Fort Stockton Independent School District

ESchool Prep Academy

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 Learning 6

School Processes & Programs 8

Perceptions 10

Goals 12

Goal 1 : HB3 Early Childhood Literacy Goal 1: By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy... 13

Goal 2 : By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will increase the percentage of third... 14

Goal 3 : By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will raise student performance at M... 15

Goal 4 : By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will exit Additional Targeted Suppor... 17

Goal 5 : By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will raise the Closing the Gaps scale... 19

Goal 6 : By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will build the organizational capacit... 21

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements 23

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Enrollment for 2026–2027 opens at 2,666 active enrollment records (2,631 unique students) in grades KG–8 against a 2026 accountability subset of 4,112. The grade distribution is bimodal: kindergarten 12, grade 1 165, grade 2 420, grade 3 403, grade 4 263, grade 5 254, grade 6 295, grade 7 385, grade 8 469. Economic disadvantage is 75.6% in the accountability file and 74.3% on the current roster — the highest in Fort Stockton ISD.

Special education is 15.9% of the roster and 17% of all testing (1,004 of 5,910 tests). Emergent Bilingual is 9.8%. Section 504 is 6.1%. Gifted and talented is 2.1%. The High Focus group represents 80% of all testing.

The defining demographic fact is mobility: 177 of 5,910 tests — 3% — came from continuously enrolled students. Ninety-seven percent of the tested population changed schools within the accountability window, and the continuously

Strengths

Special education identification at 15.9% and Emergent Bilingual at 9.8% indicate active identification and service, and the special education compliance queue — 539 students, 4,312 documents, zero overdue — shows the identification is followed by process.

Mathematics participation was 99% overall and 98% or better in every racial and ethnic group, a rare result for a virtual campus requiring travel to testing sites.

The campus reaches the population it exists to serve: 80% of testing comes from High Focus students, and it maintains large early-elementary cohorts (420 in grade 2, 403 in grade 3) that can be influenced over multiple years.

Demographic and program flags are reconciled weekly field by field between Ascender and Genius, so identification data is both generous and accurate.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Ninety-seven percent of tested students are non-continuously enrolled, and the 3% who persist score lowest of any group.	Instructional design assumes a year-long arc for a population whose median enrollment span is shorter, and no differentiated plan exists for either the short-stay majority or the persisting minority.
2	Special education students are 17% of all testing and produced zero Closing the Gaps growth points, triggering the ATS identification.	Special education is managed as a compliance population rather than as an instructional cohort with growth targets, dosage tracking, and IEP-goal progress monitoring.
3	Section 504 identification is 6.1% against 13.4% at the sister campus, and gifted and talented is 2.1% well below the rate typical of Texas campuses.	No local screening or referral protocol is calibrated across campuses, and no universal screening window exists for a continuously enrolling population.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

STAAR results across 5,910 tests were 41% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 6% Masters, with a component score of 22 against 21 in 2025. Reading/Language Arts Meets rose from 21% to 33% against a 46% target. Mathematics Meets rose from 4% to 9% against a 49% target.

Academic Growth scored 47 raw and 55 scaled across 3,080 tests, with 1,463 tests (47.5%) earning zero growth points. Annual growth scored 45; accelerated learning scored 15, with 240 of 1,556 previously-failing students advancing a band. Reading growth was 53% against a 64% target, up from 51%. Mathematics growth was 41% against a 69% target, up from 29%. Relative Performance scored 22 raw and 49 scaled at 75.6% economic disadvantage.

Closing the Gaps earned 24 raw points and a scaled score of 65: Academic Achievement 10 of 32 at 30% weight, Growth Status 7 of 32 at 50% weight, English Language Proficiency 1 of 4 at 10% weight, and Student Success 1 of 16 at 10% weight. TELPAS progress rose from 20% to 26% against a 40% target.

Subgroup Meets across all subjects: Asian 41%, Two or More Races 22%, White 21%, American Indian 18%, Hispanic 17%, Pacific Islander 17%, High Focus 15%, African American 13%; gifted and talented 57%, non-economically disadvantaged 28%, continuously enrolled 20%, economically disadvantaged 14%, Emergent Bilingual 11%, and Special Education (Current) 6%.

Special Education (Current) reached 11% Meets in Reading/Language Arts and 3% in Mathematics, with RLA growth at 38% against a 50% target and mathematics growth at 30% against a 58% target — the combination that produced zero growth points and the ATS identification.

Strengths

Reading/Language Arts Meets rose twelve points and rose in every evaluated student group — a gain recorded in every evaluated student group.

