Fort Worth Independent School District

208 T.A. Sims Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: C

Board Approval Date: November 10, 2026

Mission Statement

Mission Statement

The mission of T.A. Sims Elementary School is to encourage, educate, and empower each child by providing positive learning experiences that result in student success.

Vision

Vision

We believe in meeting students where they are and consistently encouraging, educating, and empowering each child so they can go far!

Value Statement

Values

Encourage – We believe we can achieve great things individually and as a team!

Educate – We believe that education is the key to success and we always do our best!

Empower – We believe in meeting students where they are and providing the necessary motivation and support so they go far!

Table of Contents

2
Vision 2
2
Values 2
Comprehensive Needs Assessment 5
Needs Assessment Overview 5
Demographics 6
Student Learning 8
School Processes & Programs 10
Perceptions 12
Priority Problem Statements 14
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation 15
Goals 17
Goal 1: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading from 26% to 36% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 19% to 28% by June 2027. Data Source: STAAR Reading Results. 17
Goal 2: Goal: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics from 32% to 40% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 27% to 35% by June 2027. 24
Goal 3: By June 2027, increase the implementation of high-quality instructional practices from 20.9% to 30% campus-wide, as measured by district walkthrough tools, instructional monitoring data, and evidence of lesson internalization, explicit modeling, student discourse, and DOL alignment. 30
Goal 4: By June 2027, increase the percentage of students meeting growth expectations on district benchmark assessments from 40% to 55% through the implementation of targeted intervention systems, progress monitoring, and data-driven instructional supports for students performing below grade level expectations. 35
Goal 5: Reduce chronic absenteeism from 27% to 18% and increase ADA Every six weeks from baseline of 93.8% by 1.0% every six weeks. Data Source: Attendance Analytics. 37
Goal 6: Develop and implement a comprehensive family engagement framework aligned to the campus Built to Read Initiative by June 2027, providing families with practical literacy strategies, take-home resources, and ongoing opportunities to support reading growth and academic success at home. 40
Goal 7: Accelerate academic achievement and reduce identified performance gaps through the consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instruction, purposeful intervention, frequent data analysis, and timely instructional supports. Students will engage daily in rigorous, TEKS-aligned learning experiences designed to increase achievement, growth, and college and career readiness outcomes. 44
State Compensatory 48
Budget for 208 T.A. Sims Elementary School 48
Title I 49
1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) ESSA Section 1114(b)(6) 49
1.1: Description of CNA Process 49
1.2: Location for Evidence of Multiple Meetings Held 49
2. Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) ESSA Section 1114(b) 50
2.1: Timeline for Schoolwide Program/CIP Development 1114(b)(1)(A) 50
2.2: Stakeholders 1114(b)(2) 50
2.3: Description of Plan Availability, Format, and Language 1114(b)(4) 50

2.4: Description of Plan Coordination (if Applicable) 1114(b)(5) 50
2.5: Statutorily Required Descriptions 1114(b)(7)(A) 50
3. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness ESSA Section 1114(b)(3) 51
3.1: Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation 51
Campus Funding Summary 52

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Revised/Approved: November 10, 2026

Needs Assessment Overview

Needs Assessment Overview Summary

T.A. Sims Elementary School continues to demonstrate a commitment to improving student outcomes through the implementation of high-quality instructional materials, structured PLCs, intervention systems, and teacher coaching. Analysis of student achievement data reveals notable academic growth in several grade levels, particularly Grade 4 Reading and Mathematics and Grade 5 Reading. Despite these gains, overall student performance remains below district and state expectations, contributing to the campus's accountability challenges. Grade 3 student achievement represents the most significant area of concern, with STAAR Reading Meets performance at 26% and STAAR Mathematics Meets performance at 32%. Performance gaps are particularly evident among Emergent Bilingual students, whose outcomes declined in both Reading and Mathematics. These results indicate the need for strengthened Tier I instruction, increased opportunities for rigorous student thinking, consistent implementation of lesson internalization protocols, and targeted intervention aligned to student needs.

The campus recognizes that sustainable academic improvement requires every student to engage in grade-level rigorous instruction daily. To address current performance challenges, the campus will focus on strengthening instructional planning, explicit modeling, student engagement through MRS strategies, data-driven PLC cycles, and timely intervention systems.

Demographics

Demographics Summary

T.A. Sims Elementary School is an urban campus in the historic Polytechnic Heights community of southeast Fort Worth, Texas. Established in 1989 and named after Dr. T.A. Sims, the longest-serving member of the Fort Worth ISD Board, the campus serves approximately 680–700 students in grades Pre-K3 through 5th. The student population is predominantly Hispanic (87%), followed by African American (12%) and White/Other (1%), with approximately 67% identified as Emergent Bilingual and 20% receiving Special Education services. Programs include Gifted and Talented, ESL, one-way Dual Language, RISE, Inclusion, and Resource. Enrollment is concentrated in early childhood and primary grades (Pre-K through 3rd), underscoring the importance of strong foundational instruction and early intervention. Attendance data show approximately 20% of students are chronically absent, with the highest rates in Pre-K through 1st grade, limiting instructional access and early learning—particularly for Grade 3, the first tested STAAR grade. A small subset of students accounts for a disproportionate share of behavior referrals, highlighting the need for consistent PBIS, targeted interventions, and SEL supports aligned to MTSS. The campus offers enrichment through the Fort Worth After School Program, tutoring, UIL, Art Club, and athletics, and benefits from partnerships with White's Chapel Methodist Church, La Mesa Ministry, Poly United Community Center, First United Methodist Church, Kid's Hope, Reading Partners, CIS, Girls Inc., and Cornerstone. Continued focus on instructional systems, attendance, behavior supports, and staff capacity—including leadership support—is essential to equitable outcomes.

