Fort Worth Independent School District

194 Daggett Montessori School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan



Board Approval Date: November 10, 2026

Mission Statement

To inspire a self-directed student with an ethical foundation that fosters a desire for life-long learning by guiding the child from self to community and by creating a nurturing and supportive environment.

Vision

To cultivate all students' educational experience to produce global citizens who are empowered with knowledge, skills, and integrity.

Value Statement

Core Values

We believe in nurturing the whole child to become a responsible global citizen who acts with integrity.

We foster peace with grace, courtesy and respect.

We utilize rigorous curriculum taught within the Montessori philosophy.

We cultivate the concept of "we" by developing the whole child through social, spiritual, emotional and academic values.

We achieve this through the guidance of empowered and inspired educators who lay the foundation that provide the opportunity to create life-long learners.

Table of Contents

Core Values 2
Comprehensive Needs Assessment 5
Demographics 5
Student Learning 7
School Processes & Programs 9
Perceptions 11
Priority Problem Statements 13
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation 15
Goals 17
Goal 1: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) on the annual state performance measurement from 75% to 80%. 17
Goal 2: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for Math on the annual state performance measurement from 40% to 50%. 27
Goal 3: Reduce the number of schools that are rated F from x% to y% 38
Goal 4: Reduce the percent of students who are chronically absent (absent more that 10% of the school year) from X% to Y%. 45
Campus Funding Summary 49

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Revised/Approved: November 10, 2026

Demographics

Demographics Summary

From the performance breakouts, Daggett Montessori serves a racially and economically diverse population, with sizable groups of Hispanic and White students and a meaningful proportion of students identified as economically disadvantaged, English learners, and students receiving special education services.

“Grade 5 Reading… At Approaches Grade Level or Above 2025… Hispanic 84%… White 100%… Econ Disadv 84%… EB/EL 63%.”
“Grade 8 Mathematics… At Approaches Grade Level or Above 2025… Hispanic 83%… White 100%… Econ Disadv 76%… EB/EL 78%.”

Demographics Strengths

Strengths

- **Racial/ethnic performance:** Hispanic and White students generally perform at or above district and state averages at Approaches, and often at Meets, especially in reading and Algebra I/English I.
- **English learners:**
  EB/EL students often have strong Approaches rates (e.g., Grade 3 Reading 2025 EB/EL 100%; Grade 6 Reading 2025 EB/EL 92%), suggesting effective language and literacy supports.
- **Continuously enrolled students:**
  Continuously enrolled students typically outperform noncontinuously enrolled peers at all levels of performance.

Priority demographic needs

- **Economically disadvantaged students:**
  Their performance is consistently below campus averages at Meets and Masters in multiple grades and subjects.
- **Students receiving special education services:**
  Special education students show large gaps at Meets and Masters across grades and content areas.
- **African American students (where reported):**
  In several tested areas, African American performance lags behind campus averages, especially at Meets and Masters.

“Grade 5 Mathematics 2025… At Meets Grade Level or Above… Campus 38%… African American 20%… Econ Disadv 19%.”
“Grade 5 Science 2025… At Meets Grade Level or Above… Campus 22%… African American 0%… Econ Disadv 3%.”

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects.
Root Cause: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels.
Root Cause: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters.
Root Cause: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Overall, Daggett Montessori performs above the district and often near or above the state at Approaches, with stronger results in reading/ELA than in mathematics and science. However, there is a clear dropoff from Approaches to Meets and from Meets to Masters, especially in math, science, and social studies.

“Grade 3 Reading 2025… Campus 87% Approaches, 59% Meets, 22% Masters.”
“Grade 7 Mathematics 2025… Campus 46% Approaches, 20% Meets, 0% Masters.”
“Grade 8 Science 2025… Campus 86% Approaches, 65% Meets, 25% Masters.”

Key strengths

- **Reading/ELA across grades:**
  Reading performance is consistently strong, with high Approaches and solid Meets rates (e.g., Grade 6 Reading 2025: 94% Approaches, 64% Meets, 41% Masters; Grade 7 Reading 2025: 95% Approaches, 74% Meets, 41% Masters).
- **High school EOC performance:**
  English I and Algebra I EOCs show 100% Approaches and 100% Meets for the campus, with very high Masters rates.

