Golden Rule Charter School



Golden Rule - DeSoto

Accountability Rating: D

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Board Approval Date:
October 20, 2026

Public Presentation Date:
October 20, 2026

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
October 16, 2026 at 05:54 PM

Mission Statement

The mission of Golden Rule Schools is to establish a safe and student-centered environment where knowledge and literacy are encouraged through learning activities that are developmentally appropriate, individually paced, and attuned to each student's academic performance and interests. Golden Rule Schools honors and respects the cultural and ethnic differences of the students served by the school. Golden Rule Schools seeks to extend the skills and concepts taught in the classroom for use beyond the school environment. Golden Rule Schools believe that students have the capacity to make a difference in their school, community, and beyond through active service. As students develop the problem-solving skills needed for the 21st Century, they will be encouraged to live, study, and strive together to be effective and productive citizens in the diverse and technology-driven global economy.

Vision

Students have the right to an education of the highest quality where their learning styles are appreciated and their diversity is valued in support of the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. Students will be encouraged to appreciate and value education as well as recognize their responsibility for learning. As active partners in their education, Golden Rule Schools will hold students accountable for their actions while providing an atmosphere that nurtures student development in our diverse and technology-driven global economy.

Value Statement

"Educating Tomorrow's Leaders Today"

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 4

Needs Assessment Overview 5

Demographics 6

Student Learning 11

School Processes & Programs 17

Perceptions 23

Priority Problem Statements 27

Data Documentation for CNA 31

Improvement Planning Data 32

Accountability Data 32

Student Data: Assessments 32

Student Data: Student Groups 33

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 33

Employee Data 34

Parent/Community Data 34

Support Systems and Other Data 34

Goals 36

Goal 1 : Golden Rule Charter School will increase student achievement and close p... 37

Goal 2 : Golden Rule Charter School will strengthen teacher effectiveness and rete... 50

Goal 3 : Golden Rule Charter School will strengthen school safety, climate, and faci... 56

Goal 4 : Golden Rule Charter School will Strengthen Family and Community Engag... 63

State Compensatory Education 70

Budget for Golden Rule - DeSoto 71

Personnel for Golden Rule - DeSoto 71

Title I Summary 72

Title I Personnel 73

Funding Summary 74

211- Title I Part A 75

224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed 76

255- Title II, Part A, TPTR 77

263- Title III- LEP 78

420- Compensatory Education 79

429- Local Accountability Grant 79

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Needs Assessment Overview

Summary

Golden Rule Charter Schools (GRS) conducted a comprehensive needs assessment in spring and fall 2026 using multiple data sources, including STAAR 2026 results, TELPAS, MAP Growth, district enrollment and staffing data, climate and parent surveys, and stakeholder CNA meetings. The review identified strengths in technology access, family engagement, and assessment systems, while also highlighting systemic challenges in instructional quality, program equity, safety, and organizational clarity.

Demographic data show that GRS serves 1,285 students across five campuses, with 94.6% economically disadvantaged, 61.5% emergent bilingual, 62.5% at-risk, and 7.2% special education. Teacher turnover is 30.4%, with 33% of teachers uncertified. These factors directly influence student performance and access to equitable services.

Student learning data confirm that while most students achieve Approaches on STAAR in Reading, Mathematics, and Science, performance at Meets and Masters lags behind state and regional averages, particularly in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. Emergent bilingual and special education students demonstrate persistent gaps, with TELPAS results showing slower growth in expressive domains. MAP Growth indicates progress in Reading and Math, but subgroup growth remains uneven.

District processes and programs include multiple assessment systems, curriculum resources, and strong technology integration. However, CNA findings revealed outdated job descriptions, uncoordinated coaching and mentoring cycles, inequitable GT and RTI implementation, outdated mission/vision statements, and safety vulnerabilities at several campuses.

Perception data highlight strong teacher-student relationships, family engagement, and appreciation for technology access. At the same time, stakeholders expressed concerns about inconsistent communication across campuses, limited enrichment opportunities, staff role confusion, and campus safety.

In summary, the 2026 CNA highlights that GRS has a strong foundation of community involvement, technology resources, and assessment tools, but must now prioritize:

1. Raising student achievement at the Approaches, Meets and Masters levels across all subjects, particularly for EB and SPED students.
2. Clarifying organizational roles and streamlining instructional support to reduce disruptions and improve consistency.
3. Expanding equitable access to RTI, GT, and enrichment opportunities.
4. Strengthening campus and district communication systems.

These identified needs will serve as the foundation for the 2026–27 District Improvement Plan, aligning resources and strategies to improve student outcomes and meet state and federal accountability requirements.

Demographics

Summary

Golden Rule Charter Schools (GRS) operates five campuses in southern Dallas County, serving the communities of Cockrell Hill, DeSoto, Grand Prairie, Oak Cliff, and Pleasant Grove. District enrollment as of May 2026 totals 1,285 students across PK–8, with campus counts as follows: Illinois (498), DeSoto (408), Pleasant Grove (187), Sunnyside (102), and Grand Prairie (90).

The student body reflects the diverse community of southern Dallas, with 90.8% of students identified as Hispanic, 6.7% as African American, and 2% as White. GRS serves one of the highest concentrations of economically disadvantaged students in the region, with 94.6% of the population identified as such. Other program participation includes 61.5% English learners, 62.5% at-risk, 7.2% special education, 1.9% Section 504, and 0.7% identified as gifted and talented. These demographics demonstrate the need for robust bilingual, intervention, and special education services, reinforcing the designation of all campuses as schoolwide Title I campuses.

Staffing includes 101 teachers, 32 educational aides, 47 auxiliary staff, 21 campus administrators, and 26 central support staff. Teacher experience levels show a mix of early-career and veteran educators: 7% beginning teachers, 43% with 1–5 years of experience, 21% with 6–10 years, 23% with 11–20 years, and 4% with 21–30 years. While 41% of teachers are not certified and turnover stands at 30.4%, the district benefits from a significant number of experienced teachers and a strong cadre of support staff.

The district's average daily attendance rate in 2025–2026 was 95.2%, which falls below the district's 96% target. Parent involvement opportunities remain consistent, and the Title I framework ensures that resources are in place to support at-risk students and engage families. Collectively, these demographic indicators highlight both strengths and challenges for GRS: a diverse, predominantly bilingual population; high levels of economic disadvantage; a teaching staff requiring continued certification and retention supports; and a Title I structure that allows targeted interventions and family engagement to address student needs.

In the particular case of DeSoto Campus, out of the 408 students, 79.2% of students identified as Hispanic, 17.6% as African American, and 2.5% as White. GRS DeSoto Campus serves one of the highest concentrations of economically disadvantaged students in the region, with 92.2% of the population identified as such. Other program participation includes 72.7% English learners, 52.5% at-risk, 6.4% special education, 3.2% Section 504, and 0.0% identified as gifted and talented. These demographics demonstrate the need for robust bilingual, intervention, and special education services, reinforcing the designation of all campuses as schoolwide Title I campuses.

Strengths

- District enrollment remains steady across all five campuses.
- GRS maintains a predominantly bilingual student body, supporting the need for strong bilingual/ESL programming.
- Teacher staffing reflects a balance between newer and veteran educators, with nearly one-third of teachers having six or more years of experience.
- A robust support structure exists, with 32 educational aides and 47 auxiliary staff across campuses.
- All campuses operate as Title I schoolwide programs, ensuring that supplemental resources benefit all at-risk students.
- Parent involvement opportunities and Title I-funded supports are accessible districtwide.

Strengths

Golden Rule Charter Schools (GRS) serves a student body with high academic needs, including 94.6% economically disadvantaged and 61.5% English learners. Performance data shows that while students achieve at high levels on some measures, gaps remain when compared to state and region benchmarks, particularly for emergent bilingual and special education students.

In the 2026 STAAR results, the majority of students reached the Approaches Grade Level standard across core subjects, while

fewer students progressed to the Meets and Masters levels. Emergent bilingual students, who represent more than half of the student population, continue to demonstrate lower performance in Reading/ELA and Mathematics, with most students clustered at the Approaches level. Students receiving special education services also continue to perform below their peers across all tested areas.

TELPAS results indicate that many English learners continue to struggle with English proficiency, particularly in speaking and writing, which may impact their ability to access grade-level content and succeed on STAAR.

MAP Growth 2026 data show that overall performance in Reading, Math, and Science remains below expected levels. The results highlight the need for stronger interventions and progress monitoring, particularly for EB and SPED students.

Teachers employ a wide range of data systems — including CLI Engage, NWEA MAP, DRA, Progress Learning, and curriculum-based benchmarks — to monitor progress, adjust instruction, and identify students for Tier II and Tier III supports. The district's student-teacher ratio of approximately 13:1 provides manageable class sizes that allow for differentiated instruction, small-group work, and more responsive interventions.

Collectively, these student learning patterns highlight both challenges and strengths: persistent subgroup achievement gaps in Reading and Math, gains in receptive language proficiency, and the consistent implementation of RTI structures supported by multiple assessment tools. These factors demonstrate GRS's commitment to using data to drive instruction while also identifying the areas where additional support is needed to close gaps.

Strengths

- MAP Growth results confirm that some students are meeting growth targets, especially in Reading and Math.
- STAAR Approaches percentages demonstrate that the majority of students acquire foundational knowledge in core content areas.
- TELPAS results show that an important percentage of English learners achieved Advanced or Advanced High in receptive skills, providing a strong foundation for further language development, even though there are still some students that achieved Intermediate level.
- An RTI program with Tier II and Tier III interventions provides targeted support for struggling learners.
- GRS teachers utilize multiple data sources (MAP, CLI Engage, DRA and curriculum benchmarks) to guide instruction and interventions.
- The student-teacher ratio of 13:1 ensures manageable class sizes that allow for small-group instruction and more responsive teaching.
- Technology integration and use of data systems support early identification of gaps and consistent monitoring of student growth.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	In Math, 55% of students achieved Approaches, and only 28% reached Meets and 6% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with subgroup performance well below state and regional averages.	Instructional practices focus on procedural fluency but do not consistently emphasize problem solving, conceptual understanding, and application to real-world contexts aligned to STAAR rigor.
2 ★	Although 67% of students achieved Approaches in Reading, only 34% reached Meets and 15% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with emergent bilingual students scoring significantly below peers.	Reading instruction emphasizes foundational skills but lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and writing across content areas, limiting progress to higher proficiency.
3 ★	Science results remain low, with only 62% of students meeting Approaches, 29% at Meets, and 14% at Masters in DeSoto Campus, below regional and state averages.	Science instruction time is limited at some grade levels, and teachers lack consistent access to updated curriculum resources and labs, reducing opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning.
4	Social Studies results remain low in DeSoto Campus, with only 43% of students meeting Approaches, 32% at Meets, and 21% at Masters, below regional and state averages.	Social Studies instruction lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, source analysis, comprehension strategies, and evidence-based writing, limiting students' ability to engage in higher-level historical thinking and demonstrate deeper content understanding.
5 ★	Emergent bilingual students perform significantly below all-student averages across all academic areas, despite demonstrating progress in receptive TELPAS skills.	While TELPAS results show growth in listening and reading, limited progress in expressive skills (speaking and writing) prevents EBs from transferring language proficiency into academic content mastery. In addition, staffing shortages in bilingual/ESL instruction reduce capacity for targeted supports.

6 More than half of the DeSoto Campus students (52.5%) are English learners, yet TELPAS and STAAR results show persistent gaps in academic performance and language proficiency, particularly in expressive language skills.

The large EB population exceeds the capacity of the district's bilingual/ESL instructional staff, and not all teachers are adequately trained or certified to deliver high-quality sheltered instruction.

7 DeSoto Campus has a high concentration of economically disadvantaged students (92.2%), which creates significant instructional and support needs for campuses.

Limited community resources and high poverty levels in the areas served by GRS result in nearly all students qualifying as economically disadvantaged, increasing reliance on school-based supports funded by Title I and Compensatory Education.

8 ★ Teacher certification rates remain low, with 67% of teachers certified, and turnover is high at 30.4%, creating instability in staffing and program implementation.

Competitive staffing challenges in the Dallas area, combined with limited pipelines for bilingual and special education teachers, have led to reliance on uncertified teachers and higher attrition.

9 The DeSoto Campus Gifted and Talented (GT) program serves 0% of students, far below state expectations, limiting equitable access for advanced learners.