Demographics Strengths

Enrollment of approximately 685 students exceeds projection. Comprehensive supports include free breakfast and lunch for all students, iPads, school supplies, uniforms, and seasonal supports such as winter coats. Extended learning for grades 3–5 includes academic support, homework help, OPTIMIS, fine arts, and after-school dinner. Pre-K3 is available to qualifying students in the attendance zone, strengthening early readiness. SEL is supported through Restorative Practices, PBIS, a full-time certified counselor and social worker, and partners such as Helping Hands. Highly qualified Special Education staff deliver direct services and ongoing consultation to teachers.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results show 21% of Special Education students in Grades 3-5 met the Meets Grade Level standard (Math 25%, Reading 17%). The subgroup remains the lowest-performing compared to general education but demonstrated measurable growth (Math Meets +12, Reading Meets +8). There is a need to sustain and

accelerate this positive trajectory while closing the persistent achievement gap.
Root Cause: Inconsistent campus-wide implementation of Tier 1 differentiation, co-teaching models, and MTSS practices has limited instructional effectiveness for Special Education students. Ongoing teacher capacity development is needed through structured lesson internalization, rehearsal, and aligned progress monitoring.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

T.A. Sims uses multiple data sources—MAP, STAAR, TELPAS, and CIRCLE—to analyze progress. On the Spring 2026 STAAR (Grades 3–5, TEA preliminary), campus Reading reached 35% Meets and Mathematics 38% Meets. The assessments tell a consistent story organized by grade rather than subject: 4th grade was the campus bright spot, improving sharply on both STAAR and MAP in both subjects; 5th grade was solid; and 3rd grade declined and is the most urgent follow-up. MAP Growth EOY 2025–26 showed strongly improved learning rates almost everywhere (campus Reading growth 75%, Math growth 75%), with standing rising clearly in Math and more mixed in Reading—consistent with a growing, increasingly Emergent Bilingual testing population. Beginning in 2026–2027, the campus will implement the ELEVATE instructional model to strengthen Tier 1 consistency, supported by an expanded staffing structure including classroom teachers Pre-K3–5th, dedicated Inclusion and RISE Special Education teachers, Physical Education and Fine Arts, 6 Learning Facilitators, and 7 Resident Teachers, alongside 3 counselors, a librarian, and 2 Assistant Principals. Extended learning continues through after-school tutoring, intervention blocks, pullout intervention, and Summer School.

Student Learning Strengths

4th grade	Led the campus on Spring 2026 STAAR — Math 45% Meets (Approaches +17 points YoY) and Reading 42% Meets (Approaches +24) — with Emergent Bilingual learners driving much of the gain.
Campus Reading	Rose at every STAAR tier (Approaches, Meets, Masters): Meets 28% -> 35%.
MAP Growth surged:	Campus Reading growth 75% and Math growth 75%; Math standing rose 44% -> 59% with average RIT climbing 194 -> 199.
Special Education	Improved on every measurable STAAR tier in both subjects (Math Meets +12, Reading Meets +8) and posted the campus's strongest MAP growth gains.
Pre-K students	95% of were 'On Track' on the English CIRCLE Phonological Awareness assessment; 92% were 'On Track' in Spanish.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports.
Root Cause: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in

3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports.
Root Cause: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

Problem Statement 3: The campus does not currently have a consistent, campus-wide system for collecting, analyzing, and acting on student data in a timely manner. Teachers and instructional leaders lack structured protocols and dedicated time for data analysis, limiting responsive instructional decisions.
Root Cause: The campus lacks clearly defined, consistently implemented data protocols and accountability structures to guide data analysis, instructional planning, and progress monitoring. As a result, data is not systematically used to adjust instruction or target interventions.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Problem Statement 5: Spring 2026 STAAR results show 21% of Special Education students in Grades 3-5 met the Meets Grade Level standard (Math 25%, Reading 17%). The subgroup remains the lowest-performing compared to general education but demonstrated measurable growth (Math Meets +12, Reading Meets +8). There is a need to sustain and accelerate this positive trajectory while closing the persistent achievement gap.
Root Cause: Inconsistent campus-wide implementation of Tier 1 differentiation, co-teaching models, and MTSS practices has limited instructional effectiveness for Special Education students. Ongoing teacher capacity development is needed through structured lesson internalization, rehearsal, and aligned progress monitoring.

Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized): While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Campus leadership has established a clear instructional vision through the Path to an A framework, emphasizing High-Quality Instruction, Purposeful Intervention, and Coaching and Development. Leadership walkthrough data and instructional reviews indicate variation in the implementation of core instructional practices across classrooms. Areas requiring continued development include explicit modeling, structured student discourse, checks for understanding, and alignment of lesson activities to the demonstrated depth of learning.

The culture at T.A. Sims centers on academic success for all students in a safe, positive environment with standards-aligned lesson plans and instruction that includes formative and summative assessment toward TEKS mastery. Teachers participate in Professional Learning emphasizing lesson alignment, checking for understanding, and student engagement, and use Data-Driven Instruction in PLCs to plan Tier 1 instruction and reteach. The campus uses the Ron Clark Academy House system within PBIS: grades 3–5 earn House points for academics, attendance, citizenship, effort, and school spirit, with celebrations every six weeks, while PK–2 students earn Bulldog Bucks. Leadership structures include the Instructional Leadership Team, grade-level leaders, the CERC advisory team, and the Student Support Team.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Recognition of cultural heritage and school spirit is a strength, visible in artwork, special events, and displays. Staff report strong instructional support through coaching, weekly PLCs, ILT feedback, and cross-grade collaboration. Communication with families via newsletters, calendars, call-outs, and social media is a strength. As a one-way dual language campus, T.A. Sims serves a majority of its Emergent Bilingual students in their native Spanish. All teachers are fully certified, and ten PK–5 teachers are designated TIA teachers.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1: The campus does not currently have a consistent, campus-wide system for collecting, analyzing, and acting on student data in a timely manner. Teachers and instructional leaders lack structured protocols and dedicated time for data analysis, limiting responsive instructional decisions.
Root Cause: The campus lacks clearly defined, consistently implemented data protocols and accountability structures to guide data analysis, instructional planning, and progress monitoring. As a result, data is not systematically used to adjust instruction or target interventions.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports.
Root Cause: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports.