“End of Course English I 2025… Campus 100% Approaches, 100% Meets, 62% Masters.”
“End of Course Algebra I 2025… Campus (partial table) indicates 100% Approaches and high Meets/Masters.”

- **Vertical strength in reading:**
  From Grade 3 through Grade 8, reading Approaches rates are consistently in the 80–90% range, often above district and near state.

Priority student learning needs

- **Mathematics, especially in middle grades:**
  Grade 7 math is a priority concern (2025: 46% Approaches, 20% Meets, 0% Masters), and math Meets/Masters are generally lower than reading across grades.
- **Science and social studies depth of understanding:**
  While Approaches rates are respectable, Meets and Masters in Grade 5 and Grade 8 science and Grade 8 social studies lag behind campus expectations.
- **Rigor and extension to Masters:**
  In several grades, Masters rates are in the single digits or teens, indicating limited opportunities for students to reach advanced levels.

“Grade 5 Science 2025… Campus 57% Approaches, 22% Meets, 11% Masters.”
“Grade 8 Social Studies 2025… Campus 61% Approaches, 33% Meets, 21% Masters.”

Student Learning Strengths

Key strengths

- **Reading/ELA across grades:**
  Reading performance is consistently strong, with high Approaches and solid Meets rates (e.g., Grade 6 Reading 2025: 94% Approaches, 64% Meets, 41% Masters; Grade 7 Reading 2025: 95% Approaches, 74% Meets, 41% Masters).

- **High school EOC performance:**
  English I and Algebra I EOCs show 100% Approaches and 100% Meets for the campus, with very high Masters rates.

"End of Course English I 2025… Campus 100% Approaches, 100% Meets, 62% Masters."
"End of Course Algebra I 2025… Campus (partial table) indicates 100% Approaches and high Meets/Masters."

- **Vertical strength in reading:**
  From Grade 3 through Grade 8, reading Approaches rates are consistently in the 80–90% range, often above district and near state.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters.
Root Cause: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Science and social studies show moderate Approaches rates but relatively low Meets and Masters, indicating shallow mastery.
Root Cause: Instructional practices: Heavy reliance on reading based or recall oriented tasks rather than inquiry, labs, and higher order questioning. Vocabulary and language: Academic vocabulary and language demands not explicitly taught, especially for EB/EL and economically disadvantaged students. Assessment alignment: Classroom assessments may not mirror STAAR item types and cognitive complexity.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

The TAPR data reflect a campus that is generally effective at ensuring basic proficiency, especially in reading and EOCs, but with uneven results in math and science and notable subgroup gaps. While the report does not list specific programs, the patterns suggest strengths in literacy instruction and high school readiness, and weaker, less coherent systems for math and science intervention and enrichment.

"Grade 6 Reading 2025… Campus 94% Approaches, 64% Meets, 41% Masters."
"Grade 6 Mathematics 2025… Campus 84% Approaches, 50% Meets, 19% Masters."
"Grade 7 Mathematics 2025… Campus 46% Approaches, 20% Meets, 0% Masters."

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- **Literacy instruction and vertical alignment:**
  Strong reading outcomes across grades suggest effective core literacy practices, alignment to standards, and consistent expectations.
- **EOC preparation systems:**
  100% Approaches and Meets in English I and Algebra I indicate strong course design, test preparation, and monitoring for those students.
- **Support for English learners:**
  EB/EL students often perform well at Approaches, implying effective language supports and sheltered instruction in many classrooms.