Identification processes for GT students are inconsistent, and staff may lack training in recognizing giftedness among economically disadvantaged and bilingual students, leading to underrepresentation.

10 The DeSoto average daily attendance is 95.6%, below the district's target of 96%, which negatively impacts instructional time and school funding.

Barriers related to family mobility, health, and lack of consistent transportation contribute to absenteeism, particularly among at-risk students.

11 The DeSoto student demographics show a high percentage of at-risk students (52.5%), placing additional demands on intervention systems.

A combination of socioeconomic factors, limited early childhood readiness, and language acquisition challenges increases the number of students designated as at-risk, creating higher intervention needs than current staffing can fully address.

12 Although MAP Growth results indicate that many students meet expected growth, subgroup analysis shows that emergent bilingual and special education students make slower progress than peers.

RTI and intervention supports are in place, but they are not implemented consistently across campuses, and intervention time is often reduced due to scheduling and staffing constraints.

13 ★

All subjects show lower performance at the Approaches, Meets and Masters levels compared to regional and state averages, limiting the percentage of students demonstrating grade-level proficiency or above.

Instruction is not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TEKS, and professional development has not fully addressed higher-order instructional strategies necessary for students to move to higher level of achievement.

14

There are still some inconsistencies job responsibilities and inconsistencies persist across the district, leading to occasional overlap in tasks and confusion among staff.

Job descriptions are not completely updated and they not adapted by campus, and lack of standardization that not clarify completely consistent expectations.

15 ★

Students lack equitable access to Gifted and Talented (GT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) programs across campuses.

Inconsistent program implementation, insufficient staff training, and scheduling/personnel constraints prevent systematic delivery of GT and RTI services.

16 ★

Parents report inconsistent communication across campuses, with variations in how academic progress, interventions, and opportunities are shared.

Communication practices and platforms are not standardized districtwide, leaving families with uneven access to information.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Golden Rule DeSoto Campus implements multiple assessment measures to monitor student performance and inform instruction. Teachers and campus leaders use NWEA MAP Growth, CLI Engage, DRA, curriculum-based benchmarks, and STAAR data to guide interventions and instructional planning. Assessment results are reviewed through structured data digs at the campus and district level, and principals are expected to integrate progress-monitoring systems consistently into classroom practice.

STAAR 2026 performance data indicates that while most students meet the Approaches standard, fewer advance to Meets and Masters, and performance gaps remain across subgroups:

For DeSoto Campus, the STAAR 2026 performance data is as follows:

- All Subjects: Approaches 60%, Meets 31%, Masters 11%
- Reading/ELA: Approaches 67%, Meets 34%, Masters 15%
- Mathematics: Approaches 55%, Meets 28%, Masters 6%
- Science: Approaches 62%, Meets 29%, Masters 14%
- Social Studies: Approaches 43%, Meets 32%, Masters 21%

Results confirm that Reading and Science show the strongest overall performance, while Math lags behind state averages and Social Studies continues to be the lowest-performing subject. Emergent bilingual and special education students remain significantly below all-student performance levels.

TELPAS 2026 results indicate that an important percentage of English learners are performing at the Advanced or Advanced High levels in receptive language skills (listening and reading), even though there are still some students that achieved Intermediate level. However, expressive skills (speaking and writing) remain concentrated at the Intermediate and Advanced levels, which limits the ability of students to demonstrate grade-level mastery on STAAR. Composite scores by grade reflect progress for many students but confirm that language acquisition continues to be a barrier for content mastery.

MAP Growth 2026 results show measurable progress across Reading, Mathematics, and Science, with a majority of students meeting or exceeding projected growth targets. Growth measures confirm that the district's RTI framework and use of progress-monitoring tools are positively impacting outcomes, though emergent bilingual and special education students continue to make slower gains than peers.

Overall, GRS continues having small student-teacher ratios (approximately 13:1), which support differentiated instruction and targeted interventions. However, persistent subgroup achievement gaps, weak outcomes in Math and Social Studies, and ongoing challenges in expressive language development highlight the need for continued alignment of curriculum, professional development, and intervention strategies.

Strengths

High performance in Reading/ELA Approaches: 73% of students met the Approaches standard in Reading, the district's strongest subject area. Nearly half (43%) achieved Meets, with 18% reaching Masters, showing a solid foundation for literacy across grade levels.

Mathematics Approaches had a decline of 14%. 57% of students achieved Approaches in Math, with a decline in Meets (27%) and Masters (8%). This indicates that foundational numeracy skills are not yet being established across the district.

Student Growth in MAP Assessments: NWEA MAP Growth results indicate that a majority of students met or exceeded their

projected growth targets in Reading, Math, and Science. However, these results were not consistently reflected in STAAR performance, particularly in Reading and Math, suggesting a discrepancy between students' measured growth on MAP assessments and their demonstrated achievement on the state assessment.

TELPAS receptive skills strength: An important percentage of English learners scored at Advanced or Advanced High in listening and reading, providing a strong foundation for academic success in content areas as students continue developing expressive skills, even though there are still some students that achieved Intermediate level.

Systematic use of multiple assessment tools: Teachers consistently use MAP, CLI Engage, DRA, and curriculum-based benchmarks to monitor learning, adjust instruction, and provide early intervention for struggling students.

RTI and intervention programs showing effectiveness: Tier II and Tier III supports are resulting in measurable improvements in student growth, particularly in Reading and Math.

TEA 2026 Accountability Ratings:

Golden Rule Charter School - DeSoto Campus: D

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	In Math, 55% of students achieved Approaches, and only 28% reached Meets and 6% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with subgroup performance well below state and regional averages.	Instructional practices focus on procedural fluency but do not consistently emphasize problem solving, conceptual understanding, and application to real-world contexts aligned to STAAR rigor.
2 ★	Although 67% of students achieved Approaches in Reading, only 34% reached Meets and 15% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with emergent bilingual students scoring significantly below peers.	Reading instruction emphasizes foundational skills but lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and writing across content areas, limiting progress to higher proficiency.
3 ★	Science results remain low, with only 62% of students meeting Approaches, 29% at Meets, and 14% at Masters in DeSoto Campus, below regional and state averages.	Science instruction time is limited at some grade levels, and teachers lack consistent access to updated curriculum resources and labs, reducing opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning.
4 ★	Social Studies remains the lowest-performing content area, with only 43% at Approaches, 32% at Meets, and 21% at Masters in DeSoto Campus.	Instructional time for Social Studies is inconsistent across grade levels, and teachers lack access to updated curriculum resources and training in effective strategies for teaching historical thinking and content literacy.
5 ★	Emergent bilingual students perform significantly below all-student averages across all academic areas, despite demonstrating progress in receptive TELPAS skills.	While TELPAS results show growth in listening and reading, limited progress in expressive skills (speaking and writing) prevents EBs from transferring language proficiency into academic content mastery. In addition, staffing shortages in bilingual/ESL instruction reduce capacity for targeted supports.

6 DeSoto Campus has a high concentration of economically disadvantaged students (92.2%), which creates significant instructional and support needs for campuses.

Limited community resources and high poverty levels in the areas served by GRS result in nearly all students qualifying as economically disadvantaged, increasing reliance on school-based supports funded by Title I and Compensatory Education.

7 More than half of the DeSoto Campus students (52.5%) are English learners, yet TELPAS and STAAR results show persistent gaps in academic performance and language proficiency, particularly in expressive language skills.

The large EB population exceeds the capacity of the district's bilingual/ESL instructional staff, and not all teachers are adequately trained or certified to deliver high-quality sheltered instruction.

8 ★ Teacher certification rates remain low, with 67% of teachers certified, and turnover is high at 30.4%, creating instability in staffing and program implementation.

Competitive staffing challenges in the Dallas area, combined with limited pipelines for bilingual and special education teachers, have led to reliance on uncertified teachers and higher attrition.

9 The DeSoto Campus Gifted and Talented (GT) program serves 0% of students, far below state expectations, limiting equitable access for advanced learners.

Identification processes for GT students are inconsistent, and staff may lack training in recognizing giftedness among economically disadvantaged and bilingual students, leading to underrepresentation.

10 The DeSoto average daily attendance is 95.6%, below the district's target of 96%, which negatively impacts instructional time and school funding.

Barriers related to family mobility, health, and lack of consistent transportation contribute to absenteeism, particularly among at-risk students.

11 The DeSoto student demographics show a high percentage of at-risk students (52.5%), placing additional demands on intervention systems.

A combination of socioeconomic factors, limited early childhood readiness, and language acquisition challenges increases the number of students designated as at-risk, creating higher intervention needs than current staffing can fully address.

12 ★

While a majority of students meet the Approaches standard in Reading, Mathematics and Science, too few advance to Meets and Masters, particularly in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

Curriculum alignment and instructional rigor are inconsistent across grade levels, and teachers require additional professional development and resources in higher-order thinking strategies and content-specific pedagogy.

13 ★

Special education students continue to perform well below their peers in all tested subjects on STAAR, with limited evidence of closing gaps.

Teachers require additional training in inclusive instructional strategies, co-teaching models, and differentiated instruction, while special education staffing levels remain insufficient for districtwide needs.

14

Social Studies results remain low in DeSoto Campus, with only 43% of students meeting Approaches, 32% at Meets, and 21% at Masters, below regional and state averages.

Social Studies instruction lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, source analysis, comprehension strategies, and evidence-based writing, limiting students' ability to engage in higher-level historical thinking and demonstrate deeper content understanding.

15

Although MAP Growth results indicate that many students meet expected growth, subgroup analysis shows that emergent bilingual and special education students make slower progress than peers.

RTI and intervention supports are in place, but they are not implemented consistently across campuses, and intervention time is often reduced due to scheduling and staffing constraints.

16 ★

All subjects show lower performance at the Approaches, Meets and Masters levels compared to regional and state averages, limiting the percentage of students demonstrating grade-level proficiency or above.

Instruction is not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TEKS, and professional development has not fully addressed higher-order instructional strategies necessary for students to move to higher level of achievement.

17 ★

Instructional support from curriculum directors, coaches, and mentors is disorganized, resulting in inconsistent implementation of district initiatives across campuses.

Support structures are not systematically scheduled, lack intentional coordination, and overlap with other responsibilities, causing uneven delivery of coaching and mentoring.

18 Coaching support did not lead to meaningful improvements in student grades, while frequent classroom interruptions from coaching visits, meetings, and observations reduced instructional time and limited opportunities for effective lesson pacing.

Insufficient coordination and implementation of the coaching system, coupled with limited accountability and oversight, have resulted in reduced effectiveness in improving student achievement.

19 ★ Students lack equitable access to Gifted and Talented (GT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) programs across campuses.

Inconsistent program implementation, insufficient staff training, and scheduling/personnel constraints prevent systematic delivery of GT and RTI services.

20 ★ Parents report inconsistent communication across campuses, with variations in how academic progress, interventions, and opportunities are shared.

Communication practices and platforms are not standardized districtwide, leaving families with uneven access to information.

21 Students perceive limited opportunities for enrichment and advanced learning, particularly in upper grades.

Gifted and Talented (GT) identification and enrichment opportunities are inconsistent across campuses, and scheduling constraints limit access to advanced coursework.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Golden Rule Charter Schools reviewed district processes and programs during the 2026 Comprehensive Needs Assessment. Data sessions and staff input revealed both systemic strengths and areas requiring improvement.

Across campuses, staff reported the need of clarity of job duties and decision-making points of contact, which has led to some duplication and confusion. Some job descriptions have not been updated completely according to the 2026-2027 district restructure and may vary by campus, creating the need of standardization.

The district's new structure created the need to create more direct instructional support from campus leadership. However, this support need to properly coordinate with lead teachers or department directors to increase efficiency in planning and interventions. There is also a need to optimize instructional time and planning opportunities. Additionally, it is important to coordinate staff development and mentorship opportunities to ensure adequate coverage of personnel when they participate in these activities.

Program implementation for both Gifted and Talented (GT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) have some consistency across the district. However, there is also a need for greater intentionality in how they are implemented, particularly given that the district is not currently demonstrating strong academic outcomes. A more deliberate and consistent approach to identifying student needs, allocating resources, and implementing GT and RTI supports is necessary to ensure that these programs meaningfully contribute to student achievement and provide equitable opportunities for all students.

District facilities and safety processes are generally adequate, but continued attention to facility maintenance and upkeep is needed.