Root Cause: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Problem Statement 5: Spring 2026 STAAR results show 21% of Special Education students in Grades 3-5 met the Meets Grade Level standard (Math 25%, Reading 17%). The subgroup remains the lowest-performing compared to general education but demonstrated measurable growth (Math Meets +12, Reading Meets +8). There is a need to sustain and accelerate this positive trajectory while closing the persistent achievement gap.
Root Cause: Inconsistent campus-wide implementation of Tier 1 differentiation, co-teaching models, and MTSS practices has limited instructional effectiveness for Special Education students. Ongoing teacher capacity development is needed through structured lesson internalization, rehearsal, and aligned progress monitoring.

Problem Statement 6: As of 2025-2026, some teachers at T.A. Sims have 0-5 years of teaching experience while serving a high-need population that is predominantly economically disadvantaged, emergent bilingual, and includes a significant Special Education subgroup, impacting consistent delivery of rigorous, high-quality instruction.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a comprehensive, cohesive teacher support system ensuring ongoing instructional coaching, structured professional learning, lesson internalization, and consistent feedback aligned to the ELEVATE framework.

Problem Statement 7 (Prioritized): While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Parent and Family Engagement: The campus maintains strong family participation in school-wide events—Meet the Teacher, Open House, Fall Festival, Field Day, Awards Ceremonies, and athletic events—consistently drawing 300–500 family members. While participation in culture-building events is strong, attendance at academically focused workshops, particularly those supporting literacy and learning at home, remains limited; increasing academic family engagement is a key 2026–2027 growth area. The campus does not currently have an active PTA.

Community Partnerships: Kid's Hope (through First United Methodist Church) provides mentoring. Poly United Community Center supports families through after-school care, summer programming, and resources. The Fort Worth Children's Partnership (FWCP) funds biweekly Museum School for Pre-K and Kindergarten, a summer swim camp with TCU, and incentives promoting attendance, achievement, and behavior.

Campus Culture and Systems: All staff serve on committees—Attendance, PBIS, LPAC, Grade-Level Leads, House Leads, and monthly culture committees—promoting shared responsibility and consistent implementation. The House System (Altruismo, Amistad, Isibindi, Reveur), modeled after the Ron Clark Academy, assigns grades 3–5 and staff to houses, earning points for academics, citizenship, attendance, and effort, with six-week celebrations, weekly house meetings, and spirit days that build belonging and leadership.

Perceptions Strengths

T.A. Sims fosters a strong, collaborative culture grounded in positive relationships, shared responsibility, and high student and staff engagement. Students participate actively and demonstrate leadership and respect. The majority of students attend regularly and demonstrate good conduct; while a subset experiences chronic absenteeism, the campus has established systems to monitor and address it. Staff attendance and participation are strong, communication with families is ongoing and effective, and family engagement in events is a noted strength.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: As of 2025-2026, some teachers at T.A. Sims have 0-5 years of teaching experience while serving a high-need population that is predominantly economically disadvantaged, emergent bilingual, and includes a significant Special Education subgroup, impacting consistent delivery of rigorous, high-quality instruction.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a comprehensive, cohesive teacher support system ensuring ongoing instructional coaching, structured professional learning, lesson internalization, and consistent feedback aligned to the ELEVATE framework.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences

that support literacy development and improve achievement at home.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

Problem Statement 3: The campus does not currently have a consistent, campus-wide system for collecting, analyzing, and acting on student data in a timely manner. Teachers and instructional leaders lack structured protocols and dedicated time for data analysis, limiting responsive instructional decisions.
Root Cause: The campus lacks clearly defined, consistently implemented data protocols and accountability structures to guide data analysis, instructional planning, and progress monitoring. As a result, data is not systematically used to adjust instruction or target interventions.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3.
Root Cause: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Problem Statement 5: Spring 2026 STAAR results show 21% of Special Education students in Grades 3-5 met the Meets Grade Level standard (Math 25%, Reading 17%). The subgroup remains the lowest-performing compared to general education but demonstrated measurable growth (Math Meets +12, Reading Meets +8). There is a need to sustain and accelerate this positive trajectory while closing the persistent achievement gap.
Root Cause: Inconsistent campus-wide implementation of Tier 1 differentiation, co-teaching models, and MTSS practices has limited instructional effectiveness for Special Education students. Ongoing teacher capacity development is needed through structured lesson internalization, rehearsal, and aligned progress monitoring.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports.

Root Cause 1: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3.

Root Cause 2: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning - School Processes & Programs - Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports.

Root Cause 3: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

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

Problem Statement 4: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home.