Apparent process gaps

- **Math instructional coherence:**
  The sharp drop in Grade 7 math suggests a break in vertical alignment, pacing, or instructional quality at that level.
- **Systematic intervention:**
  Subgroup gaps (special education, economically disadvantaged) and low Masters rates indicate that intervention and enrichment systems are not fully systematic or datadriven.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Math instruction and support structures are inconsistent across grade levels, leading to strong results in some grades (e.g., Algebra I) and weak results in others (e.g., Grade 7).
Root Cause: Vertical PLC structures: Grade level and cross grade math PLCs may not be consistently analyzing standards, student work, and assessments together. Instructional materials: Variation in the use or fidelity of high quality math materials and tasks. Professional learning: Limited targeted PD on conceptual math instruction and intervention strategies.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines.
Root Cause: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters.
Root Cause: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

The TAPR does not directly report survey data, but performance patterns allow some reasonable inferences about perceptions and beliefs on campus. Using general enrollment data based on the district process for enrollment of students in schools of choice, families continue to seek enrollment not based on the Montessori philosophies and teaching practices but often based on a positive public perception of the school. Perceptions also include the idea Montessori practices will be the best practices for students with learning differences.

Based on the TAPR data, the following perceptions exist:

- Strong reading and EOC outcomes suggest a campus culture that values literacy and high school readiness.
- Persistent subgroup gaps and low advanced performance in some areas may reflect perceptions about which students are "ready" for rigorous work.
- The Montessori context likely emphasizes independence and exploration, which can be a strength, but may also create variability in how tightly instruction is aligned to STAAR rigor.

"Grade 3 Reading 2025… Campus 87% Approaches, 59% Meets, 22% Masters."

"End of Course English I 2025… Campus 100% Approaches, 100% Meets, 62% Masters."

Perceptions Strengths

Likely positive perceptions

- **High expectations for literacy and EOCs:**
  Staff likely believe students can succeed in reading and high school credit courses, as reflected in strong outcomes.
- **Commitment to inclusion and diversity:**
  Strong performance for many subgroups suggests a belief in the potential of diverse learners.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): There exist a lack of understanding of the philosophies and practices of a Montessori program.
Root Cause: Families apply for enrollment for multiple reasons which include the Montessori practices but also based on the general positive reputation of the school with no back ground information of the teaching practices.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Perceptions about the capabilities of special education, economically disadvantaged, and some racial subgroups may unintentionally limit opportunities.
Root Cause: * Implicit bias: Unexamined beliefs about which students can handle challenging work. * Deficit framing: Conversations that focus on what students "lack" rather than their assets and potential. * Family school communication: Limited two way communication that builds shared, high expectations with families.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters.

Root Cause: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects.

Root Cause 1: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels.

Root Cause 2: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters.

Root Cause 3: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning - School Processes & Programs - Perceptions

Problem Statement 4: Science and social studies show moderate Approaches rates but relatively low Meets and Masters, indicating shallow mastery.

Root Cause 4: Instructional practices: Heavy reliance on reading based or recall oriented tasks rather than inquiry, labs, and higher order questioning. Vocabulary and language: Academic vocabulary and language demands not explicitly taught, especially for EB/EL and economically disadvantaged students. Assessment alignment: Classroom assessments may not mirror STAAR item types and cognitive complexity.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: Math instruction and support structures are inconsistent across grade levels, leading to strong results in some grades (e.g., Algebra I) and weak results in others (e.g., Grade 7).

Root Cause 5: Vertical PLC structures: Grade level and cross grade math PLCs may not be consistently analyzing standards, student work, and assessments together. Instructional materials: Variation in the use or fidelity of high quality math materials and tasks. Professional learning: Limited targeted PD on conceptual math instruction and intervention strategies.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 6: Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines.

Root Cause 6: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 7: There exist a lack of understanding of the philosophies and practices of a Montessori program.

Root Cause 7: Families apply for enrollment for multiple reasons which include the Montessori practices but also based on the general positive reputation of the school with no back ground information of the teaching practices.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 8: Perceptions about the capabilities of special education, economically disadvantaged, and some racial subgroups may unintentionally limit opportunities.

