Fort Worth Independent School District

223 Esperanza Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Board Approval Date: November 10, 2026

Mission Statement

At Esperanza Elementary we work as a team to facilitate high quality relevant instruction. We inspire students to be life-long learners, and equip them with critical, creative, and technological skills for excellence and kindness in their future endeavors.

Vision

Our vision is that students will persevere responsibly and confidently through the challenges of today's world and thereby make great contributions to the community.

Value Statement

Come prepared to school every day.

Own your actions.

Learn with others every day.

Take responsibility.

I have COLT Pride!

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4
Demographics 4
Student Learning 6
School Processes & Programs 8
Perceptions 9
Priority Problem Statements 11
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation 13
Goals 15
Goal 1: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for English Language Arts and Reading (ELAR) on the annual state performance measurement from X% to Y%. 15
Goal 2: Increase the percentage of grade 3 students reaching the "Meets Grade Level" standard for Math on the annual state performance measurement from X% to Y%. 22
Goal 3: Reduce the number of schools that are rated F from x% to y% 28
Goal 4: Reduce the percent of students who are chronically absent (absent more that 10% of the school year) from X% to Y%. 32
Campus Funding Summary 34

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Revised/Approved: November 10, 2026

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Esperanza Elementary is a Dual Language and ESL school in the close knit community known as Diamond Hill in the northernmost neighborhood of FWISD. Half of our classrooms are Dual Language while the other half are ESL with some monolingual students. A recent increase in international students as of the 23-24 school year has changed what used to be our Regular Program monolingual classrooms into ESL classrooms. Our Demographic breakdown is as follows: 78% Hispanic, 6% African American, 8% White, 7% Asian, and 1% 2 or more. 92% of our students qualify as Economically Disadvantaged. 10% of our students qualify as homeless. 71% are Emergent Bilinguals, 61% are served by Bilingual Education/ or ESL, 4% of our students are served by a 504 plan. 8% of our students are identified as Dyslexic, 2.4% of our students identify as homeless, 14% participate in Gifted and Talented services, 23% are served by Special Education/Speech, 10% of our students are Asylee/ Refugees, 97% of our students qualify as at-risk. Most students live within walking distance of the school. Most of our teachers (70%) have over 6 years of experience. 30% are beginner teachers with under 5 years of experience. Most teachers with school age children enroll their children in our school. 20% of our students have 10 or more absences. Our average daily attendance is 94%. Student behavior at our school is positive with minimal discipline referrals. Our enrollment has dropped this year from 450 to 437 following the District trend.

Demographics Strengths

Parents in our school community are highly supportive and regularly attend school events, student conferences, and parent activities. Most families—primarily Hispanic and multigenerational Spanish speakers, along with refugee and asylee families who speak Dari, Farsi, or Kenyarwanda—are actively engaged. Many households have two parents, and teachers collaborate well and demonstrate strong instructional skills. Through home visits and conferences, we have strengthened family relationships and reduced chronic absenteeism. In response to community interest, we have also launched several sports teams, including football, softball, volleyball, running club, and cheer.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: 97% of our students are considered "At Risk" which poses challenges of insufficient resources at home for most of our students including medical access, food access, and limited access to academically enriching experiences outside the school environment therefore the school is providing 7 Sports Teams, 1 Choir, 1 Dance Class, 80 hours of Tutoring , and 1 Food Market open at least twice per month
Root Cause: We are still learning how to best support the basic health and access needs of our families.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Chronic absenteeism which is at 20%, affects our students' access to continuous academic progress, especially for students in Special Education who grew at a rate of 61% on the February STAAR Reading Benchmark compared to a a 77% growth rate for non Special Education students.
Root Cause: We have not focused enough coordinated efforts to positively impact at risk students' learning trajectories equitably.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Students mostly in ESL classrooms with the specific "at risk" factors of asylee/refugee status, mobile, special education, and homeless status appear to have the most barriers to steady academic progress with 34% of K-2 students progressing one level on TELPAS Composite score and 44% of 3rd-5th grade students

progressing at least one level on TELPAS Composite score.
Root Cause: We have not streamlined our services to ensure prompt intervention and consistent active monitoring accross all grade levels for our most "at risk" students.