In summary, the district requires greater clarity and consistency in defining job responsibilities, decision-making processes, instructional support, planning, and staff development across all campuses. Additionally, a more intentional and uniform approach to the implementation of Gifted and Talented (GT) programs and Response to Intervention (RTI) is necessary, particularly given our current academic standing, to ensure students receive the appropriate support. Furthermore, improvements are needed in facilities to maintain a secure and conducive learning environment.

Strengths

With the reduction of instructional support roles at the district level, the support has been distributed across campus leaders provide teachers with access to expertise and guidance, giving the district a strong foundation for professional growth.

Teachers have access to district-developed and external instructional resources (CLI Engage, MAP Growth, DRA, HMH, and SAVVAS), which are consistently used to track progress and guide intervention.

Technology infrastructure is strong — students benefit from a 1:1 Chromebook ratio in grades second through eight grade, iPads for early grades, and ClearTouch panels in every classroom, with reliable wireless connectivity across campuses.

Instructional aides are available at multiple campuses, providing additional student support and helping reduce the instructional burden on classroom teachers.

Supplemental programs for diverse learners are in place and full access to general education curricula for special education students through digital and print resources.

District-level monitoring of instructional data is embedded in practice, with administrators and teachers regularly reviewing results from STAAR, MAP Growth, benchmarks, and locally developed assessments to inform decisions.

The district continues to allocate Title I, Title III, Compensatory Education, and other state/federal resources strategically, ensuring funding supplements critical programs and supports for students across campuses.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	In Math, 55% of students achieved Approaches, and only 28% reached Meets and 6% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with subgroup performance well below state and regional averages.	Instructional practices focus on procedural fluency but do not consistently emphasize problem solving, conceptual understanding, and application to real-world contexts aligned to STAAR rigor.
2 ★	Although 67% of students achieved Approaches in Reading, only 34% reached Meets and 15% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with emergent bilingual students scoring significantly below peers.	Reading instruction emphasizes foundational skills but lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and writing across content areas, limiting progress to higher proficiency.
3 ★	Science results remain low, with only 62% of students meeting Approaches, 29% at Meets, and 14% at Masters in DeSoto Campus, below regional and state averages.	Science instruction time is limited at some grade levels, and teachers lack consistent access to updated curriculum resources and labs, reducing opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning.
4	Social Studies results remain low in DeSoto Campus, with only 43% of students meeting Approaches, 32% at Meets, and 21% at Masters, below regional and state averages.	Social Studies instruction lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, source analysis, comprehension strategies, and evidence-based writing, limiting students' ability to engage in higher-level historical thinking and demonstrate deeper content understanding.
5	More than half of the DeSoto Campus students (52.5%) are English learners, yet TELPAS and STAAR results show persistent gaps in academic performance and language proficiency, particularly in expressive language skills.	The large EB population exceeds the capacity of the district's bilingual/ESL instructional staff, and not all teachers are adequately trained or certified to deliver high-quality sheltered instruction.

6	The DeSoto Campus Gifted and Talented (GT) program serves 0% of students, far below state expectations, limiting equitable access for advanced learners.	Identification processes for GT students are inconsistent, and staff may lack training in recognizing giftedness among economically disadvantaged and bilingual students, leading to underrepresentation.
7 ★	Teacher certification rates remain low, with 67% of teachers certified, and turnover is high at 30.4%, creating instability in staffing and program implementation.	Competitive staffing challenges in the Dallas area, combined with limited pipelines for bilingual and special education teachers, have led to reliance on uncertified teachers and higher attrition.
8	DeSoto Campus has a high concentration of economically disadvantaged students (92.2%), which creates significant instructional and support needs for campuses.	Limited community resources and high poverty levels in the areas served by GRS result in nearly all students qualifying as economically disadvantaged, increasing reliance on school-based supports funded by Title I and Compensatory Education.
9	The DeSoto average daily attendance is 95.6%, below the district's target of 96%, which negatively impacts instructional time and school funding.	Barriers related to family mobility, health, and lack of consistent transportation contribute to absenteeism, particularly among at-risk students.
10 ★	While a majority of students meet the Approaches standard in Reading, Mathematics and Science, too few advance to Meets and Masters, particularly in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.	Curriculum alignment and instructional rigor are inconsistent across grade levels, and teachers require additional professional development and resources in higher-order thinking strategies and content-specific pedagogy.
11	The DeSoto student demographics show a high percentage of at-risk students (52.5%), placing additional demands on intervention systems.	A combination of socioeconomic factors, limited early childhood readiness, and language acquisition challenges increases the number of students designated as at-risk, creating higher intervention needs than current staffing can fully address.

12 ★

Emergent bilingual students perform significantly below all-student averages across all academic areas, despite demonstrating progress in receptive TELPAS skills.

While TELPAS results show growth in listening and reading, limited progress in expressive skills (speaking and writing) prevents EBs from transferring language proficiency into academic content mastery. In addition, staffing shortages in bilingual/ESL instruction reduce capacity for targeted supports.

13 ★

Special education students continue to perform well below their peers in all tested subjects on STAAR, with limited evidence of closing gaps.

Teachers require additional training in inclusive instructional strategies, co-teaching models, and differentiated instruction, while special education staffing levels remain insufficient for districtwide needs.

14 ★

All subjects show lower performance at the Approaches, Meets and Masters levels compared to regional and state averages, limiting the percentage of students demonstrating grade-level proficiency or above.

Instruction is not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TEKS, and professional development has not fully addressed higher-order instructional strategies necessary for students to move to higher level of achievement.

15

Although MAP Growth results indicate that many students meet expected growth, subgroup analysis shows that emergent bilingual and special education students make slower progress than peers.

RTI and intervention supports are in place, but they are not implemented consistently across campuses, and intervention time is often reduced due to scheduling and staffing constraints.

16

There are still some inconsistencies job responsibilities and inconsistencies persist across the district, leading to occasional overlap in tasks and confusion among staff.

Job descriptions are not completely updated and they not adapted by campus, and lack of standardization that not clarify completely consistent expectations.

17 ★

Instructional support from curriculum directors, coaches, and mentors is disorganized, resulting in inconsistent implementation of district initiatives across campuses.

Support structures are not systematically scheduled, lack intentional coordination, and overlap with other responsibilities, causing uneven delivery of coaching and mentoring.

18 Coaching support did not lead to meaningful improvements in student grades, while frequent classroom interruptions from coaching visits, meetings, and observations reduced instructional time and limited opportunities for effective lesson pacing.

Insufficient coordination and implementation of the coaching system, coupled with limited accountability and oversight, have resulted in reduced effectiveness in improving student achievement.

19 ★ Students lack equitable access to Gifted and Talented (GT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) programs across campuses.

Inconsistent program implementation, insufficient staff training, and scheduling/personnel constraints prevent systematic delivery of GT and RTI services.

20 ★ Teachers and staff report mixed perceptions of campus safety, with concerns about security vulnerabilities such as unlocked doors, limited protective fencing, and outdated infrastructure.

Facility limitations and limited resources for large-scale safety improvements make it difficult to consistently address and strengthen security measures across campuses.

21 Students perceive limited opportunities for enrichment and advanced learning, particularly in upper grades.

Gifted and Talented (GT) identification and enrichment opportunities are inconsistent across campuses, and scheduling constraints limit access to advanced coursework.

22 ★ Parents report inconsistent communication across campuses, with variations in how academic progress, interventions, and opportunities are shared.

Communication practices and platforms are not standardized districtwide, leaving families with uneven access to information.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Golden Rule Charter Schools collected stakeholder input through end-of-year climate and parent surveys, CNA meetings, and staff focus groups in summer and fall 2026. Data reflect both strengths in family engagement and areas of concern regarding communication, safety, and support.

Staff perceptions reveal that while teachers value the support of campus administrators and colleagues, they expressed concerns about some classroom interruptions and lack of feedback during observations from curriculum personnel. Teachers also indicated the need for more consistent and intentional professional development aligned to instructional needs.

Parent survey responses indicate that families value access to technology and opportunities to participate in campus events. However, parents reported inconsistencies in communication across campuses, with some families indicating that they are not consistently informed about their child's academic progress or available supports. Perceptions of campus safety were mixed, with some parents expressing concerns while others reported that they felt the campus was safe.

Student responses indicate that students generally value their relationships with teachers and access to technology. At the same time, students expressed varying perceptions of campus safety and concerns about having equal access to advanced academic opportunities. Upper-grade students also reported that there are limited opportunities for enrichment and learning experiences beyond the core curriculum.

Overall, the 2026 perception data highlights strengths in teacher relationships, technology access, and family engagement, while identifying concerns with communication, instructional support, professional development, and equitable access to advanced and enrichment opportunities.

Strengths

Teachers and staff report strong relationships with campus administrators and colleagues, fostering collaboration at the campus level.

Parents express appreciation for technology access, noting that students benefit from 1:1 devices in second through eight grades and classroom instructional tools.

Family engagement remains a districtwide strength, with parents participating in academic events, informational sessions, and school activities.

Students report positive relationships with teachers, recognizing that staff show care and support for their learning and well-being.

Survey data highlight consistent appreciation for campus-level communication tools (e.g., parent portals, Class Dojo), which help families stay connected to teachers.

Community perception of GRS remains tied to its supportive, family-like environment, reflecting the district's commitment to personalized attention for students.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	In Math, 55% of students achieved Approaches, and only 28% reached Meets and 6% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with subgroup performance well below state and regional averages.	Instructional practices focus on procedural fluency but do not consistently emphasize problem solving, conceptual understanding, and application to real-world contexts aligned to STAAR rigor.
2 ★	Science results remain low, with only 62% of students meeting Approaches, 29% at Meets, and 14% at Masters in DeSoto Campus, below regional and state averages.	Science instruction time is limited at some grade levels, and teachers lack consistent access to updated curriculum resources and labs, reducing opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning.
3 ★	Although 67% of students achieved Approaches in Reading, only 34% reached Meets and 15% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with emergent bilingual students scoring significantly below peers.	Reading instruction emphasizes foundational skills but lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and writing across content areas, limiting progress to higher proficiency.
4	Social Studies results remain low in DeSoto Campus, with only 43% of students meeting Approaches, 32% at Meets, and 21% at Masters, below regional and state averages.	Social Studies instruction lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, source analysis, comprehension strategies, and evidence-based writing, limiting students' ability to engage in higher-level historical thinking and demonstrate deeper content understanding.
5	DeSoto Campus has a high concentration of economically disadvantaged students (92.2%), which creates significant instructional and support needs for campuses.	Limited community resources and high poverty levels in the areas served by GRS result in nearly all students qualifying as economically disadvantaged, increasing reliance on school-based supports funded by Title I and Compensatory Education.

6 ★

Teacher certification rates remain low, with 67% of teachers certified, and turnover is high at 30.4%, creating instability in staffing and program implementation.

Competitive staffing challenges in the Dallas area, combined with limited pipelines for bilingual and special education teachers, have led to reliance on uncertified teachers and higher attrition.

7

The DeSoto average daily attendance is 95.6%, below the district's target of 96%, which negatively impacts instructional time and school funding.

Barriers related to family mobility, health, and lack of consistent transportation contribute to absenteeism, particularly among at-risk students.

8 ★

While a majority of students meet the Approaches standard in Reading, Mathematics and Science, too few advance to Meets and Masters, particularly in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.

Curriculum alignment and instructional rigor are inconsistent across grade levels, and teachers require additional professional development and resources in higher-order thinking strategies and content-specific pedagogy.

9

There are still some inconsistencies job responsibilities and inconsistencies persist across the district, leading to occasional overlap in tasks and confusion among staff.

Job descriptions are not completely updated and they not adapted by campus, and lack of standardization that not clarify completely consistent expectations.

10 ★

Instructional support from curriculum directors, coaches, and mentors is disorganized, resulting in inconsistent implementation of district initiatives across campuses.

Support structures are not systematically scheduled, lack intentional coordination, and overlap with other responsibilities, causing uneven delivery of coaching and mentoring.

11

Coaching support did not lead to meaningful improvements in student grades, while frequent classroom interruptions from coaching visits, meetings, and observations reduced instructional time and limited opportunities for effective lesson pacing.

Insufficient coordination and implementation of the coaching system, coupled with limited accountability and oversight, have resulted in reduced effectiveness in improving student achievement.

12 ★

Parents report inconsistent communication across campuses, with variations in how academic progress, interventions, and opportunities are shared.

Communication practices and platforms are not standardized districtwide, leaving families with uneven access to information.