Root Cause 8: * Implicit bias: Unexamined beliefs about which students can handle challenging work. * Deficit framing: Conversations that focus on what students "lack" rather than their assets and potential. * Family school communication: Limited two way communication that builds shared, high expectations with families.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Local Accountability Systems (LAS) data

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR released test questions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Student failure and/or retention rates
- Local benchmark or common assessments data

Student Data: Student Groups

- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- Section 504 data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Discipline records
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio

- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Support structures: mentors
- Classroom and school walkthrough data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent engagement rate

Support Systems and Other Data

- Communications data
- Horizontal and vertical team alignments processes
- Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents

Goals

Revised/Approved: November 10, 2026

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) on the annual state performance measurement from 75% to 80%.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR six weeks assessments from 61% to 70% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of Hispanic students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 51% to 60% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Six Weeks Assessments

Strategy 1: Consistent Grade level collaboration and Vertical alignment of reading and writing instructional practices

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Classroom instruction is aligned across the grade level. Student skills are collaborated vertically.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level team leaders and administration

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: Schedule weekly collaboration meeting per grade level.	Formative		
Intended Audience: Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Team leaders and Admin **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026-May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** FWISD Curriculum/Instruction Scope and Sequence **Delivery Method:** Weekly collaboration meetings	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Schedule vertical alignment meetings per six weeks. **Intended Audience:** Elementary Teachers K-5 and MS 6th grade **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administration & Team Leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026-May 2027 - A minimum of 1 per six weeks **Collaborating Departments:** N/A **Delivery Method:** N/A			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 2: Targeted Small group instruction

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All student groups are given additional instructional support as necessary based on achievement data.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All Teachers, Teaching Assistants, and Administration

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Teachers pull small groups based on data (MAP, teacher observation/classroom performance, DOL performance, i-Ready, Leveled Reader Achievement)			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Collaborative library lessons based on student needs derived from data. Reflect a library collection that supports all students.			

Action Step 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 3: Utilize Title I funds towards an additional teacher assistant. **Intended Audience:** Student achievement **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administration **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 through May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Classroom Teachers and Title I Department **Delivery Method:** Teaching Assistants will work with small groups intervention instruction and support classroom instruction in the classroom **Funding Sources:** Title I funding for personnel - Title I (211) - 211-11-6129-501-194-30-194-101000 - $31,946	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 4 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 4: Teachers will tutor small groups after school hours **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** September 2026 through May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** N/A **Delivery Method:** Small group instruction **Funding Sources:** Extra Duty Pay for Professionals - Title I (211) - 211-11-6116-501-194-30-194-101000 - $7,928	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 5 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 5: Continue to update the campus library reading collection. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Librarian **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Aug 26 - January 27 **Collaborating Departments:** Library Media Services **Funding Sources:** - Title I (211) - 211-12-6329-501-194-30-194-101000 - $1,500	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Strategy 3: Supplement ELAR instruction/materials with STAAR preparation materials (i.e. i-Ready Think Up, STAAR Master, Fast Focus, and approved materials)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Montessori materials are supplemented with

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: Allocate school funds per grade level to purchase materials.	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 2: Incorporate materials in daily instruction	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 4: Professional development for ELAR

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

Strategy 5: Align teaching of literary elements to incorporate novel studies.

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines. **Root Cause**: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.

Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) on the annual state performance measurement from 75% to 80%.

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of Kindergarten - Grade 3 students who Meet or Exceed grade level norms on EOY MAP Growth Reading in English from 70% to 80% by June 2027.

Increase the performance of Hispanic students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 70% to 80% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP

Strategy 1: Request Professional Development to better understand the MAP assessment as well as how to interpret the data to better inform instruction

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1, 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Collaborate with the Reading Department to schedule additional PD on MAP reports. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers/Reading Dept, **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Aug 2026 - Sept 2026 **Collaborating Departments:** Reading Dept / MAP			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Strategy 2: PLC - Consistent grade level collaboration to vertically align reading and writing instructional practices

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**

Build a foundation of reading and math

- 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Admin and Team Leaders will facilitate a weekly collaboration session. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Lead Teachers and Admin **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Strategy 3: Target small group instruction based on MAP data. Utilize the MAP data student groupings.