Problem Statement 4: Pre K students are absent at almost double the rate of students in K-5 with 36% chronically absent for Pre K vs. 19% for grades K-5.
Root Cause: Pre K attendance expectations for parents do not match the attendance expectations of the school.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Our school received a rating of B based on the Texas Education Agency's accountability system based on Domain 2A for growth in grades 4 and 5 because 65% of those students achieved growth towards the "Approaches", "Meets", and "Masters" levels of performance. Overall, our MAP scores show that teaching and learning at our school have positive impact on student growth that is on target with expected growth, however the growth has not been sustained over time accross all grade levels so that our achievement is not yet surpassing the national norm across all subjects. In Math, at Middle of Year, achievement was at the 47th percentile last January and this January it has increased to the 64th percentile. In Reading, at Middle of year, achievement was at the 46th percentile in January while this year, reading achievement is at the 57th percentile. This shows that our school's achievement levels are increasing in both Reading and Math, however, we are not yet maximizing students' capacity for achievement in Reading as compared to Math. Continued acceleration will be needed to move cohorts of students across grade levels into achievement as well as growth. Areas to address include ensuring that our population of English Learners and other At Risk students continue to make academic progress. We need to pay special attention to science instruction, and to special populations such as Special Education, EB, and GT as well as writing across all grade levels.

Student Learning Strengths

Based on MAP scores in January, our school is in the 62st percentile for growth and the 64th percentile for achievement for Math. This is an increase compared to last January when we were performing at the 49th percentile for growth and 54th percentile for achievement in Math.

In Reading, our January MAP testing revealed that last year we reached the 58th percentile for growth and the 54th percentile for achievement and this year we reached the 61st percentile for growth and the 57th percentile for achievement in Reading.

This shows that we are implementing strategies in both Reading and Math classrooms that are making a positive impact on student learning. For example, PLCs have helped us to focus and align strategies from one grade level to the next. DOLs have become more aligned to STAAR and re-teach and tutoring opportunities have increased. Teachers have remained in the same grade level in most instances which creates more seasoned teachers with higher expertise. With teachers setting up systems for students track data in their classrooms students have become aware of the personal efforts that lead to increased performance.

All grade levels have increased their focus on writing and upper grades have implemented some new strategies from a recent Writing workshop (Jane Schaeffer).

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Student achievement for Reading is better than only 57% of students nationwide based on MAP , yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile.
Root Cause: Reading acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile.
Root Cause: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): In grade 3, students struggle to reach the required level of writing and comprehension that is required on the STAAR test with only 35% of students performing at the Meets level on the STAAR Benchmark in December.

Root Cause: Alignment of literacy expectations from lower grades (PK-2) to testing grades (3-5) has not taken place consistently to include supports that benefit highest risk students such as EB and SpEd. students. We have not adequately or consistently supported all grade levels to implement alignment, differentiation, and discourse as related to preparing students to bridge from one grade level to the next.

Problem Statement 4: Only 45% of students reached the approaches level in Science on the February Benchmark and only 5% reached the meets level.
Root Cause: We have not consistently implemented Science instruction at all grade levels with the same quality as reading and math.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Many of the established systems have served our school's organizational purposes and clearly outlined responsibilities. As our staffing and programs change, we need a method to continuously revise our procedures and responsibilities to ensure organization, communication, and safety and continued high quality service to the students.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

The school handbook, calendar, newsletter, team structure, and roles and responsibilities are clearly outlined. This creates a sense of order in most aspects of the school schedule and day to day operation. The school has supportive staff including counselor, instructional coach, and administrators. Some problem areas that were successfully improved include attendance calls, home visits, and transitions to and from specials and dismissal of siblings. PLCs occur regularly and are increasingly led by team content leaders. PLCs are often adjusted to meet the learning needs of the teams.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Our staffing model and schedule does not currently include designated support to provide extra assistance for literacy in the lower grades where the needs of EB students first appear.
Root Cause: We have not aligned our staffing model to provide dedicated personnel to the needs in lower grades for literacy.