Root Cause 4: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Demographics - Student Learning - School Processes & Programs - 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)
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Federal Report Card and accountability data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR 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
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Local benchmark or common assessments data
- Prekindergarten Self-Assessment Tool
- Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- Other PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- Intervention data

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- Dyslexia 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
- State certified and high quality staff data
- Campus leadership data
- Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact
- T-TESS data
- T-PESS data
- Staff mobility/stability
- Support structures: mentors
- Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data
- Classroom and school walkthrough data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent engagement rate
- Community surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent and community partnership data
- Parent activity evaluations and feedback data
- Community service agencies and support services

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Capacity and resources data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices and high yield strategies
- Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents
- Focus Group(s) data

Goals

Revised/Approved: November 10, 2026

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading from 26% to 36% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 19% to 28% by June 2027. Data Source: STAAR Reading Results.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on the STAAR ELAR assessment from the 2026 baseline of 26% to 36% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Grade 3 STAAR ELAR Results

Summative Evaluation: Some progress made toward meeting Performance Objective

Strategy 1: Implement High-Quality Tier I ELAR Instruction through:
Bluebonnet Learning
Lesson internalization
Explicit modeling
DOL alignment
PLC data cycles

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Movement of the 24 Grade 3 bubble students from Approaches to Meets; six-weeks Meets rate climbing toward 36%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, additional AP, Grade 3 teachers, Resident Teacher, Learning Facilitators:

Daily Planning:

PLC data meetings

Biweekly:

Walkthroughs

Quarterly:

Benchmark reviews

Summative Evaluation: Some Progress Made Toward Strategy

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53

- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct weekly Grade 3 and Grade 4 PLCs focused on analysis of DOL data and student misconceptions. Implement a campus lesson internalization process prior to instruction. Require teachers to identify the DOL and corresponding thinking steps during planning. Conduct weekly instructional walkthroughs focused on explicit modeling and student thinking. Provide biweekly coaching cycles for identified teachers. Analyze common assessment data every six weeks. Implement targeted intervention groups based on student performance data. Monitor Emergent Bilingual student progress during monthly data reviews. Facilitate quarterly benchmark data dives with grade-level teams. Provide additional intervention opportunities for students who do not demonstrate mastery. **Intended Audience:** Grade 3 teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Campus Administrators **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026 - May 2027. **Collaborating Departments:** Grade 3 teachers/Campus Administrators **Funding Sources:** NONE - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6499-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading from 26% to 36% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 19% to 28% by June 2027. Data Source: STAAR Reading Results.

Performance Objective 2: By June 2027, 100% of Grade 3 ELAR teachers will consistently implement campus instructional non-negotiables including lesson internalization, explicit modeling, DOL alignment, and student discourse as measured through walkthroughs and coaching documentation.

Evaluation Data Sources: Walkthrough Data
Coaching Logs
Lesson Plans
PLC Documentation

Strategy 1: Strengthen teacher capacity through coaching cycles, observation feedback, and collaborative planning.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Consistent instructional implementation will increase student engagement, rigor, and academic performance.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal
Assistant Principal

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct weekly walkthroughs. Provide feedback within 48 hours. Facilitate monthly calibration walks. Conduct coaching cycles for identified teachers. Review lesson plans weekly. **Intended Audience:** TEACHERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** ADMINISTRATOR **Date(s) / Timeframe:** AUGUST 2026-JUNE 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** NONE **Funding Sources:** n/a - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6299-503-208-30-208-101000 - $0			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading from 26% to 36% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 19% to 28% by June 2027. Data Source: STAAR Reading Results.

Performance Objective 3: By June 2027, students identified as not meeting benchmark AT 70% expectations will demonstrate growth through participation in targeted interventions and progress-monitoring cycles.

Evaluation Data Sources: Intervention Rosters
Progress Monitoring Data
Benchmark Assessments
MTSS Documentation

Strategy 1: Implement a systematic intervention process utilizing frequent data review and targeted small-group instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will close learning gaps and increase proficiency in reading.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal
Assistant Principal
Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct data reviews every three weeks. Create targeted intervention groups. Monitor student progress biweekly. Adjust groups based on data. Document intervention outcomes during PLCs. **Intended Audience:** TEACHERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** ADMINISTRATION **Date(s) / Timeframe:** AUGUST 2026- MAY 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** NONE **Funding Sources:** N/A - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 2: Goal: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics from 32% to 40% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 27% to 35% by June 2027.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics from 32% to 40% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 27% to 35% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Grade 3 Mathematics Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Daily TEKS-aligned instruction
Explicit modeling
Mathematical discourse
DOL-driven planning
Common formative assessments

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Movement of the -20 Grade 3 bubble students from Approaches to Meets; six-weeks Math Meets climbing toward 40%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, additional AP, Grade 3 teachers, Learning Facilitators.
Daily Planning PLCs
Monthly data reviews
Quarterly benchmarks

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct weekly mathematics PLCs focused on TEKS alignment and student work analysis. Require daily use of mathematical discourse structures. Implement explicit teacher think-alouds during concept development. Monitor DOL alignment through weekly lesson reviews. Analyze common formative assessment data every three weeks. Establish mathematics intervention groups based on student misconceptions. Conduct monthly instructional rounds focused on mathematics instruction. Monitor benchmark progress after each assessment cycle. Provide instructional coaching for teachers requiring additional support. Implement targeted supports for Emergent Bilingual students in mathematics. **Intended Audience:** TEACHERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** ADMINISTRATION **Date(s) / Timeframe:** (Formative review: Nov / Jan / Mar) **Funding Sources:** N/A - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6499-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 2: Goal: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics from 32% to 40% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 27% to 35% by June 2027.

Performance Objective 2: By June 2027, increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics from 32% to 40%, and increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 27% to 35%.