Title I:

2.51, 2.52

- TEA Priorities:

Build a foundation of reading and math

- 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

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

Strategy 4: Goal setting conference for each student (Specific skills, overall score)

Title I:

2.51, 2.52

- TEA Priorities:

Build a foundation of reading and math

- 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.
Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels. **Root Cause**: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Math instruction and support structures are inconsistent across grade levels, leading to strong results in some grades (e.g., Algebra I) and weak results in others (e.g., Grade 7). **Root Cause**: Vertical PLC structures: Grade level and cross grade math PLCs may not be consistently analyzing standards, student work, and assessments together. Instructional materials: Variation in the use or fidelity of high quality math materials and tasks. Professional learning: Limited targeted PD on conceptual math instruction and intervention strategies.
Problem Statement 2: Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines. **Root Cause**: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention
Perceptions
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) on the annual state performance measurement from 75% to 80%.

Performance Objective 3: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR benchmark assessments from 62% to 70% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of Hispanic students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 56% to 70% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Consistent Grade level collaboration and Vertical alignment of reading and writing instructional practices. Align the Montessori flowchart to the FWISD sequence of TEKS per six weeks. Ensure all teachers utilize the six weeks assessment blueprint.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Vertically and horizontally aligned instruction specifically the materials used

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers and Admin

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

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

Strategy 2: Analyze student STAAR data to address low performing TEKS and areas of academic need to inform instruction and small group. Re-teach small groups based student performance on TEKS analysis

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Data informed instruction

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin and Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3 - Perceptions 3

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.
Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels. **Root Cause**: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention
Problem Statement 2: Science and social studies show moderate Approaches rates but relatively low Meets and Masters, indicating shallow mastery. **Root Cause**: Instructional practices: Heavy reliance on reading based or recall oriented tasks rather than inquiry, labs, and higher order questioning. Vocabulary and language: Academic vocabulary and language demands not explicitly taught, especially for EB/EL and economically disadvantaged students. Assessment alignment: Classroom assessments may not mirror STAAR item types and cognitive complexity.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Math instruction and support structures are inconsistent across grade levels, leading to strong results in some grades (e.g., Algebra I) and weak results in others (e.g., Grade 7). **Root Cause**: Vertical PLC structures: Grade level and cross grade math PLCs may not be consistently analyzing standards, student work, and assessments together. Instructional materials: Variation in the use or fidelity of high quality math materials and tasks. Professional learning: Limited targeted PD on conceptual math instruction and intervention strategies.
Problem Statement 2: Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines. **Root Cause**: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention
Perceptions
Problem Statement 3: Middle school mathematics, particularly Grade 7, shows low performance at all levels, with almost no students reaching Masters. **Root Cause**: Curriculum alignment: Gaps between the taught curriculum and the full rigor/spiral of the TEKS, especially for proportionality, algebraic reasoning, and data analysis. Conceptual foundations: Insufficient emphasis on conceptual understanding and problem solving in earlier grades, leading to fragile foundations. Intervention structures: Limited structures for intervention

Goal 2: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for Math on the annual state performance measurement from 40% to 50%.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on Math six weeks assessments from 73% to 80% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of African American students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 73% to 80% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Six Weeks Assessments

Strategy 1: Maintain the use of Montessori materials to teach and practice mathematical skills at each grade level.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Competency in mathematical skills at each grade level

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level team leaders and administration

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: The Montessori math materials will align with the state standards and FWISD IPC to ensure academic success. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - August 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Meetings and PLC's			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 2: All elementary teachers will have access to the Montessori math materials in their classrooms. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Grade Level Team Leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs	Nov	Jan	Mar

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 2: Student work plans will reflect student mathematical progress. For example, teachers will prioritize Montessori works to complete for the week to reinforce skills per student.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement and accountability of mathematical progression

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 1: Daily progress monitoring of students' work plans to hold students accountable for their work. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Update student work plans weekly to reflect progression of learning in all content areas. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teacher **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 3: Small group targeted instruction based on classroom instructional data such as the DOL.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement and close academic gaps

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin and Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Teachers and teacher assistants will support small group instruction. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers and Teacher Assistants **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 2: High quality instructional materials will be used to support student learning in small groups. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs	Nov	Jan	Mar