Problem Statement 2: Tardiness of some students reduces learning time.
Root Cause: We have not adapted all schedules to account for lower impact of tardiness.

Problem Statement 3: Pacing of Literacy is often slow and prevents consistent re-teach and challenge time for students.
Root Cause: We have not consistently internalized and adapted reading lessons to fit effectively within the scheduled Tier 1 instructional block.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Teacher and staff comments highlight strong relational and support structures across the campus, emphasizing that administrators, counselors, and special education staff effectively connect with students and families, creating a welcoming and inclusive environment. Additional strengths include high levels of student engagement in afterschool clubs and sports, the presence of a parent pantry that contributes to family support, and consistent use of tutoring, vertical collaboration, visual supports, and writingfocused instruction. Staff also noted that students are genuinely missed when absent, reflecting a caring campus culture centered on student belonging and connection

Perceptions Strengths

Teacher and staff comments highlight strong relational and support structures across the campus, emphasizing that administrators, counselors, and special education staff effectively connect with students and families, creating a welcoming and inclusive environment. Additional strengths include high levels of student engagement in afterschool clubs and sports, the presence of a parent pantry that contributes to family support, and consistent use of tutoring, vertical collaboration, visual supports, and writingfocused instruction. Staff also noted that students are genuinely missed when absent, reflecting a caring campus culture centered on student belonging and connection

Needs:

Staff identified several areas for continued improvement, including strengthening vertical alignment across grade levels and increasing targeted support for secondlanguage learners. Attendance remains a concern, with a need for increased parent outreach and strategies to support chronically absent students. Additional needs include ensuring consistent instructional clarity across classrooms and continuing to build inclusive practices that honor diverse student backgrounds, such as clothing and cultural considerations. These needs reflect staff desire for stronger coherence in instruction, enhanced student support systems, and deeper efforts to reinforce student belonging and engagement across the campus.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: Support for Second-Language Learners Teachers identified insufficient targeted supports for second-language learners, leading to challenges in meeting the academic and linguistic needs of this student group. This gap limits students' ability to fully access grade-level content and demonstrate proficiency.
Root Cause: We have not consistently addressed the needs of EB students.

Problem Statement 2: Attendance remains a persistent concern, particularly regarding chronically absent students. Staff noted that increased parent outreach and additional campus systems are needed to improve student attendance patterns and reduce instructional loss
Root Cause: We have not focused on increased parent outreach to improve attendance and on time arrival.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): The campus lacks consistent vertical alignment across all grade levels, resulting in instructional gaps and uneven expectations for student learning. Teachers indicated a need for stronger coherence and collaboration to ensure curriculum and instructional practices build effectively from one grade to the next
Root Cause: We have not implemented best practices consistently or precisely enough from Pre-k to 5th.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Teachers expressed a need for more consistent instructional clarity across classrooms, indicating that variations in expectations and practices create inconsistencies in student learning experiences. This lack of alignment impacts the campus's ability to deliver cohesive instruction
Root Cause: We have not clearly articulated or practiced implementing the required best practices to use in each classroom.

Problem Statement 5: There is a need for deeper implementation of inclusive practices to ensure all students feel a sense of belonging. Staff noted the importance of cultural and clothing considerations (e.g., hijab acceptance) and emphasized strengthening campus systems that support equitable experiences for all students.
Root Cause: We have not addressed a combination of students social emotional needs and parent communication needs especially for parents of non English and Spanish speaking parents.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Chronic absenteeism which is at 20%, affects our students' access to continuous academic progress, especially for students in Special Education who grew at a rate of 61% on the February STAAR Reading Benchmark compared to a a 77% growth rate for non Special Education students.

Root Cause 1: We have not focused enough coordinated efforts to positively impact at risk students' learning trajectories equitably.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Students mostly in ESL classrooms with the specific "at risk" factors of asylee/refugee status, mobile, special education, and homeless status appear to have the most barriers to steady academic progress with 34% of K-2 students progressing one level on TELPAS Composite score and 44% of 3rd-5th grade students progressing at least one level on TELPAS Composite score.