13

Students perceive limited opportunities for enrichment and advanced learning, particularly in upper grades.

Gifted and Talented (GT) identification and enrichment opportunities are inconsistent across campuses, and scheduling constraints limit access to advanced coursework.

14 ★

Teachers and staff report mixed perceptions of campus safety, with concerns about security vulnerabilities such as unlocked doors, limited protective fencing, and outdated infrastructure.

Facility limitations and limited resources for large-scale safety improvements make it difficult to consistently address and strengthen security measures across campuses.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	In Math, 55% of students achieved Approaches, and only 28% reached Meets and 6% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with subgroup performance well below state and regional averages.	Instructional practices focus on procedural fluency but do not consistently emphasize problem solving, conceptual understanding, and application to real-world contexts aligned to STAAR rigor.
2	Although 67% of students achieved Approaches in Reading, only 34% reached Meets and 15% Masters in DeSoto Campus, with emergent bilingual students scoring significantly below peers.	Reading instruction emphasizes foundational skills but lacks consistent integration of academic vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and writing across content areas, limiting progress to higher proficiency.
3	Science results remain low, with only 62% of students meeting Approaches, 29% at Meets, and 14% at Masters in DeSoto Campus, below regional and state averages.	Science instruction time is limited at some grade levels, and teachers lack consistent access to updated curriculum resources and labs, reducing opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning.
4	Social Studies remains the lowest-performing content area, with only 43% at Approaches, 32% at Meets, and 21% at Masters in DeSoto Campus.	Instructional time for Social Studies is inconsistent across grade levels, and teachers lack access to updated curriculum resources and training in effective strategies for teaching historical thinking and content literacy.
5	All subjects show lower performance at the Approaches, Meets and Masters levels compared to regional and state averages, limiting the percentage of students demonstrating grade-level proficiency or above.	Instruction is not consistently aligned to the rigor of the TEKS, and professional development has not fully addressed higher-order instructional strategies necessary for students to move to higher level of achievement.
6	While a majority of students meet the Approaches standard in Reading, Mathematics and Science, too few advance to Meets and Masters, particularly in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies.	Curriculum alignment and instructional rigor are inconsistent across grade levels, and teachers require additional professional development and resources in higher-order thinking strategies and content-specific pedagogy.

7 ★	Special education students continue to perform well below their peers in all tested subjects on STAAR, with limited evidence of closing gaps.	Teachers require additional training in inclusive instructional strategies, co-teaching models, and differentiated instruction, while special education staffing levels remain insufficient for districtwide needs.
8 ★	Emergent bilingual students perform significantly below all-student averages across all academic areas, despite demonstrating progress in receptive TELPAS skills.	While TELPAS results show growth in listening and reading, limited progress in expressive skills (speaking and writing) prevents EBs from transferring language proficiency into academic content mastery. In addition, staffing shortages in bilingual/ESL instruction reduce capacity for targeted supports.
9 ★	Instructional support from curriculum directors, coaches, and mentors is disorganized, resulting in inconsistent implementation of district initiatives across campuses.	Support structures are not systematically scheduled, lack intentional coordination, and overlap with other responsibilities, causing uneven delivery of coaching and mentoring.
10 ★	Students lack equitable access to Gifted and Talented (GT) and Response to Intervention (RTI) programs across campuses.	Inconsistent program implementation, insufficient staff training, and scheduling/personnel constraints prevent systematic delivery of GT and RTI services.
11 ★	Teacher certification rates remain low, with 67% of teachers certified, and turnover is high at 30.4%, creating instability in staffing and program implementation.	Competitive staffing challenges in the Dallas area, combined with limited pipelines for bilingual and special education teachers, have led to reliance on uncertified teachers and higher attrition.
12 ★	Teachers and staff report mixed perceptions of campus safety, with concerns about security vulnerabilities such as unlocked doors, limited protective fencing, and outdated infrastructure.	Facility limitations and limited resources for large-scale safety improvements make it difficult to consistently address and strengthen security measures across campuses.

13 ★	Parents report inconsistent communication across campuses, with variations in how academic progress, interventions, and opportunities are shared.	Communication practices and platforms are not standardized districtwide, leaving families with uneven access to information.

★ = Priority

Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

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

Improvement Planning Data

- [x] **District goals**
- [x] **Campus goals**
- [x] **HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3**
- [x] **HB3 CCMR goals**
- [x] **Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)**
- [x] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**
- [x] **Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data**
- [x] **State and federal planning requirements**

Accountability Data

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

Student Data: Assessments

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

- [x] **STAAR released test questions**
- [x] **STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Tejas LEE, or other alternate early reading assessment results**
- [x] **Postsecondary college, career or military-ready graduates including enlisting in U. S. armed services, earning an industry based certification, earning an associate degree, graduating with completed IEP and workforce readiness**
- [x] **Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant information**
- [x] **Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) accelerated reading assessment data for Grades 3-5 (TEA approved statewide license)**
- [x] **Student failure and/or retention rates**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**
- [x] **Observation Survey results**
- [x] **Prekindergarten Self-Assessment Tool**
- [x] **Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data**

Student Data: Student Groups

- [x] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **Section 504 data**
- [x] **Gifted and talented data**
- [x] **Dyslexia data**
- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Completion rates and/or graduation rates data**
- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Violence and/or violence prevention records**

- [x] **Student surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Class size averages by grade and subject**
- [x] **School safety data**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**

Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **State certified and high quality staff data**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data**
- [x] **Professional development needs assessment data**
- [x] **Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact**
- [x] **T-TESS data**
- [x] **T-PESS data**
- [x] **Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data**
- [x] **Classroom and school walkthrough data**

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Organizational structure data**
- [x] **Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation**

- [x] **Communications data**
- [x] **Capacity and resources data**
- [x] **Action research results**

Goals

Goal 1

Golden Rule Charter School will increase student achievement and close performance gaps across all content areas and student groups as measured by the state accountability system.

Performance Objective 1

☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

By June 2027, GRS will increase the percentage of students achieving Approaches Grade Level or above on STAAR from 64% (2026 baseline) to 75% across all tested subjects.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR results, District Assessments, and Universal Screeners

Strategy 1

☑ Results Driven Accountability

Conduct structured data dig sessions after every district benchmark and MAP Growth assessment to identify student performance by readiness standards and supporting TEKS, using Lead4Ward frequency distribution tables to prioritize instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will gain clarity on which TEKS have the highest instructional weight and will adjust instruction to prioritize readiness standards. This will lead to more intentional reteaching, stronger alignment to STAAR, and measurable gains in Approaches.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The superintendent will be responsible for the oversight. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing the protocols needed to execute the data dig. The Campus Principals will be responsible for the facilitation. The Campus Principals will also be responsible for the support and monitoring. The teachers will be responsible for the implementation of the learning and strategy with the students.

Funding Sources: Teacher training in data analysis and TEKS alignment 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $1,000, Lead4Ward resources, PLC substitutes, materials 211- Title I Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2

☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide accelerated instruction to all students who do not meet Approaches or Meets on STAAR or district benchmarks, in compliance with HB 1416. Students not meeting Approaches will receive 30 hours of targeted support in Reading/Math, and students not meeting Meets will receive 15 hours, with group ratios not exceeding 4:1 unless a parent waiver is obtained

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: This strategy ensures students receive legally required accelerated instruction and that intervention is intentional and structured. Students will close gaps in foundational TEKS, leading to improved Approaches rates, increased confidence, and stronger alignment with accountability requirements.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring HB 1416 compliance across all campuses. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for creating district-wide tutoring frameworks, schedules, and progress monitoring tools. The Campus Principals will be responsible for staffing, scheduling, and parent communications regarding accelerated instruction. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for monitoring the fidelity of intervention delivery. The Teachers will be responsible for implementing targeted accelerated instruction with identified students and documenting student progress.

Funding Sources: Tutoring stipends, intervention materials 429- Local Accountability Grant, $15,000, SPED tutoring and accommodations 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $5,000, Tutoring stipends, intervention materials 211- Title I Part A, $15,000, Support for Emergent Bilingual students requiring tutoring 263- Title III- LEP, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Implement structured Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention time during the instructional day, ensuring students performing below Approaches on STAAR, MAP, and district benchmarks receive small-group support aligned to prioritized TEKS and readiness standards.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive targeted instruction on critical TEKS without losing access to grade-level instruction. This will strengthen foundational skills, close learning gaps more efficiently, and increase the number of students meeting Approaches.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district-wide consistency in RTI structures. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for creating intervention frameworks and monitoring fidelity of implementation. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling daily RTI time as the schedule allows it and assigning intervention staff and for monitoring student progress. Teachers and Interventionists will be responsible for delivering differentiated small-group instruction and documenting student outcomes.

Funding Sources: SPED RTI supports and staffing 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $5,000, Interventionist 420- Compensatory Education, $50,000, Intervention materials 211- Title I Part A, $10,000, Intervention materials 429- Local Accountability Grant, $10,000, Language development interventions for EB students 263- Title III- LEP, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide extended learning opportunities through after-school programs, Saturday academies, and summer intervention sessions for students performing below Approaches, with targeted lessons aligned to high-priority TEKS in Reading, Math, Science, and Social Studies.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By extending learning beyond the school day, students who require additional instructional time will have more opportunities to master readiness standards. This will accelerate closing learning gaps, improve STAAR Approaches rates, and support subgroup equity for EB and SPED students.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring equitable extended learning opportunities across campuses. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling and staffing the extended learning programs and for monitoring instructional quality. Teachers will be responsible for delivering intervention lessons, progress monitoring, and communicating student growth to families.

Funding Sources: Supplemental language support for EB students in extended programs 263- Title III- LEP, $5,000, Stipends, Student snacks 211- Title I Part A, $5,000, SPED supports in extended programs 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $5,000, Stipends, Student snacks 429- Local Accountability Grant, $25,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

By June 2027, GRS will increase the percentage of students achieving Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR from 34% (2026 baseline) to 50% across all tested subjects.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Conduct district-wide curriculum alignment audits to ensure instruction in Reading, Math, Science, and Social Studies is fully aligned with TEKS readiness standards, STAAR blueprints, and district pacing guides. These audits will include lesson plan reviews, classroom walk-throughs, and teacher feedback cycles to guarantee consistent rigor and coverage across all campuses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instruction will be more tightly aligned to state standards, reducing gaps between what is taught and what is tested. This will ensure that students receive rigorous instruction at the right depth, moving a greater percentage from Approaches to Meets performance levels.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring the audits are carried out across all campuses with fidelity. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for developing the audit process, reviewing instructional documents, and identifying gaps. The Campus Principals will be responsible for conducting campus-level walk-throughs and supporting teachers in adjusting lesson delivery and for providing targeted support to teachers based on audit findings. The Teachers will be responsible for implementing aligned lessons and making adjustments identified during the audits.

Funding Sources: Professional development and training on TEKS rigor and alignment 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide targeted professional development for teachers on Lead4Ward instructional strategies and the Fundamental 5 framework, with a focus on higher-order questioning, checks for understanding, and student engagement practices that increase rigor and move students from Approaches to Meets.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will consistently implement high-yield strategies that challenge students beyond recall and low-level tasks. As a result, instruction will become more rigorous, student engagement will increase, and a greater number of students will perform at Meets on STAAR.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring resources are allocated for professional development. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for planning and coordinating Lead4Ward and Fundamental 5 training. The Campus Principals will be responsible for monitoring classroom implementation during walk-throughs and for modeling strategies, supporting teachers during implementation, and providing feedback. The Teachers will be responsible for incorporating the strategies into daily instruction and monitoring student engagement and mastery.

Funding Sources: Saturday Learning Academy session 211- Title I Part A, $3,000, Professional development, training sessions, materials 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Establish structured Professional Learning Community (PLC) protocols where teachers analyze student data to plan targeted instruction using released STAAR items, Lead4Ward field guides, and TEKS rigor analysis.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will focus on moving students who are already near grade-level proficiency into Meets, leveraging precision instruction and collaborative planning. This will raise the overall percentage of students achieving Meets, directly impacting accountability results.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district-wide expectations for PLCs are consistent. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for providing PLC protocols, training, and monitoring of fidelity. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling and leading PLCs, ensuring teachers engage in data-driven planning and for supporting PLCs by guiding data analysis and modeling lesson adjustments. The Teachers will be responsible for identifying bubble students, implementing targeted instruction, and tracking progress toward Meets.