Mathematics growth rose twelve points, from 29% to 41%, in the Closing the Gaps component carrying the heaviest weight.

Mathematics Meets more than doubled, from 4% to 9%, and rose in every racial and ethnic group except Pacific Islander (5% to 0% across 7 tests).

TELPAS progress rose six points from 20% to 26%, earning the campus its English Language Proficiency point.

Nine of eleven student groups scored above the bottom-5% Closing the Gaps cut point of 56, so the ATS identification rests on a single group rather than a campus-wide failure.

Gifted and talented students reached 79% Meets in Reading/Language Arts and non-economically disadvantaged students 46%, confirming the instructional model produces strong results where prerequisite skills are intact.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Special Education (Current) produced zero Closing the Gaps growth points at 55.6% component weight -- RLA growth 38% against a 50% target, mathematics growth 30% against 58% -- and a scaled score of 51 below the 56 cut point, triggering Additional Targeted Support.	Specially designed instruction is delivered within general tiered structures with accommodations layered on, and no system links IEP goals to assessed TEKS, tracks specially designed instruction minutes, or monitors IEP-goal progress on the RTI cadence.
2	Mathematics Meets is 9% against a 49% target and mathematics growth is 41% against a 69% target.	No required synchronous conceptual-instruction block exists for students below Approaches; adaptive practice substitutes for re-teaching prerequisite concepts in a cumulative KG-8 mathematics sequence.
3	Forty-seven and a half percent of growth tests earned zero points, and the accelerated learning score is 15.	HB 1416 accelerated instruction is tracked as roster assignment rather than delivered dosage, with no per-student hours record and no non-delivery flag.
4	Student Success earned 1 of 16 available points with 59% of tests below Approaches.	Reteach cycles target students near cut points rather than the below-Approaches majority where the same instructional minute produces more total point movement.
5	TELPAS progress is 26% against a 40% target and Emergent Bilingual students reached 4% Meets in Mathematics.	No role owns language-proficiency growth with a measurable target, and no interim TELPAS-domain measure exists in the assessment calendar.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Instruction runs on the Bright Thinker blended model with TEKS-aligned HQIM, IXL adaptive practice, Sirius assessments, TFAR resources, and HB 1416 tutoring. Assessment includes redesigned unit tests, short-cycle Zinger assessments, two benchmark windows, exit tickets, and biweekly data reviews on a published 2026–27 calendar.

RTI operates at specified intervals: Tier 2 small-group instruction three times weekly with progress checks every 10 instructional days; Tier 3 individualized instruction four to five times weekly with progress monitoring every 5 instructional days and diagnostic reevaluation on persistent non-growth. PLCs are differentiated by content and purpose.

Teacher development runs monthly Principal Manager–led leadership training, biweekly assistant principal and coach PD, weekly teacher PD and PLC, weekly walkthroughs on a T-TESS-crosswalked tool, biweekly coaching cycles, semester calibration, and mid-year and end-of-year evaluations feeding individualized PD plans.

Special populations processes include four dedicated dashboards — Special Populations, Special Programs Tracker, SPED Compliance (SAMEGoal), and SPED Onboarding to Services — tracking IEP compliance, ARD cadence, least restrictive environment, service delivery, LPAC decisions, TELPAS cycles, and case-manager assignment.

Organizational process is defined by a recurring meeting cadence with per-meeting action inboxes, a TAP Action Hub aggregating next steps across 32 dashboards with deadlines and overdue flags, TAP indicator codes on every action, a three-phase escalation protocol, a central Turnaround Evidence Archive, and quarterly budget audits with TEA and ESSA allowability checks.

Strengths

Processes produced measurable gains: Reading/Language Arts Meets up twelve points, Mathematics Meets more than doubled, Mathematics growth up twelve points, and TELPAS progress up six points. The system moved.

Special education compliance processes work at scale — 4,312 required documents across 539 students with zero overdue.

Process specification is complete and coherent: PD content, walkthrough instrument, lesson-plan template, and evaluation rubric all crosswalk to the same T-TESS domains.

Progress-monitoring intervals are explicit, differentiated by tier, and tied to a defined reevaluation trigger.

Every action belongs to a named recurring meeting with a deadline, an overdue flag, and a TAP indicator code, and a Bi-weekly Special Populations forum already exists for the ATS group.