Root Cause 2: We have not streamlined our services to ensure prompt intervention and consistent active monitoring accross all grade levels for our most "at risk" students.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Student achievement for Reading is better than only 57% of students nationwide based on MAP , yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile.

Root Cause 3: Reading acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile.

Root Cause 4: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: In grade 3, students struggle to reach the required level of writing and comprehension that is required on the STAAR test with only 35% of students performing at the Meets level on the STAAR Benchmark in December.

Root Cause 5: Alignment of literacy expectations from lower grades (PK-2) to testing grades (3-5) has not taken place consistently to include supports that benefit highest risk students such as EB and SpEd. students. We have not adequately or consistently supported all grade levels to implement alignment, differentiation, and discourse as related to preparing students to bridge from one grade level to the next.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 6: Our staffing model and schedule does not currently include designated support to provide extra assistance for literacy in the lower grades where the needs of EB students first appear.

Root Cause 6: We have not aligned our staffing model to provide dedicated personnel to the needs in lower grades for literacy.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 7: The campus lacks consistent vertical alignment across all grade levels, resulting in instructional gaps and uneven expectations for student learning. Teachers indicated a need for stronger coherence and collaboration to ensure curriculum and instructional practices build effectively from one grade to the next

Root Cause 7: We have not implemented best practices consistently or precisely enough from Pre-k to 5th.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 8: Teachers expressed a need for more consistent instructional clarity across classrooms, indicating that variations in expectations and practices create inconsistencies in student learning experiences. This lack of alignment impacts the campus's ability to deliver cohesive instruction

Root Cause 8: We have not clearly articulated or practiced implementing the required best practices to use in each classroom.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

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

Accountability Data

- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Accountability Distinction Designations

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR released test questions
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Student failure and/or retention rates
- Local benchmark or common assessments data

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility/stability
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- Section 504 data
- Homeless data
- Dyslexia data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Discipline records
- Student surveys and/or other feedback

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data

- Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data
- Classroom and school walkthrough data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent engagement rate
- Parent and community partnership data

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Horizontal and vertical team alignments processes

Goals

Revised/Approved: November 10, 2026

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

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR six weeks assessments from 34% to 50% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of general program from 31% to 50% by June 2027.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Six Weeks Assessments

Strategy 1: Implement consistent Tier 1, standards-aligned ELAR lessons (focus on TEKS rigor--especially comprehension + writing).
Use daily structured literacy blocks (phonics, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, writing).
Ensure learning objectives and success criteria are visible and explicit.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of consistent Tier 1, standards-aligned ELAR lessons, students will increase in reading proficiency and thereby score higher on 6 weeks assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Classroom Teachers

Title I:
2.51, 2.52
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building
- **Targeted Support Strategy** - **Additional Targeted Support Strategy** - **Results Driven Accountability**

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Through the lens of the Cowtown 12, team leaders and administrators guide planning for PLCs and faculty meetings, differentiated professional learning for new teachers, SLOs aligned to campus needs, observations and coaching. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators, and Classroom Teachers **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Weekly PLCs, Bi Monthly PD **Collaborating Departments:** ELA/ Bilingual **Delivery Method:** In person			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Student achievement for Reading is better than only 57% of students nationwide based on MAP , yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile. **Root Cause**: Reading acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms.

Problem Statement 2: Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile. **Root Cause**: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

Problem Statement 3: In grade 3, students struggle to reach the required level of writing and comprehension that is required on the STAAR test with only 35% of students performing at the Meets level on the STAAR Benchmark in December. **Root Cause**: Alignment of literacy expectations from lower grades (PK-2) to testing grades (3-5) has not taken place consistently to include supports that benefit highest risk students such as EB and SpEd. students. We have not adequately or consistently supported all grade levels to implement alignment, differentiation, and discourse as related to preparing students to bridge from one grade level to the next.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Our staffing model and schedule does not currently include designated support to provide extra assistance for literacy in the lower grades where the needs of EB students first appear. **Root Cause**: We have not aligned our staffing model to provide dedicated personnel to the needs in lower grades for literacy.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: The campus lacks consistent vertical alignment across all grade levels, resulting in instructional gaps and uneven expectations for student learning. Teachers indicated a need for stronger coherence and collaboration to ensure curriculum and instructional practices build effectively from one grade to the next **Root Cause**: We have not implemented best practices consistently or precisely enough from Pre-k to 5th.