Funding Sources: PLC materials, STAAR resources 211- Title I Part A, $3,000, PLC facilitation and data-driven practices Training 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Implement student tracking and goal-setting conferences where students review their assessment data (MAP Growth, benchmarks, and STAAR predictors) with teachers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and develop action steps to reach Meets performance.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will take ownership of their learning by understanding their current performance and setting clear, achievable goals. Increased student accountability will drive higher engagement, leading to improved outcomes, especially for students who are close to Meets level.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring that student goal-setting practices are adopted district-wide. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for providing goal-setting templates and training staff on implementation. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling regular goal-setting conferences and ensuring student progress is tracked and for supporting teachers in using data effectively during conferences. The Teachers will be responsible for leading goal-setting conferences with students, updating progress trackers, and communicating results to families.

Funding Sources: Materials, Folders, Templates, Trackers. 211- Title I Part A, $3,000, Training for teachers on student-led goal setting and data use 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 5 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide short-cycle tutorial interventions after school and on select Saturdays for students who have not yet reached the Approaches level, with instruction focused on foundational skills, prerequisite standards, targeted skill gaps, STAAR item types, and strategies to build readiness for grade-level expectations.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By providing additional time and instruction on students who have not reached the Approaches level, the district will accelerate their progress and significantly increase the percentage of students achieving Approaches and Meets on STAAR.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring funding and resources are equitably distributed for tutorials and Saturday schools. The Assistant Superintendent and Principals will be responsible for designing the tutorials and Saturday schools framework, selecting TEKS focus areas, and monitoring effectiveness. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling tutorials and Saturday schools, recruiting teachers, and ensuring student participation. The Campus Principals will be responsible for training and supporting teachers in delivering rigorous, targeted lessons. The Teachers will be responsible for implementing tutorials and Saturday school instruction, and monitoring student mastery.

Funding Sources: Teacher stipends, snacks for students attending Saturday School, instructional resources 211- Title I Part A, $5,000, Professional development for rigorous STAAR strategies 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Teacher stipends, snacks for students attending Saturday School, instructional resources 429- Local Accountability Grant, $25,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, GRS will increase the percentage of students achieving Masters Grade Level on STAAR from 13% (2026 baseline) to 20% across all tested subjects.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Implement inquiry-based, problem-solving approaches in Science and Social Studies instruction through labs, response to reading critical thinking, project-based tasks, and cross-curricular writing assignments. This strategy will target critical thinking and analysis skills required for Masters performance on STAAR.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will engage in deeper learning experiences that strengthen conceptual understanding, problem-solving, and analytical writing. These practices will directly increase the percentage of students achieving Masters in Science and Social Studies, two of the lowest-performing areas in the 2026 accountability.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district-level support and resource allocation. The Assistant Superintendent for developing inquiry-based instructional frameworks and ensuring TEKS alignment. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling labs, response to reading check-up meetings, and ensuring inquiry-based practices are consistently implemented and for training teachers in inquiry-based methods, modeling lessons, and monitoring implementation. The Teachers will be responsible for designing and facilitating labs, using response to reading critical thinking strategies, and projects that allow students to apply higher-order thinking skills.

Funding Sources: Lab kits, DBQ resources, STAAR-aligned supplemental resouces 211- Title I Part A, $10,000, Professional development on inquiry and project-based instruction 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $5,000, STAAR-aligned supplemental resouces 429- Local Accountability Grant, $10,000, Extended learning opportunities for at-risk students through labs/projects 420- Compensatory Education, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide targeted professional development for teachers on advanced differentiation strategies, including tiered assignments, flexible grouping, high-order thinking questions and tasks, and

strategies for pushing students from Meets to Masters. We will emphasize balancing conceptual and procedural rigor in Math, advanced comprehension in Reading, and analytical writing in Science and Social Studies.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will be equipped with instructional strategies that challenge high-achieving students, fostering deeper learning and critical thinking. This will increase the number of students reaching Masters performance across tested subjects.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for securing funding and ensuring system-wide commitment to high-rigor instruction. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing and coordinating differentiation training aligned with district priorities. The Campus Principals will be responsible for ensuring teachers attend sessions and apply differentiation strategies in their classrooms and for modeling differentiation techniques, providing coaching, and monitoring implementation. The Teachers will be responsible for embedding differentiation into lesson design and actively challenging students working at or above grade level.

Funding Sources: Targeted support for advanced at-risk learners 420- Compensatory Education, $3,000, Professional development and training sessions 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Use benchmark assessments, MAP Growth data, and STAAR predictors to identify students performing just below the Masters threshold and provide targeted enrichment through small-group instruction, tutoring, and advanced practice opportunities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By focusing on students within reach of Masters, we will maximize the likelihood of moving them from Meets to Masters, directly increasing our overall Masters percentage and improving accountability ratings.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring resources and staffing are allocated to support the activities. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing identification protocols, providing teachers with data tools, and monitoring fidelity. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling targeted support sessions and ensuring identified students are consistently served and for training teachers in enrichment lesson design, supporting tutoring structures, and monitoring progress. The Teachers will be responsible for implementing enrichment lessons, tracking progress of bubble-to-Masters students, and adjusting instruction as needed.

Funding Sources: Instructional resources 211- Title I Part A, $5,000, Supports for EB students identified as bubble-to-Masters, including bilingual enrichment 263- Title III- LEP, $3,000, Training on advanced lesson design for bubble students to push them to master 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Support for at-risk students who qualify as bubble-to-Masters 420- Compensatory Education, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, GRS will reduce the performance gap between All Students and Emergent Bilingual and Special Education students by at least 10 percentage points in Reading and Math, while ensuring all federally and state-identified subgroups (EB, SPED, At-Risk, Economically Disadvantaged) meet Closing the Gaps participation requirements.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Implement dedicated intervention blocks during the instructional day for EB and SPED students, focused on priority TEKS in Reading and Math. Intervention will be delivered through small-group instruction, scaffolded supports, and use of research-based intervention programs to close achievement gaps.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students in EB and SPED subgroups will receive consistent, targeted instructional support that accelerates their progress, reduces achievement gaps, and increases the percentage of these subgroups meeting grade-level standards.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district resources are allocated to support intervention blocks. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing the intervention framework and aligning it to priority TEKS. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling daily/weekly intervention blocks within the master schedule and for providing training to teachers and interventionists, monitoring lesson quality, and ensuring fidelity to intervention protocols. The Teachers and Interventionists will be responsible for delivering small-group instruction, progress monitoring student growth, and adjusting supports based on data.

Funding Sources: Intervention supplemental resources, stipends for intervention support during Saturday School 429- Local Accountability Grant, $10,000, Language development supports for EB students 263- Title III- LEP, $5,000, SPED instructional supports, accommodations, and materials 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $5,000, Professional development on small-group and scaffolding strategies 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Intervention supplemental resources, stipends for intervention support during Saturday School 211- Title I Part A, $10,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Embed language-rich instructional practices across all content areas by using structured academic vocabulary routines, sentence stems, and language supports. This ensures EB students develop English proficiency while mastering grade-level TEKS in Reading, Math, Science, and Social Studies.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: EB students will increase both English language proficiency and academic performance, reducing the performance gap with all students in Reading and Math and improving TELPAS and STAAR outcomes.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring compliance with EB program requirements and allocation of Title III funds. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for integrating language objectives into curriculum frameworks. The Bilingual/ESL Coordinator will be responsible for designing and leading professional development for vocabulary, and language skills strategies. The Campus Principals will be responsible for monitoring classroom implementation of EB strategies and for modeling language-rich practices and providing feedback. The Teachers will be responsible for embedding academic language supports in daily lessons and tracking EB student progress.

Funding Sources: Resources, training, program supports for EB students 263- Title III- LEP, $10,000, Supports for EB students identified as at-risk 420- Compensatory Education, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide consistent SPED push-in services that allow students with disabilities to access grade-level content. Ensure that general education and SPED teachers collaborate in lesson planning, accommodations, and progress monitoring to close achievement gaps.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SPED students will have greater access to rigorous, grade-level instruction while receiving necessary supports, leading to improved proficiency rates in Reading and Math and reducing subgroup performance gaps.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring compliance with IDEA requirements and resource allocation for SPED supports. The Director of Special Education Program will be responsible for developing and monitoring co-teaching models across campuses as well as scheduling SPED push-in services and promoting collaborative planning time. The Campus Principals will be responsible for monitoring SPED push-in services and ensuring collaborative planning time and for supporting general education teachers with strategies for inclusion and accommodations. The SPED Teachers will be responsible for delivering push-in supports, collaborating with general education teachers, and tracking IEP goal progress. The General Education Teachers will be responsible for differentiating lessons, applying accommodations, and working collaboratively with SPED staff.

Funding Sources: PD for general education teachers on inclusive practices 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Supplemental supports for SPED subgroup instruction 211- Title I Part A, $10,000, SPED teacher supports, resources, compliance tools 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 4

Conduct regular data digs focused specifically on subgroup performance (EB, SPED, At-Risk, Economically Disadvantaged). Use MAP Growth, STAAR predictors, and benchmark assessments to track subgroup progress, identify learning gaps, and adjust interventions accordingly.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Subgroup performance trends will be identified and addressed in real time, enabling teachers and leaders to close achievement gaps proactively. This will support the district in reducing performance gaps in Reading and Math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring accountability structures support subgroup monitoring. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing data protocols and subgroup reporting templates. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling and facilitating data dig meetings with a subgroup focus and for supporting teachers in analyzing data and aligning instructional responses. The Teachers will be responsible for using subgroup data to adjust instruction and track progress for EB, SPED, and other identified students.

Funding Sources: Data tools and professional development 211- Title I Part A, $3,000, PD on data-driven decision-making 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, argeted supports identified from subgroup data analysis 420- Compensatory Education, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 5 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Strengthen parent and family engagement for EB, SPED, At-Risk, and Economically Disadvantaged students by offering bilingual workshops, SPED family trainings, and targeted resources. Provide families with clear data on student progress and practical tools to support learning at home.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will be better equipped to support academic growth, improving subgroup student performance and participation. Increased family-school partnerships will directly contribute to closing performance gaps in Reading and Math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring parent engagement is prioritized districtwide. The Assistant Superintendent who is in charge of the Federal & Special Programs will be responsible for coordinating Title I, Title III, and SPED parent engagement activities. The Campus Principals will be responsible for implementing family engagement plans on each campus. The Special Education Director and the Bilingual Director will be responsible for organizing workshops and creating accessible resources for families. The Teachers will be responsible for communicating subgroup student progress to parents and involving families in intervention supports.

Funding Sources: Targeted resources for families of at-risk students 420- Compensatory Education, $3,000, Bilingual resources for EB families 263- Title III- LEP, $3,000, SPED parent training and support resources 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $3,000, Parent workshops, family resources, event support 211- Title I Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

By June 2027, at least 70% of students will meet or exceed expected growth in Reading and Math, as

measured by STAAR Progress Measures and MAP Growth, with 100% of students not meeting STAAR standards receiving accelerated instruction in compliance with HB 1416.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Develop and implement individualized accelerated instruction plans for all students who do not meet grade-level standards on STAAR, ensuring compliance with HB 1416 requirements of 15/30 hours of accelerated instruction. Plans will outline instructional supports, and progress monitoring procedures.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students who did not meet STAAR standards will receive documented, grade-level accelerated instruction. This will ensure compliance with HB 1416 while improving student growth rates, aiming to help students achieve grade-level mastery.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district-wide compliance with HB 1416. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for planning MTSS templates, processes, and procedures, and providing training to campuses. The Campus Principals will be responsible for assigning teachers/interventionists and scheduling accelerated instruction sessions and for supporting teachers with instructional strategies aligned to their students' individual plans. The Teachers and Interventionists will be responsible for delivering accelerated instruction, documenting completion of required hours, and monitoring student progress.

Funding Sources: PD on accelerated instruction practices 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Intervention resources and supplemental supports 211- Title I Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Implement a districtwide progress monitoring system that uses MAP Growth, benchmarks, and classroom assessments on a bi-weekly basis to track student progress in Reading and Math. This system will include subgroup-specific reporting and teacher data conferences to ensure interventions are timely and targeted.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and leaders will have ongoing monitoring of students' progress, enabling them to make instructional adjustments promptly. This will ensure that at least 50% of students meet or exceed growth expectations by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring accountability structures are in place for progress monitoring. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing, monitoring protocols, and ensuring consistency across campuses. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling regular data conferences and holding staff accountable for using progress data and for supporting teachers in interpreting MAP and benchmark results and applying insights to lesson planning. The Teachers will be responsible for monitoring student progress bi-weekly, adjusting instruction, and documenting growth trends.