The evidence archive is centralized with a defined contents list, and budget review is quarterly against TAP categories including a specific special-populations line.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	All four special-populations processes and dashboards are compliance-oriented; none tracks special education academic growth, IEP goal progress, or specially designed instruction dosage -- the exact data the ATS identification requires.	The special-populations suite was built to solve visible compliance failures and did so; academic growth was assumed to be covered by general academic dashboards, which do not disaggregate growth by special education status against IEP goals.
2	Fully specified processes coexist with 47.5% zero-growth tests and 9% mathematics Meets, meaning fidelity of implementation rather than design is the gap.	Implementation is verified by artifact submission -- lesson plans, coaching logs, PLC agendas -- rather than by delivered-dosage records, so a documented process and an executed process are indistinguishable in the evidence base.
3	HB 1416 accelerated instruction has no per-student attended-hours record.	Accelerated instruction was implemented as a roster assignment within existing intervention blocks rather than as a separately tracked service with a dosage requirement and a non-delivery alert.
4	Nine of fifteen TEA measures are hand-entered and display as PENDING.	No system of record was designated for these measures during the version-one rollout, and none has been assigned since.
5	Academic Growth determined the campus rating at 55 scaled, yet no process produces an interim growth measure during the year.	Growth is observable only annually in state data, and no in-year proxy -- such as prior-year-band to current-benchmark-band movement -- has been defined, so the domain that decides the rating cannot be managed during the year in which it is earned.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

The campus does not currently administer a student, family, or staff climate or perception survey. Perception data available for this needs assessment is indirect and drawn from three sources: behavioral engagement, voluntary participation, and complaint volume.

Behavioral measures come from the weekly at-risk engine, which computes a score from All Passing, Core Passing, Attendance Hours, and Login Count. The run generated August 19, 2026 for the week of August 17 scored 8,261 students across the Stellar Virtual campuses, flagged 87 with multi-week declining streaks, and identified 536 as onboarding-overdue against a September 9 first day. The strongest available proxy for how students and families experience the campus is persistence, and 97% of tested students did not remain continuously enrolled.

A powerful positive perception signal exists in participation behavior: 2,231 of 2,246 students — 99% — traveled to a physical testing site for mathematics, and 98% or better did so in every racial and ethnic group.

Voluntary participation data comes from monthly virtual family sessions, quarterly Family Engagement Nights, the quarterly advisory board, and bi-monthly Campus Improvement Team and advisory committee meetings, with Family Engagement Logs recording attendance and quarterly analysis disaggregated for Emergent Bilingual and special education families.

Complaint and concern data comes from the Parent Concerns Dashboard on a Salesforce schema with a daily refresh, and from Student Success Coach contact logs across 25 caseloads. A staff-facing issues and suggestions form collects feedback on the dashboard tools, and a weekly feedback rhythm with the data team is a stated partnership expectation.

Strengths

The 99% mathematics participation rate is the clearest positive perception measure available: families in every racial and ethnic group brought their children to a physical site when the campus asked, at 98% or better. Whatever the accountability rating says, families showed up.

Families of students with disabilities experience a campus that meets its legal deadlines — zero of 4,312 required documents overdue across 539 students — which is the most consequential trust signal available to that population.

Engagement perception is measured continuously rather than annually. A weekly score, delta, and streak give a running read on whether a student is choosing to participate.

Family contact cadence is measured per student with a 14-day no-contact flag, so the campus can name the families it is failing to reach.

Parent concerns refresh daily, giving the fastest available signal that a family’s experience has gone wrong.

Family engagement analysis is deliberately disaggregated for Emergent Bilingual and special education families, so equity of experience is examined rather than averaged away.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	No student, family, or staff climate or satisfaction survey is administered, so the Perceptions strand of the needs assessment has no primary data source at the district's lowest-rated campus.	No survey instrument, administration window, target population, or response-rate goal exists in the assessment calendar. Perception was treated as qualitative context rather than as measurable data with an owner.
2	Ninety-seven percent of tested students were not continuously enrolled, yet the campus holds no exit-interview or withdrawal-reason data of instructional value.	Withdrawal processing is designed for PEIMS leaver-code accuracy through the Withdrawal/ Leavers Audit Trail rather than for learning why families left. Leaver codes satisfy the state; they do not tell the campus what to change.
3	All available perception data is opt-in and therefore biased toward the already-engaged and the already-dissatisfied -- engagement-night attendees, advisory board volunteers, and complaint filers.	No push-based, representative sampling method exists, so the families of the students most at risk are the least likely to appear in any perception dataset.
4	Families of special education students -- the group that triggered the ATS identification -- are surveyed only through the general quarterly family engagement analysis, with no instrument addressing whether they believe their child's IEP is being implemented.	Special education family perception is inferred from compliance timeliness, which the campus achieves. Compliance and satisfaction are treated as the same measure, so a family whose child's documents are on time and whose child is making no progress registers as satisfied.
5	Staff perception of working conditions, workload, and support is not collected, despite a teacher-effectiveness data pipeline dependent on a single manual conversion task and no measure of special education staffing capacity.	Staff feedback collection is scoped to the dashboard tools rather than to the working environment, and no staff climate survey exists in the annual calendar.