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 4: Consistent grade level collaboration with vertical alignment of instructional practices.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Collaboration and commonality amongst all grade levels

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin and Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 1: Incorporate an additional planning session per six weeks for all grade levels. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Gradel Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Promote commonality among all grade levels with instructional practices, DOLs, local assessments, and resources. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Math instruction and support structures are inconsistent across grade levels, leading to strong results in some grades (e.g., Algebra I) and weak results in others (e.g., Grade 7). **Root Cause**: Vertical PLC structures: Grade level and cross grade math PLCs may not be consistently analyzing standards, student work, and assessments together. Instructional materials: Variation in the use or fidelity of high quality math materials and tasks. Professional learning: Limited targeted PD on conceptual math instruction and intervention strategies.

Goal 2: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for Math on the annual state performance measurement from 40% to 50%.

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of Kindergarten - Grade 3 students who Meet or Exceed grade level norms on EOY MAP Growth Math in English from 47% to 60% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of African American students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 34% to 50% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP

Strategy 1: Strategically use special education teachers/dyslexia teachers to assist with small group administration of MAP.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement by effectively addressing student groups

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin and Staff

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Collaborate with SPED teachers and Dyslexia teachers to compile a list of students requiring small group based on IEPs, 504 plans, and instructional needs. **Intended Audience:** Student Groups **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin, SPED, and Dyslexia Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin, Diagnostician, SPED Teachers, Dyslexia Teachers, and Counselor **Delivery Method:** Staff Meetings and Emails			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Six weeks progress checks to ensure small group instruction is effective and supports students' academic needs. **Intended Audience:** Student Groups **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin, SPED, and Dyslexia Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin, Diagnostician, SPED Teachers, Dyslexia Teachers, and Counselor **Delivery Method:** Staff Meetings and Emails			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 2: Prepare students to be successful w/ MAP assessment. For example, incorporate computer skills in instructions. For older students, incorporate typing skills and orient students to the various ways of responding to a question.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Competency in computer skills and responding to various question types

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Integrate computer-based skills into daily instruction **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Monitor progress and adjust instruction based on observed needs in technology use, content skills, and response to question types. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels. **Root Cause**: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Science and social studies show moderate Approaches rates but relatively low Meets and Masters, indicating shallow mastery. **Root Cause**: Instructional practices: Heavy reliance on reading based or recall oriented tasks rather than inquiry, labs, and higher order questioning. Vocabulary and language: Academic vocabulary and language demands not explicitly taught, especially for EB/EL and economically disadvantaged students. Assessment alignment: Classroom assessments may not mirror STAAR item types and cognitive complexity.

Goal 2: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for Math on the annual state performance measurement from 40% to 50%.

Performance Objective 3: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on Math benchmark assessments from 45% to 60% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of African American students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 35% to 50% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Incorporate FWISD TEKS into Montessori Plans to ensure alignment with state standards.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in academic achievement

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: Teachers will utilize the FWISD IPC as the primary guide for daily and weekly lesson planning.	Formative		
Intended Audience: Students	Nov	Jan	Mar
Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible: Admin and Teachers			
Date(s) / Timeframe: August 2026 - May 2027			
Collaborating Departments: Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders			
Delivery Method: Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Monitor Instructional Implementation of the FWISD IPC and Tier One instruction through walkthroughs and coaching conferences **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin and Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 2: Teachers will collaborate every six weeks to ensure commonality among all grade levels with lesson planning, DOLs, assessments, and instructional resources.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Commonality amongst all grade levels

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, 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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Teachers will unpack standards identified in the FWISD IPC to execute lessons with clear learning objectives. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin and Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Meetings and PLCs			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 2: Teachers will analyze math data to adjust instruction and provide intense interventions. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin and Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leader Meetings and PLCs	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 3: Teachers will utilize district-adopted materials and resources aligned with the FWISD IPC. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Grade Level Team Leaders **Delivery Method:** Grade Level Team Leaders and PLCs	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Math instruction and support structures are inconsistent across grade levels, leading to strong results in some grades (e.g., Algebra I) and weak results in others (e.g., Grade 7). **Root Cause**: Vertical PLC structures: Grade level and cross grade math PLCs may not be consistently analyzing standards, student work, and assessments together. Instructional materials: Variation in the use or fidelity of high quality math materials and tasks. Professional learning: Limited targeted PD on conceptual math instruction and intervention strategies.