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Mathematics Results
District Benchmarks
Common Formative Assessments
DOL Data

Strategy 1: Implement high-quality Tier I mathematics instruction through TEKS-aligned planning, mathematical discourse, and explicit modeling.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased mathematical reasoning and problem-solving proficiency.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal
Assistant Principal
Learning Facilitator
Grade 3 Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct weekly Math PLCs. Analyze student work. Plan for mathematical discourse opportunities. Monitor implementation of explicit modeling. Review benchmark data after each administration. **Intended Audience:** TEACHERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** ADMINISTRATION **Date(s) / Timeframe:** AUGUST 2026- JUNE 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** NONE **Funding Sources:** N/A - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6121-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 2: Goal: Increase the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics from 32% to 40% by June 2027. Increase Emergent Bilingual students scoring Meets Grade Level or above from 27% to 35% by June 2027.

Performance Objective 3: By June 2027, 100% of Grade 3 mathematics teachers will consistently implement campus instructional non-negotiables focused on mathematical discourse, explicit modeling, checks for understanding, and DOL alignment.

Evaluation Data Sources: Walkthrough Data
Coaching Documentation
Lesson Plans
PLC Agendas

Strategy 1: Provide targeted coaching and professional learning focused on high-impact mathematics instructional practices.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will consistently implement effective instructional practices, leading to improved student outcomes.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal
Assistant Principal
Learning Facilitator

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct weekly observations. Facilitate monthly instructional calibration. Implement teacher coaching cycles. Review lesson alignment during PLCs. Monitor student engagement and discourse. **Intended Audience:** TEACHERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** ADMINISTRATION **Date(s) / Timeframe:** AUGUST 2026- JUNE 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** NONE **Funding Sources:** N/A - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6329-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 3: By June 2027, increase the implementation of high-quality instructional practices from 20.9% to 30% campus-wide, as measured by district walkthrough tools, instructional monitoring data, and evidence of lesson internalization, explicit modeling, student discourse, and DOL alignment.

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of Grades 3-5 students achieving Meets Grade Level or above in ELAR from 35% to 46% by June 2027, as measured by district benchmark assessments and STAAR results. Increase Special Education and Emergent Bilingual student performance by at least 10 percentage points during the same period.
Increase evidence of:

Explicit modeling
MRS engagement
Student discourse
DOL alignment

Evaluation Data Sources: ELAR Benchmark Assessments
STAAR ELAR Results

Strategy 1: Implement instructional coaching cycles monthly based on SPOT data

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Walkthrough data
Coaching logs
PLC artifacts
Lesson plans

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, AP, Grades 3-5 teachers, Learning Facilitators, Data Analyst.

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Run the six-week DDI cycle in Grades 3-5 and prioritize the ~73 Reading Approaches-only students for Meets conversion. **Intended Audience:** Grades 3-5 Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Campus Administrations **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026- May 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** Grades 3-5 Teachers/Campus Administrations **Funding Sources:** none - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6329-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 3: By June 2027, increase the implementation of high-quality instructional practices from 20.9% to 30% campus-wide, as measured by district walkthrough tools, instructional monitoring data, and evidence of lesson internalization, explicit modeling, student discourse, and DOL alignment.

Performance Objective 2: By June 2027, 100% of teachers will consistently implement campus instructional non-negotiables, including lesson internalization, standards-aligned instruction, explicit modeling, DOL alignment, and checks for understanding, as measured through district walkthrough tools and instructional monitoring data.

Evaluation Data Sources: District Walkthrough Tool
Campus Walkthrough Data
Lesson Plans
PLC Agendas
Coaching Documentation

Strategy 1: Implement a campus-wide instructional framework focused on lesson internalization, DOL-driven planning, explicit modeling, and student-centered learning experiences.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will consistently deliver rigorous, TEKS-aligned instruction that increases student engagement, learning outcomes, and academic achievement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal
Assistant Principal
Learning Facilitator
Instructional Leadership Team

Title I:
2.51, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct coaching cycles for teachers based on student and instructional data. Provide observation feedback within 48 hours of walkthroughs. Facilitate monthly instructional calibration walks. Schedule demonstration lessons and peer observations as needed. Monitor teacher growth through coaching and walkthrough evidence. **Intended Audience:** TEACHERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** ADMINISTRATION **Date(s) / Timeframe:** AUGUST 2026- MAY 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** NONE **Funding Sources:** na - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6411-503-208-30-208-101000 - $0			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 4: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Problem Statement 4: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 4: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Goal 4: By June 2027, increase the percentage of students meeting growth expectations on district benchmark assessments from 40% to 55% through the implementation of targeted intervention systems, progress monitoring, and data-driven instructional supports for students performing below grade level expectations.

Performance Objective 1: By June 2027, increase the percentage of students meeting growth expectations on common formative assessments and district benchmark assessments from a baseline BY 10% as measured through six-weeks assessment data, benchmark assessments, and campus progress-monitoring systems.

Evaluation Data Sources: Common Assessment Data

Strategy 1: Implement LEAD process and MTSS framework.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student outcome

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
Action Step 1: Intervention groups every 3 weeks Data meetings Student progress monitoring Intervention audits **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** TEACHERS ADMINISTRATORS ON MONDAY'S ONLY **Date(s) / Timeframe:** AUG 2026 -MAY 2027 **Collaborating Departments:** NONE **Delivery Method:** NONE **Funding Sources:** na - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6412-503-208-30-208-101000 - $1	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

Goal 5: Reduce chronic absenteeism from 27% to 18% and increase ADA Every six weeks from baseline of 93.8% by 1.0% every six weeks. Data Source: Attendance Analytics.

Performance Objective 1: Decrease the percentage of chronically absent students from 27% to 18% by June 2027. Decrease chronic absence in the most affected grades -- Pre-K3 through 1st (77 of 136 chronically absent students) -- by at least 6 percentage points.