Problem Statement 4: Teachers expressed a need for more consistent instructional clarity across classrooms, indicating that variations in expectations and practices create inconsistencies in student learning experiences. This lack of alignment impacts the campus's ability to deliver cohesive instruction **Root Cause**: We have not clearly articulated or practiced implementing the required best practices to use in each classroom.

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

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of Kindergarten - Grade 3 students who Meet or Exceed grade level norms on EOY MAP Growth Reading in English from 41% to 60% by June 2027.
Increase the percentage of Kindergarten - Grade 3 students who Meet or Exceed grade level norms on EOY MAP Growth Reading in Spanish from 68% to 70% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of English Special Education from 24% to 30% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP

Strategy 1: Plan and utilize data driven interventions focused on student needs demonstrated on MAP Fluency and the MAP Learning Continuum.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of data driven interventions being planned and implemented, students' reading proficiency will increase.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators.

Title I:
2.51

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Team leaders implement Thursday planning sessions to include intervention planning. Teachers submit intervention plans via shared drive for administrators to review during weekly PLCs. Administrators will check MAP Fluency Progress Monitoring and observe intervention blocks to check for implementation fidelity. Teacher assistants support delivery of interventions according to a schedule. For Grades 3-5 Teachers will learn/ refresh knowledge of Science of Teaching Reading via August/ afterschool PD which will include time in August to create small group skills starter kits. During the first week of school, 3-5 reading teachers will administer a running record during intervention time. Teachers will create intervention plans based on demonstrated student need by TEKS as shown on district assessments. Teachers will administer MAP Fluency weekly for Progress Monitoring purposes for all tier 2 and 3 students. During PLCs and during walkthroughs, teachers will demonstrate knowledge and implementation of small group interventions. Grade 3-5 "push in" tutoring opportunities will be offered based on data trends. For Grades PK-2 Teachers will learn/ refresh knowledge of Science of Teaching Reading via August/ afterschool PD which will include time in August to create small group skills starter kits. Administrators communicate expectation of intervention plans and intentional planning for foundational reading skills to be taught with fidelity (Phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding, encoding, and fluency) During first week of school, PK-2nd grade teachers administer Bluebonnet reading inventory (to assess letter/sound knowledge, etc.) During PLCs and during walkthroughs, teachers will demonstrate knowledge and implementation of small group interventions. During intervention time K-2 teachers will rotate through 2 reading groups daily using systematic phonemic awareness/ phonics materials prepared in their starter kits. Teachers will administer MAP Fluency weekly for Progress Monitoring purposes for all K-2 students. Display board for MAP Fluency data will be created at BOY, MOY, and EOY, **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators, Teacher Assistants, Team Leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August PD and ongoing monthly progress checks **Collaborating Departments:** ELAR/ Bilingual **Delivery Method:** In person **Funding Sources:** Push In Reading Tutor - Title I (211) - 211-11-6117-501-223-30-223-101000 - $7,000, Subs to offer observation time as professional learning - Title I (211) - 211-11-6112-501-223-30-223-101000 - $1,500, Classroom supplies and headsets to facilitate instruction and progress monitoring - Title I (211) - 211-11-6399-501-223-30-223-101000 - $24,563, Teacher Assistants - Title I (211) - 211-11-6129-501-223-30-223-101000 - $63,470			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Student achievement for Reading is better than only 57% of students nationwide based on MAP , yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile.
Root Cause: Reading acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms.