★ = Priority

Goals

Goal 1

HB3 Early Childhood Literacy
Goal 1: By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will increase the percentage of third-grade students performing at Meets Grade Level or above in reading from the 2026 baseline to 55%, with annual targets established for every evaluated student group.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- Grade 3 Reading (Meets and above)
2026 baseline-- 29%
2026-27 target-- 35%
2031 target-- 55%

Performance Objective 2 ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- Campus Wide Reading Meets
2026 baseline-- 33%
2026-27 target-- 39%
2031 target-- 55%

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- KG-2 Early Screener administered
2026 baseline-- mclass (Instrument Used-- Amplify)
2026-27 target-- 100% of students
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- Economically disadvantaged Grade 3 Reading (Meets and above)
2026 baseline-- 25%
2026-27 target-- 31%
2031 target-- 46%

Goal 2

By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will increase the percentage of third-grade students performing at Meets Grade Level or above in mathematics from the 2026 baseline to 58%, with annual targets established for every evaluated student group.

Performance Objective 1

☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- Grade 3 Mathematics (Meets and above)
2026 baseline-- 8%
2026-27 target-- 17%
2031 target-- 58%

Performance Objective 2

☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- Campus Wide Mathematics (Meets and above)-- 9%
2026 baseline-- 9%
2026-27 target-- 18%
2031 target-- 58%

Performance Objective 3

☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- KG-2 Mathematics Screener administered three times yearly
2026 baseline-- ixl
2026-27 target-- 100% of students
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 4

☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Performance objective-- Students below approaches receiving required synchronous intervention
2026 baseline-- not tracked
2026-27 target-- 100%
2031 target-- 100%

Goal 3

By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will raise student performance at Meets Grade Level or above from 33% to 55% in Reading/Language Arts and from 9% to 58% in Mathematics, and raise its Academic Growth score from 53% to 74% in reading and from 41% to 78% in mathematics.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

Performance objective-- RLA Meets (All students)
2026 baseline-- 33%
2026-27 target-- 39%
2031 target-- 55%

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

Performance objective-- Mathematics Meets (All students)
2026 baseline-- 9%
2026-27 target-- 18%
2031 target-- 58%

Performance Objective 3

Performance objective-- RLA Academic Growth Score
2026 baseline-- 53%
2026-27 target-- 58%
2031 target-- 74%

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Performance objective-- Mathematics Academic Growth Scrore
2026 baseline-- 41%
2026-27 target-- 49%
2031 target-- 78%

Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority

Performance objective-- Growth- evaluated tests earning zero points
2026 Baseline-- 47.5% (1463 of 3080)
2026-27 target-- 40%
2031 target-- <20%

Performance Objective 6 ☑ High Priority

Performance objective-- Accleerated learning score
2026 baseline-- 15
2026-27 target-- 26

2031 target-- 55

Performance Objective 7 ✅ High Priority

Performance objective-- STAAR Component Score
2026 baseline-- 22
2026-27 target-- 28
2031 target-- 47

Performance Objective 8 ✅ High Priority

Performance objective-- Student Success Points Earned
2026 baseline-- 1 of 16
2026-27 target-- 4 of 16
2031 target-- 10 of 16

Performance Objective 9 ✅ High Priority

Performance objective-- RLA Participation
2026 baseline-- 94.5%
2026-27 target-- greater than or equal to 97%
2031 target-- greater than or equal to 99%

Goal 4

By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will exit Additional Targeted Support status by raising the Special Education (Current) Closing the Gaps scaled score from 51 to at or above 65, driven by raising special education reading growth from 38% to 60% and mathematics growth from 30% to 68%.