Goal 3: Reduce the number of schools that are rated F from x% to y%

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR benchmark assessments in English from 60% to 70% by June 2027.

Increase the performance of Hispanic students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 49% to 60% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Consistent Grade level collaboration and Vertical alignment of reading and writing instructional practices

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Classroom instruction is aligned across the grade level. Student skills are collaborated vertically.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade level team leaders and administration

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: Schedule weekly collaboration meeting per grade level. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Team leaders and Admin **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026-May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** FWISD Curriculum/Instruction Scope and Sequence **Delivery Method:** Weekly collaboration meetings	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 2: Schedule vertical alignment meetings per six weeks. **Intended Audience:** Elementary Teachers K-5 and MS 6th grade **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administration & Team Leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026-May 2027 - A minimum of 1 per six weeks	Nov	Jan	Mar

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Strategy 2: Targeted Small group instruction

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All student groups are given additional instructional support as necessary based on achievement data.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All Teachers, Teaching Assistants, and Administration

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 1: Teachers pull small groups based on data (MAP, teacher observation/classroom performance, DOL performance, i-Ready, Leveled Reader Achievement)	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
Action Step 2: Collaborative library lessons based on student needs derived from data. Reflect a library collection that supports all students.	Nov	Jan	Mar

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Strategy 3: Supplement ELAR instruction/materials with STAAR preparation materials (i.e. i-Ready Think Up, STAAR Master, Fast Focus, and approved

materials)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Montessori materials are supplemented with

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: Allocate school funds per grade level to purchase materials.	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 2: Incorporate materials in daily instruction	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.
Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels. **Root Cause**: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines. **Root Cause**: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.

Goal 3: Reduce the number of schools that are rated F from x% to y%

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students that score meets grade level or above on Math benchmark assessments in English from X% to Y% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of African American students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from X% to Y% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Request Professional Development to better understand the MAP assessment as well as how to interpret the data to better inform instruction

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Collaborate with the Reading Department to schedule additional PD on MAP reports. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers/Reading Dept, **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Aug 2026 - Sept 2026 **Collaborating Departments:** Reading Dept / MAP			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Strategy 2: PLC - Consistent grade level collaboration to vertically align reading and writing instructional practices

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Admin and Team Leaders will facilitate a weekly collaboration session. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Lead Teachers and Admin **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 3: Target small group instruction based on MAP data. Utilize the MAP data student groupings.

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math
- ESF Levers:
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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 2 - Perceptions 2

Strategy 4: Goal setting conference for each student (Specific skills, overall score)

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math
- ESF Levers:
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

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.

Problem Statement 2: Students receiving special education services show large achievement gaps at all performance levels. **Root Cause**: Alignment of IEP goals: IEP goals not consistently aligned to grade level TEKS and STAAR rigor. Co teaching and inclusion: Inconsistent implementation of effective co teaching models and accommodations in general education classrooms.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Intervention and enrichment systems are not fully integrated into the master schedule and daily routines. **Root Cause**: Scheduling: Insufficient protected time for intervention blocks or flexible grouping. Progress monitoring systems: Data cycles may be infrequent or not tightly linked to specific instructional responses. Staffing and roles: Intervention responsibilities may be unclear for specific student groups.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Perceptions about the capabilities of special education, economically disadvantaged, and some racial subgroups may unintentionally limit opportunities. **Root Cause**: * Implicit bias: Unexamined beliefs about which students can handle challenging work. * Deficit framing: Conversations that focus on what students "lack" rather than their assets and potential. * Family school communication: Limited two way communication that builds shared, high expectations with families.

Goal 4: Reduce the percent of students who are chronically absent (absent more that 10% of the school year) from X% to Y%.