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

Performance Objective 3: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR benchmark assessments from 32% to 50% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of 3rd grade General Program 23% to 50% by June 2027.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Data driven instruction will be planned after 6 weeks assessments to target gaps for high priority TEKS.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of data driven instruction being planned, student achievement will increase.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Demo Coach

Title I:
2.52
- **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
- **Results Driven Accountability**

Problem Statements: Demographics 3

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: During PLCs, grade levels will identify gaps and plan interventions based on specific TEKS. Data tracking will take place at the student and classroom level. Historical data will be gathered and shared to ensure improved campus outcomes based on specific TEKS. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators and Demo Coach **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Summer data analysis- July Weekly PLCs Daily DOL tracking 6 weeks assessments Semester benchmark response in fall and spring **Collaborating Departments:** ELAR/ Bilingual **Delivery Method:** In person			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 3: Students mostly in ESL classrooms with the specific "at risk" factors of asylee/refugee status, mobile, special education, and homeless status appear to have the most barriers to steady academic progress with 34% of K-2 students progressing one level on TELPAS Composite score and 44% of 3rd-5th grade students progressing at least one level on TELPAS Composite score. **Root Cause**: We have not streamlined our services to ensure prompt intervention and consistent active monitoring accross all grade levels for our most "at risk" students.

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

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on Math second six weeks assessments from 66% to 70% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of General Program EB students from 57% to 65% by June 2027.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Six Weeks Assessments

Strategy 1: Through the lens of the Cowtown 12, implement consistent Tier 1, standards-aligned Math lessons (focus on TEKS rigor--especially academic vocabulary, problem solving, and math fluency).
Use daily structured math blocks (fluency, application problem, concept development, problem set, de-brief, DOL, re-teach/ challenge, intervention)
Ensure learning objectives, think aloud models, and success criteria are visible and explicit.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of consistent implementation of Tier 1 instruction, students will demonstrate higher achievement on assessments of math TEKS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Title I:
2.51
- **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 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Study, model, plan for, and rehearse elements of the Cowtown 12 during all PLCs and faculty meetings. Administrators will provide feedback in the moment to support implementation of explicit modeling, high leverage engagement strategies and explicit re-teaching. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators and grade level leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** August and ongoing weekly PLCs and bi monthly faculty meetings **Collaborating Departments:** Math/ Bilingual **Delivery Method:** in person			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile. **Root Cause**: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

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

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of Kindergarten - Grade 3 students who Meet or Exceed grade level norms on EOY MAP Growth Math in English from 63.8% to 70% by June 2027.

Increase the performance of 2nd grade from 56% to 65% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP

Strategy 1: Plan and utilize data driven interventions focused on student needs demonstrated on the MAP Learning Continuum.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of data driven interventions, math knowledge gaps will close leading to enhanced student achievement and progress.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and team leaders

Title I:
2.51
- **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
- **Results Driven Accountability**

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Team leaders implement Thursday planning sessions to include intervention planning. Teachers submit intervention plans via shared drive for administrators to review during weekly PLCs. Administrators will check online intervention usage platform and observe intervention blocks to check for implementation fidelity. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Adminisrators **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Weekly checks for intervention usage **Collaborating Departments:** Math **Delivery Method:** in person			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile. **Root Cause**: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

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

Performance Objective 3: Increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that score meets grade level or above on Math benchmark assessments from 31% to 50% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of general program from 27% to 50% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Data driven instruction will be planned after 6 weeks assessments to target gaps for high priority TEKS.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of data driven instruction being planned, student achievement will increase

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators and Team Leaders

Title I:
2.51
- **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 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: During PLCs, grade levels will identify gaps and plan interventions based on specific TEKS. Data tracking will take place at the student and classroom level. Historical data will be gathered and shared to ensure improved campus outcomes based on specific TEKS. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators and grade level leaders **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Summer data analysis- July Weekly PLCs Daily DOL tracking 6 weeks assessments Semester benchmark response in fall and spring **Collaborating Departments:** Math **Delivery Method:** in person			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile. **Root Cause**: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