Performance Objective 1

Performance objective-- Special Education CTG scaled score
2026 baseline-- 51 (cut point 56)
2026-27 target-- 58
2031 target-- greater than or equal to 65

Performance Objective 2

Performance objective-- Special education growth points
2026 baseline-- 0.0 of 55.6% weight
2026-27 target-- 12.5
2031 target-- 25.0

Performance Objective 3

Performance objective-- Special education RLA Growth
2026 baseline-- 38%
2026-27 target-- 45%
2031 target-- 60%

Performance Objective 4

Performance objective-- Special Education Mathematics Growth
2026 baseline-- 30%
2026-27 target-- 38%
2031 target-- 68%

Performance Objective 5

Performance objective-- Special Education RLA Meets
2026 baseline-- 11%
2026-27 target-- 16%
2031 target-- 38%

Performance Objective 6

Performance objective-- Special Education Mathematics Meets
2026 baseline-- 3%
2026-27 target-- 9%

2031 target-- 41%

Performance Objective 7

Performance objective-- Specially designed instruction minutes per student
2026 baseline-- Not tracked
2026-27 target-- 100%
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 8

Performance objective-- IEP Goal Progress Monitored on the RTI Cadence
2026 baseline-- Not tracked
2026-27 target-- 100%
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 9

Performance objective-- IEP Goals cross walked to assessed TEKS
2026 baseline-- Not tracked
2026-27 target-- 100%
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 10

Performance objective-- Special Education Compliance Documents Overdue
2026 baseline-- 0 of 4312
2026-27 target-- 0
2031 target-- 0

Performance Objective 11

Performance objective-- Certified special education teachers
2026 baseline-- Not tracked
2026-27 target-- Baseline established
2031 target-- Ratio Target met

Goal 5

By June 2031, eSchool Prep Academy will raise the Closing the Gaps scaled score for continuously enrolled students from 30 to at or above 60, and raise TELPAS progress from 26% to 42%, so that persistence and language acquisition both produce measurable academic advantage.

Performance Objective 1

Performance objective-- continuously enrolled CTG Scaled score
2026 baseline-- 30
2026-27 target-- 45
2031 target-- greater than or equal to 60

Performance Objective 2

Performance objective-- Continuously enrolled RLA Meets
2026 baseline-- 33%
2026-27 target-- 38%
2031 target-- 48%

Performance Objective 3

Performance objective-- Continuously enrolled mathematics Meets
2026 baseline-- 7%
2026-27 target-- 15%
2031 target-- 54%

Performance Objective 4

Performance objective-- Share of tested students continously enrolled
2026 baseline-- 3% (177 of 5910)
2026-27 target-- 8%
2031 target-- 20%

Performance Objective 5

Performance objective-- TELPAS Progress Rate
2026 baseline-- 26%
2026-27 target-- 31%
2031 target-- 42%

Performance Objective 6

Performance objective-- Emergent Bilingual RLA Meets
2026 baseline-- 26%
2026-27 target-- 32%

2031 target-- 48%

Performance Objective 7

Performance objective- Emergent Bilingual Math Meets
2026 baseline-- 8%
2026-27 target--- 16%
2031 target-- 54%

Performance Objective 8

Performance objective-- New Enrollees completing two-week onboarding sequence
2026 baseline-- not tracked
2026-27 target-- 90%
2031 target-- 100%

Goal 6

By June 2031, eSchool Prep 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.

Performance Objective 1

Performance objective-- Student, Family, and staff perception administered annually
2026 baseline-- none
2026-27 target-- 3 administered, greater than or equal to 30% response
2031 target-- greater than or equal to 50% response

Performance Objective 2

Performance objective-- Special Education family survey on IEP Implementation
2026 baseline-- None
2026-27 target-- -- greater than or equal to 40 response

Performance Objective 3

Performance objective-- Teacher Retention rate reported
2026 baseline-- not tracked
2026-27 target-- Baseline established
2031 target-- greater than or equal to 85%

Performance Objective 4

Performance objective-- Attendance rate and chronic absenteeism reported monthly
2026 baseline-- Not reported
2026-27 target-- 100% of months
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 5

Performance objective-- TEA Plan measures with a system of record
2026 baseline-- 6 of 15
2026-27 target-- 12 of 15
2031 target-- 15 of 15

Performance Objective 6

Performance objective-- Walkthrough data published monthly by TTESS Domain Against outcomes
2026 baseline-- Not produced
2026-27 target-- 100% ofmonths
2031 target-- 100%

Performance Objective 7

Performance objective-- Section 504 identification rate
2026 baseline-- 6.1%
2026-27 target-- Referral protocol calibrated with LSVA
2031 target-- Rate reflects need, not campus

Performance Objective 8

Performance objective-- Gifted and talented identification rate
2026 baseline-- 2.1%
2026-27 target-- Universal screening window established
2031 target-- greater than or equal to 5%

Performance Objective 9

Performance objective-- Grade 8 to Grade 9 transition protocol with LSVA
2026 baseline-- None
2026-27 target-- Documented and in use
2031 target-- 100% of rising 9th graders

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