Performance Objective 1: Decrease the number and percentage of students who are chronically absent (absent more than 10%) from 7.5% to 5% by June 2027.
Decrease the number and percentage of Hispanic students or the student group that is most marginalized by instruction on our campus (gender, race, program, other) from 7.5% to 5% by June 2027.

Strategy 1: Consistent school communication with parents.

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Teachers/Staff will communicate with parents after the 2nd consecutive day of absences. **Intended Audience:** Parents **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers and Staff **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Teachers, Staff, Counselors, and Admin **Delivery Method:** Email and phone conferences			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Teachers/Staff will communicate with parents at 3 week progress week and at 6 weeks reporting period for students chronically absent. **Intended Audience:** Parents **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Teachers and Staff **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Teachers, Staff, Counselors, and Admin **Delivery Method:** Email, phone conferences, or progress reports			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 2: Implement a catalyst to encourage students daily attendance and punctuality at the campus level or teacher level.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: The attendance committee will implement a positive attendance campaign. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Attendance Committee **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Attendance Committee **Delivery Method:** Emails and Attendance Meetings	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 2: The attendance committee will have students complete an attendance contract with clear expectations. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Attendance Committee **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Attendance Committee **Delivery Method:** Attendance Meetings	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 3: Consistently utilize the services of the assigned stay in school coordinator.

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: The in-school coordinator will conduct home visits. **Intended Audience:** Students with chronic absences. **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Attendance Administrator (Assistant Principal) **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Attendance Administrator, Counselor, and Attendance Committee **Delivery Method:** Email notification	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: The in-school coordinator will be a participant in MTSS meetings for students with chronic absences via virtual, phone conference, or in-person. **Intended Audience:** Students with chronic absences. **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Attendance Administrator (Assistant Principal) **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Attendance Administrator, Counselor, and Attendance Committee **Delivery Method:** Email notification			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 4: The attendance committee will address the root cause of chronic absences.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Decrease the number of chronic absences

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Admin

Title I:
2.53
- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: The attendance committee will meet with parents and students to identify the root cause of chronic absences and devise a plan to the problem. **Intended Audience:** Parents and Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Attendance Committee **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Attendance Committee **Delivery Method:** Attendance Committee Meetings **Funding Sources:** - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6121-503-194-30-194-101000 - $1,034			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: The attendance committee will monitor chronic absences the third week of the month and evaluate the plan's progress to decrease excessive absences. **Intended Audience:** Students **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Attendance Committee **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Admin and Attendance Committee **Delivery Method:** Attendance Meetings			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students perform below campus averages at Meets and Masters across multiple grades and subjects. **Root Cause**: - Instructional differentiation: Inconsistent use of data-driven small-group instruction targeted to specific skill gaps. - Family engagement: Barriers (time, language, transportation) that limit families' ability to support academic interventions at home.

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: There exist a lack of understanding of the philosophies and practices of a Montessori program. **Root Cause**: Families apply for enrollment for multiple reasons which include the Montessori practices but also based on the general positive reputation of the school with no back ground information of the teaching practices.

Campus Funding Summary

Title I (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	2	3	Title I funding for personnel	Instruction |Title I Teacher Assistant (11-6129)	211-11-6129-501-194-30-194-101000	$31,946.00
1	1	2	4	Extra Duty Pay for Professionals	Instruction | Extra Duty - Professional (11-6116)	211-11-6116-501-194-30-194-101000	$7,928.00
1	1	2	5		Instrctnl Res/Med Svcs | Other Reading Materials (12-6329)	211-12-6329-501-194-30-194-101000	$1,500.00
						Sub-Total	$41,374.00
						Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$41,374.00
						+/- Difference	$0.00

Family Engagement (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
4	1	4	1		Family Engagement | Extra Duty/Ot - Support (61-6121)	211-61-6121-503-194-30-194-101000	$1,034.00
						Sub-Total	$1,034.00
						Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$1,034.00
						+/- Difference	$0.00
						Grand Total Budgeted	$42,408.00
						Grand Total Spent	$42,408.00
						+/- Difference	$0.00