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

Performance Objective 1: Increase the percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR benchmark assessments in English from 54% to 64% by June 2027.
Increase the percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students that score meets grade level or above on ELAR benchmark assessments in Spanish from 41% to 60% by June 2027.
Increase the performance of Emergent Bilingual students from 47% to 60% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Data driven instruction will be planned after 6 weeks assessments and benchmarks to target gaps for high priority TEKS.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of interventions being implemented and tracked, student achievement will increase.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Title I:
2.51

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

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Administrators will monitor writing across all content areas. Teachers and students will track progress on on SCRs and ECRs. Provide targeted TEKS support during Reteach/ Challenge blocks and intervention time based on 6 weeks assessment data. Track progress using campus, classroom, and student level data trackers in PLC room and in classrooms. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators, Team Leaders, and Demo Coach **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Weekly Spot observations **Collaborating Departments:** ELAR/ Bilingual **Delivery Method:** in person			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Students mostly in ESL classrooms with the specific "at risk" factors of asylee/refugee status, mobile, special education, and homeless status appear to have the most barriers to steady academic progress with 34% of K-2 students progressing one level on TELPAS Composite score and 44% of 3rd-5th grade students progressing at least one level on TELPAS Composite score. **Root Cause**: We have not streamlined our services to ensure prompt intervention and consistent active monitoring accross all grade levels for our most "at risk" students.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Student achievement for Reading is better than only 57% of students nationwide based on MAP , yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile. **Root Cause**: Reading acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms.

Problem Statement 3: In grade 3, students struggle to reach the required level of writing and comprehension that is required on the STAAR test with only 35% of students performing at the Meets level on the STAAR Benchmark in December. **Root Cause**: Alignment of literacy expectations from lower grades (PK-2) to testing grades (3-5) has not taken place consistently to include supports that benefit highest risk students such as EB and SpEd. students. We have not adequately or consistently supported all grade levels to implement alignment, differentiation, and discourse as related to preparing students to bridge from one grade level to the next.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Our staffing model and schedule does not currently include designated support to provide extra assistance for literacy in the lower grades where the needs of EB students first appear. **Root Cause**: We have not aligned our staffing model to provide dedicated personnel to the needs in lower grades for literacy.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 3: The campus lacks consistent vertical alignment across all grade levels, resulting in instructional gaps and uneven expectations for student learning. Teachers indicated a need for stronger coherence and collaboration to ensure curriculum and instructional practices build effectively from one grade to the next **Root Cause**: We have not implemented best practices consistently or precisely enough from Pre-k to 5th.

Problem Statement 4: Teachers expressed a need for more consistent instructional clarity across classrooms, indicating that variations in expectations and practices create inconsistencies in student learning experiences. This lack of alignment impacts the campus's ability to deliver cohesive instruction **Root Cause**: We have not clearly articulated or practiced implementing the required best practices to use in each classroom.

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

Performance Objective 2: Increase the percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students that score meets grade level or above on Math benchmark assessments in English from 43% to 53% by June 2027.

Increase the performance of Emergent Bilingual students from 36% to 50% by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Sources: Benchmark Assessments

Strategy 1: Data driven instruction will be planned after 6 weeks assessments and benchmarks to target gaps for high priority TEKS.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of interventions being implemented and tracked, student achievement will increase.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Title I:
2.51
- ESF Levers:
Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Administrators will monitor the use of problem solving strategies and writing in Math that conveys deep understanding of the process and operations involved in STAAR level math problems. Teachers and students will increase their use of academic vocabulary for a deep understanding of processes and operations in STAAR level math problems. Provide targeted TEKS support during Reteach/ Challenge blocks and intervention time based on 6 weeks assessment data. Track progress using campus, classroom, and student level data trackers in PLC room and in classrooms. **Intended Audience:** Teachers **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Administrators, Team Leaders, and Demo Coach **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Weekly DOL checks and PLCs **Collaborating Departments:** Math **Delivery Method:** in person			

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Student achievement for Math is better than only 64 percent of students nationwide based on MAP, yet our goal is to achieve at or above the 75th percentile.
Root Cause: Math acceleration techniques that impact all students have not been implemented consistently or fully across all classrooms and the amount of reading required for Math affects some students who are not yet reading on grade level.