Evaluation Data Sources: Attendance/ADA reports; six-weeks attendance monitoring; MAP growth for chronically absent students

Strategy 1: Implement a tiered attendance framework including monitoring, family outreach, incentives, attendance committees, and individualized attendance interventions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Chronic-absence rate declines from baseline; the MAP decline among chronically absent students reverses.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Weekly attendance reviews
Monthly attendance committee meetings
Nine-week campus reviews

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 4

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Review attendance reports weekly. Identify students approaching chronic absenteeism thresholds. Conduct parent communication within three absences. Implement monthly attendance incentive programs. Hold attendance committee meetings monthly. Develop attendance improvement plans for identified students. Conduct home visits for students with persistent attendance concerns. Provide attendance updates during leadership meetings. Celebrate students with improved attendance during each grading period. Monitor effectiveness of attendance interventions quarterly. **Intended Audience:** STUDENT **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** MS. ROJO, DATA CLERK MS. CLATER, COUNSELOR DR. MARZELL, PRINICIPAL PREK -2ND GRADE TEACHERS. **Date(s) / Timeframe:** OCTOBER -MAY 2027 **Funding Sources:** INCENTIVES - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000 - $2,086			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 4: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 4: Students identified as chronically absent were the only subgroup to decline in Mathematics on Spring 2026 measures (approximately 10 points in growth and 2 points in standing on MAP). Chronic absenteeism significantly limits access to core instruction; approximately 20% of enrolled students (136) have missed 10% or more of instructional days, with 57% of chronically absent students in PK3-3. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, data-driven attendance system with clearly defined roles, timelines, and accountability measures. As a result, monitoring, intervention, and family outreach are inconsistent, limiting support for students experiencing chronic absenteeism.

Goal 6: Develop and implement a comprehensive family engagement framework aligned to the campus Built to Read Initiative by June 2027, providing families with practical literacy strategies, take-home resources, and ongoing opportunities to support reading growth and academic success at home.

Performance Objective 1: Implement and build participation in literacy-focused family engagement opportunities through our Built to Read Series:
Built to Read Family Night
Built to Read Literacy Lab
Built to Read Together
Built to Read Parent Academy
Built to Read Family Learning Series

Evaluation Data Sources: Built to Read Event Attendance Records
Family Engagement Sign-In Sheets
Participation Logs

Strategy 1: Implement the Built to Read Family Engagement Framework

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Recurring, well-attended literacy nights raise academically focused family participation toward the 35% target.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Participation logs
Parent surveys
Event attendance records

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 6 - School Processes & Programs 7 - Perceptions 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Host quarterly literacy family nights. Conduct parent workshops focused on reading strategies. Provide take-home literacy resources during each grading period. Communicate student academic progress regularly with families. Implement family reading challenges. Increase participation through targeted outreach efforts. Utilize multiple communication platforms to share resources. Survey families after engagement events. Analyze participation data quarterly. Adjust engagement opportunities based on family feedback and participation trends. **Intended Audience:** ALL STAKEHOLDERS **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Angela Phillips Ms. Clater, Counselor Dr. Marzell, Principal **Date(s) / Timeframe:** September _Open House: Built to Read Series **Funding Sources:** SUPPLIES - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6116-503-208-30-208-101000 - $500			

Action Step 2 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 2: Host monthly literacy nights with reading activities and home-strategy modeling; distribute bilingual take-home materials. **Date(s) / Timeframe:** September-May (monthly); formative review Nov / Jan / Mar **Funding Sources:** Family literacy-night materials & manipulatives (consumable supplies and take-home activity materials) - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000 - $700, Bilingual printing & translation of family materials (English/Spanish handouts, home-strategy guides, parent folders) - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000 - $586			

Action Step 3 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 3: Track sign-ins and participation logs each cycle; follow up with families who haven't yet attended. **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Ongoing; six-weeks review (Nov / Jan / Mar) **Funding Sources:** - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 2: Develop a calendar of literacy workshops (phonics, vocabulary, comprehension).

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principal

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 6 - School Processes & Programs 7 - Perceptions 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Build the literacy-event calendar and committee at BOY.			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Strategy 3: Create a family literacy committee to plan and promote events with diverse representation.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A representative committee plans and promotes events, broadening reach across the campus's diverse families.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Family engagement specialist, counselor, parent representatives, community partners.

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 6 - School Processes & Programs 7 - Perceptions 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Recruit a family literacy committee with diverse representation at BOY. **Date(s) / Timeframe:** (Formative review: Nov / Jan / Mar)			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 3: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 6: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 7: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

Goal 7: Accelerate academic achievement and reduce identified performance gaps through the consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instruction, purposeful intervention, frequent data analysis, and timely instructional supports. Students will engage daily in rigorous, TEKS-aligned learning experiences designed to increase achievement, growth, and college and career readiness outcomes.

Performance Objective 1: By June 2027, the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 26% to 36%, and the percentage of Emergent Bilingual Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above will increase from 19% to 28%, as measured by STAAR, district benchmark assessments, and campus progress-monitoring data. Progress will be reviewed at the end of each six-weeks grading cycle, and instructional and intervention supports will be adjusted based on student performance evidence.