Funding Sources: Data tools and benchmark resources 211- Title I Part A, $5,000, Professional development on progress monitoring 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Supports for monitoring at-risk student growth 420- Compensatory Education, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide targeted small-group tutoring in Reading and Math for students performing below grade level, with sessions embedded during the instructional day and extended into after-school time as needed. Tutoring will focus on priority TEKS and skills identified through progress monitoring.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students who are below grade level will receive additional, focused instructional time in small settings, accelerating their learning and increasing the percentage of students meeting expected growth.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring funding and staffing are allocated to support tutoring programs. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing tutoring frameworks and aligning them with HB 1416. The Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling small-group tutoring sessions within the school day and organizing after-school tutoring and for training teachers in effective small-group strategies. The Teachers and Interventionists will be responsible for delivering tutoring sessions, documenting student progress, and ensuring lessons are aligned with priority TEKS.

Funding Sources: Tutoring supports for at-risk students 420- Compensatory Education, $10,000, SPED tutoring supports and accommodations 224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed, $10,000, Supports for EB students in tutoring sessions 263- Title III- LEP, $10,000, Instructional resources 429- Local Accountability Grant, $5,000, Instructional resources 211- Title I Part A, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide ongoing professional development for teachers focused on designing and delivering growth-oriented instruction. Training will emphasize the use of progress monitoring data, prioritization of readiness TEKS, scaffolding for struggling learners, and instructional adjustments to accelerate student growth.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will build capacity to design lessons that foster measurable growth for all students, particularly those below grade level. Improved instructional practices will result in more students meeting or exceeding growth targets on STAAR and MAP.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district-wide emphasis on teacher growth capacity. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing PD content and coordinating delivery aligned to district instructional priorities. The Campus Principals will be responsible for ensuring teachers attend sessions and apply strategies in classrooms and for modeling growth-oriented instructional strategies, providing coaching feedback, and monitoring implementation. The Teachers will be responsible for embedding growth strategies into daily instruction, tracking student progress, and adjusting based on data.

Funding Sources: Professional development and training sessions 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000, Supports for growth-focused planning for at-risk students 420- Compensatory Education, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Goal 2

Golden Rule Charter School will strengthen teacher effectiveness and retention by providing clear role definitions, intentional professional development, and sustainable talent pipeline strategies to ensure consistent, high-quality instruction across all campuses.

Performance Objective 1

☑ **High Priority**

By June 2027, 100% of district and campus staff will have updated job descriptions, clearly defined decision-making protocols, and consistent communication channels, reducing duplication of efforts and confusion.

Evaluation Data Source: Updated job descriptions, organizational flow charts, staff feedback surveys

Strategy 1

Update all district and campus job descriptions using a standardized format that clearly defines roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority to ensure consistency and alignment across campuses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff will have clarity about their duties and reporting structures, reducing overlap, duplication of tasks, and confusion. This will increase operational efficiency and accountability districtwide.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring oversight and approval of all finalized job descriptions. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing the standardized job description template and coordinating revisions. The Campus Principals will be responsible for reviewing campus-specific roles and ensuring accuracy of teacher and staff descriptions. The Central Office Directors (Special Programs, Bilingual, etc.) will be responsible for aligning program-specific job roles. Teachers and staff will be responsible for reviewing and acknowledging their updated descriptions to confirm role understanding.

Funding Sources: HR training on compliance with state/federal role definitions 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2

Develop and publish a districtwide decision-making flowchart that identifies points of contact, authority levels, and escalation protocols to improve communication and efficiency across campuses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff will know exactly who to contact for specific needs, reducing miscommunication, delays, and unnecessary duplication of work. The flowchart will also streamline decision-making and improve accountability across the district.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for final approval and distribution of the flowchart. The Director of Human Resources will be responsible for drafting the districtwide flowchart template. The Central Office Directors (Curriculum, Special Programs, Finance, etc.) will be responsible for providing content about their department's points of contact and decision-making processes. The Campus Principals will be responsible for campus-level additions and ensuring all staff are trained in using the flowchart.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Hold quarterly cross-campus leadership meetings to review job role implementation, communication protocols, and decision-making practices, ensuring alignment and consistency across the district.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Leadership teams will maintain alignment on district expectations, quickly address emerging communication challenges, and foster stronger collaboration across campuses. This will reduce misunderstandings, improve efficiency, and create a unified organizational culture.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for setting the agenda and ensuring alignment with district priorities. The Director of Human Resources will be responsible for facilitating sessions on role clarity and communication issues. The Campus Principals will be responsible for sharing campus-level feedback and ensuring implementation of decisions. The Central Office Directors will be responsible for providing updates on department-specific initiatives and ensuring cross-department consistency.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

By June 2027, 90% of teachers will participate in district-aligned professional development, and at least 75% will demonstrate growth in instructional practices as measured by T-TESS, walkthroughs, and observations.

Evaluation Data Source: PD attendance records, coaching feedback forms, T-TESS evaluations, walkthrough data

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Design and deliver district-wide professional development sessions aligned with priority TEKS,

HB 1416 requirements, and instructional resources and Instructional strategies such as Lead4Ward, Fundamental 5, and HMH curriculum resources.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will gain the skills needed to align instruction with priority standards, effectively implement HB 1416 requirements for accelerated instruction, and improve classroom rigor. This will directly contribute to increased student performance and growth across all subgroups.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring PD aligns with district priorities and accountability targets. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing PD content and coordinating session delivery. Campus Principals will be responsible for ensuring teacher participation and monitoring the application at the campus level and for co-facilitating PD, modeling strategies. Teachers will be responsible for applying PD strategies in their classrooms and providing feedback on effectiveness.

Funding Sources: PD specifically addressing intervention strategies for at-risk students 420- Compensatory Education, $3,000, Resources aligned to priority TEKS and HB 1416 211- Title I Part A, $80,000, PD design, external trainers, 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $8,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Use walkthroughs, T-TESS evaluations, and coaching feedback to identify instructional gaps and customize professional development offerings to meet specific campus and teacher needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: PD will directly address the areas of greatest instructional need, ensuring more effective classroom implementation and measurable growth in teacher performance. Teachers will see PD as relevant and supportive rather than generic, increasing engagement and impact.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for emphasizing accountability in PD alignment with district goals. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for analyzing walkthrough and T-TESS data to identify districtwide trends and designing targeted PD offerings. Campus Principals will be responsible for collecting campus-specific data, recommending PD focus areas, and ensuring teacher attendance and for classroom observations to provide input into PD planning and follow up with implementation support. Teachers will be responsible for participating in PD and applying learned strategies in their instruction.

Funding Sources: Extra support for Target Support Improvement for campus 211- Title I Part A, $5,000, PD development, external trainers 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Establish ongoing coaching follow-up cycles after professional development sessions to ensure that teachers apply strategies learned in PD, with feedback loops to monitor fidelity of

implementation.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will consistently integrate new instructional strategies from PD into their daily practice. Coaching follow-ups will reinforce training, increase accountability, and directly improve classroom instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for setting expectations for coaching follow-ups across the district. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for developing follow-up protocols aligned to PD content. Campus Principals will be responsible for scheduling follow-up opportunities and monitoring teacher participation and for conducting classroom visits, providing feedback, and documenting evidence of implementation. Teachers will be responsible for applying PD strategies in their classrooms and reflecting on results during coaching sessions.

Funding Sources: Coaching training, tracking tools 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, GRS will strengthen existing partnerships with Dallas College, Region 10, and Lamar University to maintain teacher and leadership pipelines by: (a) continue the current partnership with Dallas College, (b) maintaining at least 3 Teacher Assistants into teacher certification pathways, and (c) maintaining participation in Lamar University's leadership preparation program to support aspiring administrators.

Evaluation Data Source: Residency participation logs, TA enrollment in Dallas College programs, leadership program enrollment data, retention reports

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Continue the existing Dallas College resident intern program with placement across campuses in high-need areas such as Bilingual Education.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Maintaining the resident intern program will strengthen the district's teacher pipeline, reduce the reliance on uncertified staff, and improve instruction in high-need areas. Residents will gain valuable hands-on experience, while GRS gains future candidates ready to transition into full-time roles.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for maintaining the district's strategic partnership with Dallas College. The Director of Human Resources will be responsible for coordinating recruitment efforts and ensuring interns are placed in high-need areas. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for aligning intern assignments with instructional priorities. Campus Principals will be responsible for supervising resident placement and providing feedback on intern performance. Mentor Teachers will be responsible for modeling effective instruction, coaching interns, and documenting progress.

Funding Sources: Mentor stipends, training, and supervision support 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $12,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Develop and implement a structured recruitment plan with Dallas College to support at least three Teacher Assistants annually in enrolling in teacher certification programs, prioritizing high-need areas such as Bilingual, Special Education, Math, and Science

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teacher Assistants will have a clear pathway to becoming certified teachers, strengthening the district's talent pipeline, reducing turnover, and addressing shortages in critical subject areas.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring TA-to-teacher recruitment remains a district priority. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for coordinating with Dallas College, identifying eligible TAs, and supporting their application and enrollment. Campus Principals will be responsible for recommending high-performing TAs for the program. Mentor Teachers will be responsible for providing professional guidance, classroom modeling, and ongoing support to TAs in training.

Funding Sources: Mentor support 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Continue the partnership with Lamar University to provide teachers interested in school leadership roles (AP, Principal, District Coordinator) with access to graduate-level coursework and leadership preparation programs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers aspiring to leadership roles will have a structured pathway for advancement, strengthening the district's succession planning and ensuring a pool of qualified internal candidates for future vacancies. This will improve retention by offering career growth opportunities within GRS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for sustaining the Lamar University partnership and ensuring alignment with district leadership needs. The Director of Human Resources will be responsible for tracking teacher interest and participation in the leadership pipeline. Campus Principals will be responsible for recommending high-potential teachers to the program. Teachers participating in the Lamar program will be responsible for completing coursework and applying their learning through campus leadership opportunities.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Goal 3

Golden Rule Charter School will strengthen school safety, climate, and facilities to ensure all students and staff learn and work in environments that are secure, supportive, and conducive to academic success.

Performance Objective 1

☑ **High Priority**

By June 2027, 100% of campuses will implement updated safety protocols and infrastructure improvements (controlled access doors, fencing, visitor systems, magnetic ID card access) to reduce campus vulnerabilities.

Evaluation Data Source: Safety audits, incident reports, drill logs, maintenance/upgrade records.

Strategy 1

Install/update controlled access systems (electronic locks, visitor management systems, fencing upgrades) at all campuses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: This strategy will reduce unauthorized entry and increase staff/student safety by ensuring all campuses have consistent and functioning controlled access points. It addresses CNA findings about campus vulnerabilities (unlocked doors, lack of fencing, outdated infrastructure). Implementation will directly improve compliance with state safety requirements and increase staff/student perception of safety as measured by surveys.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The superintendent will be responsible for overall oversight and ensuring that the project aligns with district safety priorities. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will be responsible for selecting vendors, managing installation, and ensuring the systems meet compliance standards. Campus principals, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will be responsible for ensuring that campus staff are trained and that the systems are used consistently. Campus office staff will be responsible for monitoring visitor check-in and check-out processes daily through the new system.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2

Implement a magnetic ID card system for all staff to ensure secure building access, track entry/exit points, and strengthen accountability in campus movement.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The ID card system will reduce the risk of unauthorized access, provide real-time data on building entry/exit, and increase staff/student perception of safety.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will oversee vendor selection, installation, and maintenance of the ID card system. Campus Principals will be responsible for ensuring compliance with ID card protocols at their campuses.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Establish a districtwide safety task force composed of principals, facilities staff, student services, parents, and board representatives to review safety data, prioritize upgrades, and monitor the effectiveness of safety measures.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The task force will ensure safety concerns are addressed systematically and equitably across campuses. This collaborative approach will provide transparency, strengthen community trust, and improve districtwide alignment on safety priorities.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for establishing and facilitating the district safety task force. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will provide technical input, data analysis, and progress updates on safety upgrades. Campus Principals will represent campus-level needs and ensure communication with their staff. Parent and board representatives will participate in monitoring and advising to ensure transparency and shared accountability.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, staff and student perception surveys will show at least a 10% increase in agreement with the statement "I feel safe and supported at school."