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

Performance Objective 1: Decrease the number and percentage of students who are chronically absent (absent more than 10%) from 34% to 20% by June 2027.
Decrease the number and percentage of chronically absent Special Education students from 40% to 20% by June 2027.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Focus attendance data

Strategy 1: Campus outreach to increase school's awareness of family and student needs, increase parent awareness of attendance impact on learning, and and provide increased individualized student support for chronically absent students.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: As a result of increased communication, outreach, and intervention, we will decrease the percentage of chronically absent students and improve attendance for students who have been chronically absent in the past.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Family Engagement Specialist, Counselor, and Administrators

Title I:
2.53
- **TEA Priorities:**
Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools
- **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership, Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems, Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials, Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building
- **Targeted Support Strategy** - **Additional Targeted Support Strategy** - **Results Driven Accountability**

Problem Statements: Demographics 2, 3

Action Step 1 Details	Formative Reviews		
	Formative		
	Nov	Jan	Mar
Action Step 1: Implement MTSS for academics and behavior specifically for chronically absent students. Monthly home visits. Warm calls before 9:30 a.m. for students who are absent within the first few weeks of school. Parent attendance information meetings by grade level during first semester. **Intended Audience:** Parents **Provider / Presenter / Person Responsible:** Counselor, FES, and Administrators **Date(s) / Timeframe:** Warm calls daily by 9:30 am, Monthly home visits, SST meets one time per month. Parent info meetings complete by November for each grade level. **Collaborating Departments:** Family Engagement/ Counseloing/ Homeless **Delivery Method:** in person **Funding Sources:** Incentives for students and communication supplies for parent communication - Family Engagement (211) - 211-61-6399-503-223-30-223-101000 - $2,413			

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Chronic absenteeism which is at 20%, affects our students' access to continuous academic progress, especially for students in Special Education who grew at a rate of 61% on the February STAAR Reading Benchmark compared to a a 77% growth rate for non Special Education students. **Root Cause**: We have not focused enough coordinated efforts to positively impact at risk students' learning trajectories equitably.
Problem Statement 3: Students mostly in ESL classrooms with the specific "at risk" factors of asylee/refugee status, mobile, special education, and homeless status appear to have the most barriers to steady academic progress with 34% of K-2 students progressing one level on TELPAS Composite score and 44% of 3rd-5th grade students progressing at least one level on TELPAS Composite score. **Root Cause**: We have not streamlined our services to ensure prompt intervention and consistent active monitoring accross all grade levels for our most "at risk" students.

Campus Funding Summary

Title I (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	2	1	1	Push In Reading Tutor	Instruction | Temp/Hourly - Professional (11-6117)	211-11-6117-501-223-30-223-101000	$7,000.00
1	2	1	1	Subs to offer observation time as professional learning	Instruction | Subs - Professional (11-6112)	211-11-6112-501-223-30-223-101000	$1,500.00
1	2	1	1	Classroom supplies and headsets to facilitate instruction and progress monitoring	Instruction | General Supplies and Technology (11-6399)	211-11-6399-501-223-30-223-101000	$24,563.00
1	2	1	1	Teacher Assistants	Instruction |Title I Teacher Assistant (11-6129)	211-11-6129-501-223-30-223-101000	$63,470.00
						Sub-Total	$96,533.00
						Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$96,533.00
						+/- Difference	$0.00

Family Engagement (211)							
Goal	**Performance Objective**	**Strategy**	**Action Step**	**Resources Needed**	**Description**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
4	1	1	1	Incentives for students and communication supplies for parent communication	Family Engagement | General Supplies and Technology (61-6399)	211-61-6399-503-223-30-223-101000	$2,413.00
						Sub-Total	$2,413.00
						Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$2,413.00
						+/- Difference	$0.00
						Grand Total Budgeted	$98,946.00
						Grand Total Spent	$98,946.00
						+/- Difference	$0.00