Evaluation Data Sources: performance data

Strategy 1: Implement high-quality Tier I literacy instruction through Bluebonnet Learning, lesson internalization, explicit modeling, structured student discourse, daily checks for understanding, and data-driven intervention systems.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: INCREASED STUDENT OUTCOME

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: ADMINSTRATION/STUDENTS/PARENTS

Title I:
2.51, 2.52, 2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 6 - School Processes & Programs 7 - Perceptions 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Conduct weekly Grade 3 PLCs focused on TEKS alignment, DOL development, and analysis of student work. Require teachers to identify the DOL and corresponding thinking steps during lesson planning. Implement weekly lesson internalization protocols prior to instruction. Conduct biweekly instructional walkthroughs focused on explicit modeling and student cognitive engagement. Provide coaching cycles and actionable feedback to teachers based on walkthrough data. Analyze common assessment and benchmark data every three weeks to identify student misconceptions. Implement targeted intervention groups for students not demonstrating mastery. Monitor Emergent Bilingual student performance during six-weeks data reviews. Conduct benchmark data meetings after each assessment administration. Adjust intervention plans based on student progress-monitoring data.			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 3: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 6: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 7: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.
Perceptions
Problem Statement 2: While family participation in campus events is strong, there are limited systems to engage families in academically focused learning experiences that support literacy development and improve achievement at home. **Root Cause**: The campus lacks a structured, intentional family engagement framework that prioritizes literacy and equips families with practical strategies, academic resources, and ongoing opportunities to support learning beyond the school day.

Goal 7: Accelerate academic achievement and reduce identified performance gaps through the consistent implementation of high-quality Tier I instruction, purposeful intervention, frequent data analysis, and timely instructional supports. Students will engage daily in rigorous, TEKS-aligned learning experiences designed to increase achievement, growth, and college and career readiness outcomes.

Performance Objective 2: By June 2027, the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 32% to 40%, and the percentage of Emergent Bilingual Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above will increase from 27% to 35%, as measured by STAAR, district benchmark assessments, and campus progress-monitoring data. Progress will be reviewed at the end of each six-weeks grading cycle, and instructional and intervention supports will be adjusted based on student performance evidence.

Evaluation Data Sources: Performance Data

Strategy 1: Strengthen mathematics instruction through TEKS-aligned lesson planning, explicit modeling, mathematical discourse, frequent formative assessments, and targeted intervention designed to address student misconceptions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student performance

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: FACULTY AND STAFF

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Facilitate weekly mathematics PLCs focused on unpacking standards and analyzing student performance. Implement daily mathematical discourse opportunities and student problem-solving tasks. Require teachers to utilize think-alouds and explicit modeling during concept development. Monitor lesson alignment to the DOL through weekly planning reviews. Administer and analyze common formative assessments every three weeks. Establish flexible intervention groups based on student data. Conduct monthly instructional observations focused on mathematics instruction. Provide coaching support for teachers requiring instructional assistance. Monitor Emergent Bilingual student mathematics performance during six-weeks reviews. Adjust intervention and instructional plans based on benchmark and progress-monitoring data. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administration **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August 2026- June 2027			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Spring 2026 STAAR results indicate Reading achievement in Grades 3-5 of 35% at Meets and 10% at Masters, with the greatest area of need in 3rd grade (Reading Meets 31% -> 26%). These results highlight gaps in instructional practice, TEKS-aligned planning, and the need for accelerated literacy supports. **Root Cause**: There is inconsistent implementation of research-based literacy practices across grade levels, including comprehension, vocabulary development, and support for Emergent Bilingual students. PLC structures have not been consistently leveraged to drive data-informed reading instruction.
Problem Statement 3: Spring 2026 STAAR results show that 38% of Grades 3-5 students met the Meets Grade Level standard in Mathematics. This campus average masks a significant decline in 3rd grade (Math Meets 45% -> 32%), offset by gains in 4th grade, indicating inconsistent TEKS-aligned instruction and a need for accelerated, grade-specific supports. **Root Cause**: Lesson internalization systems have been established, inconsistent implementation, monitoring, and feedback have limited their effectiveness. Instructional leadership capacity and structured coaching are not yet sufficient to ensure consistent, high-quality math instruction across all grade levels.

State Compensatory

Budget for 208 T.A. Sims Elementary School

Total SCE Funds: $0.00
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

N/A

Title I

1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) ESSA Section 1114(b)(6)

1.1: Description of CNA Process

Based on previous administration:

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) was conducted during the spring of 2026 and was reviewed with campus leadership and staff throughout the campus improvement planning process. Input was gathered through grade-level PLCs, leadership team meetings, staff discussions, and campus planning sessions. Stakeholders included teachers, instructional support staff, campus administrators, and other campus personnel who were selected based on their roles in instruction, student support, and school improvement efforts.

During the Fall of 2026, The campus also gathered stakeholder feedback during the annual Meet the Teacher event and through ongoing communication with families regarding campus programs, student achievement, and attendance initiatives. While a formal parent planning committee was not convened, family input and campus engagement data were considered during the planning process.

Multiple sources of data were analyzed to identify strengths, challenges, and priority needs. Areas examined included student achievement, attendance, school processes and programs, demographics, family engagement, and campus culture. Data sources included STAAR results, TAPR reports, district and campus assessment data, attendance reports, intervention data, walkthrough trends, coaching data, and accountability indicators. Data was selected based on its relevance to student outcomes, accountability performance, and campus improvement priorities. Findings from the data analysis were used to determine root causes, establish campus goals, and develop targeted strategies and action steps for the 2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan.

1.2: Location for Evidence of Multiple Meetings Held

Families were provided an opportunity to engage with the campus during the Meet the Teacher and Open House event, where campus expectations, instructional priorities, attendance expectations, and student supports were discussed.

Documentation of stakeholder engagement is maintained through meeting agendas, event flyers, sign-in sheets, PLC agendas, leadership meeting notes, and campus planning documents. Evidence is located in campus administrative records and planning files and includes:

- Meet the Teacher event agenda
- Meet the Teacher event flyer
- Parent and family sign-in sheets from Meet the Teacher
- PLC agendas and meeting notes
- Leadership Team meeting agendas and notes

- Campus improvement planning documents and records

Information gathered through these meetings and discussions was used to identify campus strengths, areas for improvement, and priority needs that informed the development of the 2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan.

2. Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) ESSA Section 1114(b)

2.1: Timeline for Schoolwide Program/CIP Development 1114(b)(1)(A)

The Campus Improvement Plan was developed during the spring 2026 and update in the Fall of 2026 through ongoing discussions with campus staff, grade-level teams, PLCs, and the campus leadership team. Campus needs, student achievement data, attendance data, and instructional priorities were reviewed and used to develop goals, strategies, and action steps. Family engagement opportunities included the Meet the Teacher and Open House event, where campus information and expectations were shared with families. Evidence of stakeholder meetings is maintained in campus records and includes meeting agendas, PLC documentation, the Meet the Teacher agenda and flyer, and event sign-in sheets.

2.2: Stakeholders 1114(b)(2)

Staff members were actively involved in the development of the Campus Improvement Plan through PLC meetings, leadership team meetings, grade-level discussions, and campus planning sessions. Families and community members were provided opportunities to engage with the campus during the Meet the Teacher event and Open House, where campus priorities, expectations, and student support information were shared. Feedback from staff discussions, stakeholder interactions, student performance data, attendance data, and campus needs assessments was used to develop the plan. Documentation of stakeholder involvement, including stakeholder lists, meeting agendas, and sign-in sheets identifying participants and their roles, is maintained in campus planning records and administrative files.

2.3: Description of Plan Availability, Format, and Language 1114(b)(4)

The Campus Improvement Plan is made available to the district, campus staff, parents, and the public through the campus and district websites and is maintained in the campus administrative office upon request. The plan is written in a clear, understandable format and key information is communicated to families through campus meetings, written communications, and parent events. Translation and language support are provided as needed to ensure families can access and understand the plan and the campus improvement goals.

2.4: Description of Plan Coordination (if Applicable) 1114(b)(5)

The Campus Improvement Plan is coordinated with federal, state, and local programs to support student achievement and school improvement efforts. Resources and services are integrated through Title I, State Compensatory Education (SCE), bilingual/ESL services, special education services, attendance improvement initiatives, family engagement programs, and district instructional support systems. The plan is aligned with the FWISD District Improvement Plan and supports the implementation of comprehensive school improvement activities designed to improve outcomes for all students, particularly identified student groups.

2.5: Statutorily Required Descriptions 1114(b)(7)(A)

The statutorily required descriptions for Title I Schoolwide Program components are addressed within the corresponding goals, performance objectives, strategies, and action steps throughout the Campus Improvement Plan. Applicable strategies have been aligned and identified within Plan4Learning to ensure compliance with ESSA Section 1114 requirements.

"See aligned strategies and action steps throughout the Campus Improvement Plan."

3. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness ESSA Section 1114(b)(3)

3.1: Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation

Program effectiveness will be monitored through ongoing reviews of student achievement, attendance, intervention, and implementation data during campus leadership meetings, PLCs, and formative review periods. Documentation, including meeting agendas, sign-in sheets, meeting notes, walkthrough data, assessment results, attendance reports, and intervention records, is maintained in campus administrative and planning files.

Progress toward goals and strategies will be reviewed during the fall, winter, and spring Formative Reviews. An annual evaluation of the Schoolwide Program and Campus Improvement Plan will be conducted during the Summative Review process. Results of the evaluation will be used to identify strengths, areas for improvement, and priority needs and will inform the development of the next year's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Campus Improvement Plan.

Campus Funding Summary

Title I (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
							$0.00
						Sub-Total	$0.00
						Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$159,451.00
						+/- Difference	$159,451.00

Family Engagement (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	1	1	NONE	Family Engagement | Misc Operating Costs (61-6499)	211-61-6499-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00
1	2	1	1	n/a	Family Engagement | Misc Contracted Services (61-6299)	211-61-6299-503-208-30-208-101000	$0.00
1	3	1	1	N/A	Family Engagement | General Supplies and Technology (61-6399)	211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00
2	1	1	1	N/A	Family Engagement | Misc Operating Costs (61-6499)	211-61-6499-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00
2	2	1	1	N/A	Family Engagement | Extra Duty/Ot - Support (61-6121)	211-61-6121-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00
2	3	1	1	N/A	Family Engagement | Other Reading Materials (61-6329)	211-61-6329-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00
3	1	1	1	none	Family Engagement | Other Reading Materials (61-6329)	211-61-6329-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00
3	2	1	1	na	Family Engagement | Travel - Employee Only (61-6411)	211-61-6411-503-208-30-208-101000	$0.00
4	1	1	1	na	Family Engagement | Travel - Student (61-6412)	211-61-6412-503-208-30-208-101000	$1.00

Family Engagement (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
5	1	1	1	INCENTIVES	Family Engagement | General Supplies and Technology (61-6399)	211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000	$2,086.00
6	1	1	1	SUPPLIES	Family Engagement | Extra Duty - Professional (61-6116)	211-61-6116-503-208-30-208-101000	$500.00
6	1	1	2	Bilingual printing & translation of family materials (English/Spanish handouts, home-strategy guides, parent folders)	Family Engagement | General Supplies and Technology (61-6399)	211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000	$586.00
6	1	1	2	Family literacy-night materials & manipulatives (consumable supplies and take-home activity materials)	Family Engagement | General Supplies and Technology (61-6399)	211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000	$700.00
6	1	1	3		Family Engagement | General Supplies and Technology (61-6399)	211-61-6399-503-208-30-208-101000	$0.00
						Sub-Total	$3,879.00
						Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$3,986.00
						+/- Difference	$107.00
						Grand Total Budgeted	$163,437.00
						Grand Total Spent	$3,879.00
						+/- Difference	$159,558.00