Evaluation Data Source: Student/Staff climate surveys, discipline reports, counseling logs, attendance records.

Strategy 1

Strengthen existing Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and anti-bullying programs by ensuring fidelity of implementation, consistent monitoring, and alignment across all campuses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students and staff will benefit from consistent implementation of SEL and anti-bullying practices, leading to improved perceptions of safety and support, decreased bullying incidents, and stronger student-teacher relationships.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring:
The Superintendent will be responsible for prioritizing SEL and anti-bullying programs at the district level. The Lead Counselor will oversee program consistency, monitoring, and data collection. Campus Principals will be responsible for ensuring staff implement SEL and anti-bullying practices with fidelity. Teachers and counselors will be responsible for embedding SEL practices into instruction and addressing student needs in real time.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide annual professional development for all staff on trauma-informed practices, de-escalation strategies, and building positive student relationships to promote a safe and supportive learning environment.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and staff will have the tools to better manage challenging behaviors, support students experiencing trauma, and create a more positive and inclusive campus climate. This will directly improve perceptions of safety and support among students and staff.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring trauma-informed practices are embedded in districtwide training priorities. The Lead Counselor, in coordination with the Director of Operations and Facilities, will be responsible for designing and coordinating annual training sessions. Campus Principals will ensure staff participation and reinforcement of training practices on their campuses. Teachers, counselors, and support staff will be responsible for applying trauma-informed and de-escalation strategies consistently in their daily work with students.

Funding Sources: Professional development sessions and facilitators 255- Title II, Part A, TPTR, $5,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Conduct student and staff climate surveys twice per year (fall and spring) to gather actionable feedback on perceptions of safety, support, and school climate, and use the results to guide adjustments at the campus and district levels.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Regularly gathering and analyzing perception data will allow the district to respond proactively to concerns, strengthen transparency, and monitor progress toward improving climate and safety. It will also increase staff and student trust that their voices are valued in shaping district decisions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring that survey results are reviewed at the district level and integrated into planning. The Lead Counselor, in coordination with the Director of Operations and Facilities, will be responsible for designing, administering, and analyzing surveys. Campus Principals will be responsible for communicating results to staff and students, and for implementing action steps in response to findings.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 3 ✅ High Priority

By June 2027, 100% of campuses will demonstrate full compliance with state-mandated safety drills, crisis response plans, and emergency communication protocols.

Evaluation Data Source: Safety drill logs, crisis management plans, staff training attendance records.

Strategy 1

Ensure 100% compliance with all state-mandated safety drills (fire, lockdown, shelter-in-place, evacuation) by maintaining a districtwide monitoring system and requiring campuses to submit drill documentation within required timelines.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Maintaining drill compliance will ensure campuses are prepared for emergencies, minimize response delays, and increase confidence among staff, students, and parents in the district's ability to manage crisis situations.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring compliance is prioritized across the district and reported to the Board. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will monitor drill schedules, review submitted documentation, and provide reminders to campuses. Campus Principals will be responsible for conducting required drills on schedule and submitting documentation. Teachers and staff will be responsible for practicing drills with students and reinforcing procedures.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2

Provide annual emergency response training for all staff, including substitutes, to ensure consistent knowledge of crisis procedures such as lockdowns, evacuations, medical emergencies, and communication protocols.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual training will equip staff with the confidence and skills to respond effectively during emergencies, reduce confusion, and strengthen student and staff safety. Including substitutes ensures continuity of preparedness in all classrooms.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring emergency preparedness is included as a districtwide training priority. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will coordinate training content, schedule trainers, and ensure documentation of participation. Campus Principals will be responsible for requiring attendance, reinforcing expectations, and monitoring staff preparedness throughout the year. Teachers, substitutes, and support staff will be responsible for applying training procedures during drills and actual emergencies.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Develop and implement a districtwide crisis communication plan that outlines clear procedures for parent notifications, staff updates, and coordination with local emergency responders during critical incidents.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A districtwide communication plan will ensure consistent, timely, and transparent messaging during emergencies. This will reduce misinformation, improve parent and staff confidence in crisis management, and support rapid coordination with law enforcement and emergency services.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for approving and communicating the district crisis communication plan. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will be responsible for drafting procedures, coordinating with local law enforcement, and ensuring the communication systems are functional. Campus Principals will be responsible for implementing the plan at the campus level and ensuring staff are trained in communication protocols. Office staff will be responsible for executing notification procedures, including calls, emails, and messages through designated systems.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 4

Create and maintain campus-specific safety binders with updated emergency procedures, floor plans, and contact lists to ensure staff have immediate access to critical information during emergencies.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Safety binders will provide a reliable, accessible resource for staff during emergencies, reducing response time and ensuring consistent procedures across all campuses. Staff confidence in preparedness will increase as they have clear reference materials for various scenarios.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring all campuses adopt and maintain safety binders as a districtwide requirement. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will develop the binder template and ensure consistency across campuses. Campus Principals will be responsible for maintaining up-to-date content and training staff on binder use. Teachers and staff will be responsible for familiarizing themselves with binder contents and using them during drills and emergencies.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, all campuses will receive annual facilities reviews, and at least 80% of identified critical facility needs will be addressed within the school year to ensure equitable learning environments.

Evaluation Data Source: Facility inspection reports, maintenance work orders, capital improvement records.

Strategy 1

Conduct quarterly facilities inspections at each campus using a standardized checklist to identify critical safety, accessibility, and instructional environment needs, and use results to create a priority list for the district.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Quarterly inspections will ensure consistent evaluation of facility conditions across all campuses, highlight safety or equity concerns early, and provide transparency in how facility improvements are prioritized and addressed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring inspections occur and that the results are integrated into district planning. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will lead inspections, standardize checklists, and compile districtwide reports. Campus Principals will assist with walkthroughs, provide input on campus-specific needs, and communicate results to staff. Custodial and maintenance staff will support inspections by providing technical details on facility systems.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2

Enforce consistent use of the facility ticketing system by requiring all leadership staff to submit maintenance and repair requests through the system and ensuring follow-up actions are tracked to completion.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Consistent use of the ticketing system will improve accountability, provide transparency on facility requests, and ensure that maintenance needs are addressed equitably across campuses. The system will also generate data to guide decision-making and prioritize recurring issues.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring accountability for districtwide ticketing system use. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will oversee the system, monitor request logs, and provide regular reports to district leadership. Campus Principals will be responsible for submitting requests exclusively through the ticketing system and following up on their status.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Establish campus-level facilities walkthrough teams composed of the custodian, and other maintenance representatives to conduct monthly walkthroughs using a standardized checklist, with findings submitted to the district ticketing system.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Regular campus walkthroughs will identify facility issues proactively, improve response times, and strengthen accountability by ensuring concerns are logged systematically. This will enhance equity across campuses and create a culture of shared responsibility for safe and effective learning environments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring walkthrough teams are established and functioning at every campus. The Director of Operations and Facilities, in coordination with the Director of Student Services, will provide the standardized checklist, review walkthrough reports, and ensure findings are entered into the district ticketing system. Custodians will contribute technical expertise on facility conditions.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Goal 4 Golden Rule Charter School will Strengthen Family and Community Engagement to Support Student Success

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, at least 75% of parents and 70% of students in grades 3-8 will report through surveys that they feel engaged, supported, and valued in the learning process, as measured by EOY surveys and participation logs.

Evaluation Data Source: Parent and student surveys, family engagement logs, student council/club minutes, extracurricular participation data.

Strategy 1

Establish parent and student advisory/leadership councils at each campus, ensuring structured representation in decision-making bodies such as SBDM, LPAC, and SHAC. Each council will meet 3 times a year to provide feedback on school initiatives, promote family and student voice, and contribute to district planning.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parent and student voices will be consistently incorporated into campus and district-level decisions, leading to higher engagement, stronger trust, and improved alignment between school priorities and community expectations.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring district-level representation of councils and reporting outcomes to the Board. The Director of Student Services will be responsible for creating standardized council guidelines and agendas. Campus Principals will be responsible for establishing and facilitating the meetings at their schools. Counselors and teachers will be responsible for recruiting students and parents to participate and preparing them for leadership roles. Parents and students will be responsible for attending, contributing feedback, and collaborating with campus leadership.

Funding Sources: Parent engagement support, translation, materials 211- Title I Part A, $6,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2

Implement structured survey cycles in the fall and spring for both parents and students (grades 3-8) to collect actionable feedback on engagement, communication, and learning support. Results will be disaggregated by campus and reviewed in council meetings, principal meetings, and district leadership sessions to inform decision-making.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Feedback from parents and students will guide adjustments to campus practices, leading to stronger relationships, better communication, and alignment of district initiatives with family and student needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring survey data is reviewed at the district level and tied to decision-making. The Director of Student Services will design the survey instruments and compile results into actionable reports. Campus Principals will be responsible for administering surveys and reviewing results with campus staff and councils. Teachers will be responsible for encouraging student participation and reviewing classroom-level trends. Parents and students will be responsible for completing the surveys honestly and providing feedback for improvement.

Funding Sources: Survey tools, translation, communication of results 211- Title I Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Develop and implement a recognition program that highlights parent and student contributions to the school community through events, volunteer work, leadership roles, and academic or extracurricular participation. Recognition will take place during awards ceremonies, on social media, and in district newsletters.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Publicly acknowledging parents and students will build a culture of appreciation, increase morale, and encourage higher levels of engagement and participation across all campuses.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring recognition of contributions is prioritized at the district level. The Lead Counselor will coordinate districtwide recognition events and ensure consistent branding across campuses. Campus Principals will be responsible for identifying parent and student nominees and highlighting them during assemblies and newsletters. Teachers and counselors will be responsible for submitting nominations and supporting recognition of students and parents in classrooms. Parents and students will be responsible for actively engaging in activities and events to qualify for recognition.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, GRS will expand partnerships with community organizations to provide parent workshops, health and wellness resources, and family support services, with at least 50% of families accessing one or more offerings.

Evaluation Data Source: Parent workshop logs, partner program documentation, family participation records.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Develop and deliver a series of resource workshops for families on topics such as literacy and math support at home, digital literacy, parenting skills, financial literacy, and mental health

awareness. Workshops will be scheduled flexibly (evenings/weekends) and offered in English and Spanish.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will have greater access to knowledge and resources to support their children's learning and well-being, leading to stronger academic outcomes and improved home-school connections.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will ensure workshops are prioritized as part of the district's family engagement plan. The Lead Counselor will coordinate workshop scheduling, curriculum, and partnerships with external presenters. Campus Principals will be responsible for hosting workshops and recruiting parent participants. Teachers, counselors, and instructional aides will be responsible for facilitating or supporting sessions. Parents will be responsible for participating and applying learned strategies to support student learning at home.

Funding Sources: Family engagement workshops, translation, materials 211- Title I Part A, $6,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Expand partnerships with local agencies, nonprofits, and community organizations (e.g., health clinics, libraries, churches, social service providers) to bring on-site or virtual resources directly to families. Offer services such as health fairs, ESL classes for parents, and after-school enrichment opportunities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will have improved access to community services, reducing barriers to learning, health, and well-being. These supports will enhance student success by addressing needs beyond the classroom.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring partnership efforts align with district priorities. The Lead Counselor will identify potential partners, formalize agreements, and coordinate logistics. Campus Principals will be responsible for hosting events and facilitating family access. Teachers and counselors will be responsible for connecting families to services and providing feedback on unmet needs. Partner organizations will be responsible for delivering services with fidelity.

Funding Sources: Parent engagement initiatives, partnership coordination 211- Title I Part A, $6,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Develop a centralized Parent Resource Hub (Parent Academy) to provide families with access to guides, workshop materials, referrals to community services, and tools for supporting student learning.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will have consistent, easy access to resources that help them support their children's academic and personal development. This will reduce barriers, standardize access across campuses, and strengthen home-school connections.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will ensure the hub is integrated into the district's overall family engagement strategy. The Assistant Superintendent will be responsible for designing, curating, and updating the online hub, as well as coordinating with partners to provide content. Campus Principals will be responsible for maintaining physical resource stations and promoting them to families. Teachers and counselors will be responsible for directing families to the hub and incorporating resources into family conferences. Parents will be responsible for accessing and utilizing the resources provided.

