -- listening, speaking, reading, writing -- between administrations.

TELPAS results enter the system only as an annual accountability outcome, not as an instructional data source. There is no interim language-proficiency measure in the assessment calendar and therefore nothing for a dashboard to display between April administrations.

★ = Priority

Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

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

Improvement Planning Data

- [x] **District goals**
- [x] **Campus goals**
- [x] **HB3 CCMR goals**
- [x] **Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)**
- [x] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**
- [x] **Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data**
- [x] **State and federal planning requirements**

Accountability Data

- [x] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Effective Schools Framework data**
- [x] **Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data**
- [x] **Accountability Distinction Designations**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**
- [x] **Results Driven Accountability (RDA)**
- [x] **Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) data**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **State and federally required assessment information**
- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions**

- [x] **STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Postsecondary college, career or military-ready graduates including enlisting in U. S. armed services, earning an industry based certification, earning an associate degree, graduating with completed IEP and workforce readiness**
- [x] **Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant information**
- [x] **SAT and/or ACT assessment data**
- [x] **Student failure and/or retention rates**
- [x] **Local diagnostic reading assessment data**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**
- [x] **State-developed online interim assessments**
- [x] **Grades that measure student performance based on the TEKS**

Student Data: Student Groups

- [x] **Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups**
- [x] **Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group**
- [x] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability**
- [x] **Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant achievements by race, ethnicity, gender, etc.**
- [x] **Section 504 data**
- [x] **Homeless data**
- [x] **Gifted and talented data**
- [x] **Dyslexia data**

- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**
- [x] **Dual-credit and/or college prep course completion data**
- [x] **STEM and/or STEAM data**
- [x] **Pregnancy and related services data**
- [x] **Graduation plan types**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Completion rates and/or graduation rates data**
- [x] **Annual dropout rate data**
- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Student surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**
- [x] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**

Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **State certified and high quality staff data**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **Professional development needs assessment data**
- [x] **Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact**
- [x] **Equity data**
- [x] **Staff mobility/stability**
- [x] **Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data**

- [x] **Classroom and school walkthrough data**

Parent/Community Data

- [x] **Parent surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Parent engagement rate**
- [x] **Community surveys and/or other feedback**

Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation**
- [x] **Communications data**
- [x] **Capacity and resources data**
- [x] **Study of best practices and high yield strategies**
- [x] **Technology and resource allocation data**
- [x] **Enrichment course/materials**
- [x] **Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents**

Goals

Goal 1

Goal 1: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will raise student performance at Meets Grade Level or above from 26% to 53% in Reading/Language Arts and from 5% to 48% in Mathematics, meeting TEA's interim Closing the Gaps targets, with annual targets established for every evaluated student group.

Goal 2

Goal 2: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will raise its Academic Growth score from 57 to 78 in Reading/Language Arts and from 58 to 82 in Mathematics, and reduce the share of growth-evaluated tests earning zero growth points from 39% to below 15%.

Goal 3

Goal 3: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will sustain College, Career, and Military Readiness at or above 93% of adjusted graduates while diversifying the pathways producing it, raising TSIA assessment attainment in Reading/Language Arts from 9.7% to 30%, dual credit from 6.5% to 20%, and industry-based certification from 3.9% to 15%.

Goal 4

Goal 4: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will reduce the annual dropout rate for grades 9-12 from 12.5% to below 6.0%, with the largest reductions among Emergent Bilingual, homeless, and highly mobile students.

Goal 5

Goal 5: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will exit Targeted Support and Improvement status by meeting Closing the Gaps targets for every identified student group, beginning with raising TELPAS progress from 17% to 30% and Emergent Bilingual Reading Meets from 15% to 33%.

Goal 6

Goal 6: By June 2031, Lone Star Virtual Academy will build the organizational capacity, family partnership, and monitoring infrastructure required to sustain improvement, establishing baseline measures in 2026-2027 for every area the needs assessment identified as having no data.

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

Title	Person Responsible	Review Date	Addressed By	Addressed On
Title I, Part C Migrant	Amanda Urias	10/26/2026	Amanda Urias	10/22/2026