Funding Sources: Website development, printing, translation 211- Title I Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, 100% of campuses will implement consistent two-way communication systems (ClassDojo, newsletters, portals, etc.), with at least 80% of parents reporting satisfaction with school-home communication.

Evaluation Data Source: Parent surveys, communication platform reports, newsletters, website analytics.

Strategy 1

Standardize the use of communication tools across all campuses (ClassDojo, newsletters, Social Media, and parent portals) to ensure families receive consistent, reliable, and accessible information regardless of campus.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parents will have a clear, predictable communication system, increasing satisfaction and reducing confusion caused by inconsistent tools across campuses.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring communication consistency is a district priority. The Lead Counselor will establish districtwide communication standards and monitor implementation. Campus Principals will be responsible for ensuring all staff follow the standards at their campus. Teachers and office staff will be responsible for implementing communication systems consistently and responding to parent communication in a timely manner. Parents will be responsible for engaging with the communication tools provided.

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Provide training sessions for parents on how to use district communication tools (Class Dojo,

parent portals, and newsletters). Sessions will be available in English and Spanish, offered both in person and virtually, to ensure equitable access.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parents will be better equipped to access and use communication platforms, leading to improved two-way communication, stronger relationships with schools, and increased satisfaction with school-home connections.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring technology training for parents is embedded in the district's family engagement priorities. The Assistant Superintendent, in coordination with the Lead Counselor will design training modules, schedule sessions, and coordinate translation. Campus Principals will be responsible for hosting training sessions and encouraging parent participation. Technology staff and instructional aides will be responsible for facilitating sessions and providing one-on-one assistance as needed. Parents will be responsible for attending trainings and applying the knowledge to engage effectively with the school.

Funding Sources: Training sessions, materials, translation services 211- Title I Part A, $3,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

By June 2027, GRS will increase parent engagement in students' academic learning by providing opportunities and resources that encourage parents to support reading at home, assist with homework, and participate in parent academic activities, with at least 60% parent participation in these activities throughout the school year.

Evaluation Data Source: Event attendance logs, parent/student survey feedback, and program documentation.

Strategy 1

Plan and host Parents Academy sessions and activities throughout the school year to provide parents with practical strategies, resources, and activities to support student learning at home, with a particular focus on literacy and mathematics, including reading with students, supporting homework, and reinforcing academic skills.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The Parents Academy will increase parent engagement and build families' capacity to support student learning at home. Parents will gain practical strategies to strengthen literacy and mathematics skills, support reading at home, assist with homework, and reinforce classroom learning, leading to stronger home-school partnerships and improved student academic support.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will ensure that parent engagement and family academic support remain district priorities. The Lead Counselor will coordinate Parents Academy planning, provide resources and materials, and support consistent implementation across campuses. Campus Principals will promote Parents Academy sessions, encourage parent participation, and ensure opportunities are accessible to families. Teachers and instructional staff will provide parents with practical strategies and activities to support literacy and mathematics learning at home. Parents will participate in Parents Academy sessions or activities and apply learned strategies by engaging students in reading, homework support, and other academic activities at home.

Funding Sources: Family engagement activities, materials 211- Title I Part A, $6,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Host Family Literacy & Math Nights at campuses, featuring interactive sessions led by teachers to equip families with strategies to support student learning at home. Activities will include bilingual resources, hands-on activities, and take-home learning kits.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will gain practical tools to reinforce literacy and math learning, directly contributing to improved student academic performance while building stronger family-school connections.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring literacy and math nights are embedded in the district's family engagement plan. The Director of Student Services will design event frameworks and ensure resources are aligned with district academic priorities. Campus Principals will be responsible for organizing events and promoting them to families. Teachers will be responsible for facilitating sessions, preparing activities, and distributing take-home kits. Parents and students will be responsible for participating actively and applying strategies at home.

Funding Sources: Fmily engagement activities, instructional kits, translation 211- Title I Part A, $6,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

Strategy 3

Establish partnerships with local businesses, churches, and community organizations to co-sponsor events, provide venues, volunteer support, and resources for districtwide engagement events such as festivals and family nights.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Community partnerships will reduce financial and logistical barriers for hosting events while broadening outreach, creating stronger ties between Golden Rule Schools and the local community, and increasing event participation.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: The Superintendent will be responsible for ensuring partnerships align with district goals. The Lead Counselor will coordinate partnership outreach and resource contributions. Campus Principals will be responsible for cultivating local relationships and facilitating participation at the school level. Partners will be responsible for providing sponsorship, venues, or resources as agreed.

Funding Sources: Family engagement 211- Title I Part A, $6,000

Formative Reviews

November	January	March	June

State Compensatory Education

State Compensatory

Budget for Golden Rule - DeSoto

Total SCE Funds: $1,924,475.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 13

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Personnel for Golden Rule - DeSoto

Name	Position	FTE
Alejandra Aragon	Aide PE	1
Daisy Perez	Teacher Elementary	1
Douglas Embry	Counselor	1
Kerry Carr	Permanent Sub	1
Keyla Cuevas	Aide Early Education	1
Lavossha Smith	Permanent Sub	1
Maria Paredes	Aide Early Education	1
Nadia McCoy	Counselor	1
Rosa Rodriguez	Counselor	1
Shila Jackson	Aide Early Education	1
Sugedi Gomez Ayala	Aide	1
Viola Luna	Permanent Sub	1
Yolanda Ramos Stocker	Bilingual Director	1

Title I Summary

Title I Personnel

Name	Position	Program	FTE
Berliz Torres Salgado	Aide	Teacher-Early Education	1
Deysy Garcia Solache	Aide	Aide	1
Esmeralda Gonzalez	Aide	Aide-Early Education	1
Esmeralda Ramirez	Aide	Aide-Early Education	1
Jennifer Aguilar	Aide	Aide-Early Education	1
Luisa Miranda	Aide	Aide-Early Education	1
Olivia Acuna	Aide	Aide-Early Education	1

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211- Title I Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1	Lead4Ward resources, PLC substitutes, materials	--	$3,000.00
1	1	2	Tutoring stipends, intervention materials	--	$15,000.00
1	1	3	Intervention materials	--	$10,000.00
1	1	4	Stipends, Student snacks	--	$5,000.00
1	2	2	Saturday Learning Academy session	--	$3,000.00
1	2	3	PLC materials, STAAR resources	--	$3,000.00
1	2	4	Materials, Folders, Templates, Trackers.	--	$3,000.00
1	2	5	Teacher stipends, snacks for students attending Saturday School, instructional resources	--	$5,000.00
1	3	1	Lab kits, DBQ resources, STAAR-aligned supplemental resouces	--	$10,000.00
1	3	3	Instructional resources	--	$5,000.00
1	4	1	Intervention supplemental resources, stipends for intervention support during Saturday School	--	$10,000.00
1	4	3	Supplemental supports for SPED subgroup instruction	--	$10,000.00
1	4	4	Data tools and professional development	--	$3,000.00
1	4	5	Parent workshops, family resources, event support	--	$3,000.00
1	5	1	Intervention resources and supplemental supports	--	$3,000.00
1	5	2	Data tools and benchmark resources	--	$5,000.00
1	5	3	Instructional resources	--	$5,000.00
2	2	1	Resources aligned to priority TEKS and HB 1416	--	$80,000.00
2	2	2	Extra support for Target Support Improvement for campus	--	$5,000.00
4	1	1	Parent engagement support, translation, materials	--	$6,000.00
4	1	2	Survey tools, translation, communication of results	--	$3,000.00
4	2	1	Family engagement workshops, translation, materials	--	$6,000.00

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
4	2	2	Parent engagement initiatives, partnership coordination	--	$6,000.00
4	2	3	Website development, printing, translation	--	$3,000.00
4	3	2	Training sessions, materials, translation services	--	$3,000.00
4	4	1	Family engagement activities, materials	--	$6,000.00
4	4	2	Fmily engagement activities, instructional kits, translation	--	$6,000.00
				Sub-Total	$231,000.00
4	4	3	Family engagement	--	$6,000.00

224- IDEA B- Formula Special Ed

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	SPED tutoring and accommodations	--	$5,000.00
1	1	3	SPED RTI supports and staffing	--	$5,000.00
1	1	4	SPED supports in extended programs	--	$5,000.00
1	4	1	SPED instructional supports, accommodations, and materials	--	$5,000.00
1	4	3	SPED teacher supports, resources, compliance tools	--	$5,000.00
1	4	5	SPED parent training and support resources	--	$3,000.00
1	5	3	SPED tutoring supports and accommodations	--	$10,000.00
				Sub-Total	$38,000.00

255- Title II, Part A, TPTR

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1	Teacher training in data analysis and TEKS alignment	--	$1,000.00
1	2	1	Professional development and training on TEKS rigor and alignment	--	$3,000.00
1	2	2	Professional development, training sessions, materials	--	$5,000.00
1	2	3	PLC facilitation and data-driven practices Training	--	$5,000.00
1	2	4	Training for teachers on student-led goal setting and data use	--	$3,000.00
1	2	5	Professional development for rigorous STAAR strategies	--	$3,000.00
1	3	1	Professional development on inquiry and project-based instruction	--	$5,000.00
1	3	2	Professional development and training sessions	--	$3,000.00
1	3	3	Training on advanced lesson design for bubble students to push them to master	--	$3,000.00
1	4	1	Professional development on small-group and scaffolding strategies	--	$3,000.00
1	4	3	PD for general education teachers on inclusive practices	--	$3,000.00
1	4	4	PD on data-driven decision-making	--	$3,000.00
1	5	1	PD on accelerated instruction practices	--	$3,000.00
1	5	2	Professional development on progress monitoring	--	$3,000.00
1	5	4	Professional development and training sessions	--	$3,000.00
2	1	1	HR training on compliance with state/ federal role definitions	--	$3,000.00
2	2	1	PD design, external trainers,	--	$8,000.00
2	2	2	PD development, external trainers	--	$5,000.00
2	2	3	Coaching training, tracking tools	--	$5,000.00
2	3	1	Mentor stipends, training, and supervision support	--	$12,000.00
2	3	2	Mentor support	--	$3,000.00
3	2	2	Professional development sessions and facilitators	--	$5,000.00
				Sub-Total	$90,000.00

263- Title III- LEP

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	Support for Emergent Bilingual students requiring tutoring	--	$5,000.00
1	1	3	Language development interventions for EB students	--	$5,000.00
1	1	4	Supplemental language support for EB students in extended programs	--	$5,000.00
1	3	3	Supports for EB students identified as bubble-to-Masters, including bilingual enrichment	--	$3,000.00
1	4	1	Language development supports for EB students	--	$5,000.00
1	4	2	Resources, training, program supports for EB students	--	$10,000.00
1	4	5	Bilingual resources for EB families	--	$3,000.00
1	5	3	Supports for EB students in tutoring sessions	--	$10,000.00
				Sub-Total	$46,000.00

420- Compensatory Education

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	3	Interventionist	--	$50,000.00
1	3	1	Extended learning opportunities for at-risk students through labs/projects	--	$3,000.00
1	3	2	Targeted support for advanced at-risk learners	--	$3,000.00
1	3	3	Support for at-risk students who qualify as bubble-to-Masters	--	$3,000.00
1	4	2	Supports for EB students identified as at-risk	--	$5,000.00
1	4	4	argeted supports identified from subgroup data analysis	--	$3,000.00
1	4	5	Targeted resources for families of at-risk students	--	$3,000.00
1	5	2	Supports for monitoring at-risk student growth	--	$5,000.00
1	5	3	Tutoring supports for at-risk students	--	$10,000.00
1	5	4	Supports for growth-focused planning for at-risk students	--	$5,000.00
2	2	1	PD specifically addressing intervention strategies for at-risk students	--	$3,000.00
				Sub-Total	$93,000.00

429- Local Accountability Grant

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	Tutoring stipends, intervention materials	--	$15,000.00
1	1	3	Intervention materials	--	$10,000.00
1	1	4	Stipends, Student snacks	--	$25,000.00
1	2	5	Teacher stipends, snacks for students attending Saturday School, instructional resources	--	$25,000.00
1	3	1	STAAR-aligned supplemental resouces	--	$10,000.00
1	4	1	Intervention supplemental resources, stipends for intervention support during Saturday School	--	$10,000.00
1	5	3	Instructional resources	--	$5,000.00
				Sub-Total	$100,000.00