Elgin Independent School District

Booker T. Washington Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
November 13, 2026 at 01:48 PM

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 3

Demographics 4

Student Learning 8

School Processes & Programs 11

Perceptions 14

Priority Problem Statements 16

Data Documentation for CNA 21

Improvement Planning Data 22

Accountability Data 22

Student Data: Assessments 22

Student Data: Student Groups 23

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 23

Employee Data 23

Parent/Community Data 23

Support Systems and Other Data 23

Goals 25

Goal 1 : LEVER 1:PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT THROUGH STRO... 26

Goal 2 : LEVER 2: ESSENTIAL ACTIONS AND KEY PRACTICES Each lever is defined... 36

Goal 3 : LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS The campus establi... 43

Goal 4 : LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MAT... 55

Goal 5 : LEVER 5: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CAPACITY BUILDING The ca... 76

Goal 6 : LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS The campus maintains stro... 82

Funding Summary 88

211 - Title I-Part A 89

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Booker T. Washington Elementary serves a diverse population of students in Pre-Kindergarten through fifth grade. According to 2025–2026 Texas Education Agency data, the campus enrolled 659 students, with a student population that is predominantly Hispanic (90.3%), followed by White (4.6%), African American (3.3%), students identifying with two or more races (1.5%), Asian (0.2%), and Pacific Islander (0.2%). The campus exited federal Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) because of improved performance, and TEA identified it for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) for Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students.

Booker T. Washington Elementary is a Title I schoolwide campus. The campus earned a D (67) in 2026, up from an F (58) in 2025, and is in the second year of its TEA-approved Turnaround Plan, which stays in effect until the campus earns a C or better. In 2026, the campus exited federal Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) because of improved performance, and TEA identified it for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) for Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students. Sixteen of our 31 teachers (52%) have five or fewer years of experience, so much of our instructional expertise is still developing.

The campus serves a significant population of students with diverse academic, linguistic, and socioeconomic needs. Approximately 76.9% of students are economically disadvantaged, while 65.0% are identified as Emergent Bilingual and 11.9% receive special education services.

Additionally, 2.3% of students experience homelessness, 2.1% are identified with dyslexia, 4.2% are classified as immigrant students, and 1.4% are identified as migratory students.

Booker T. Washington Elementary serves a predominantly Hispanic student population, with significant percentages of students identified as economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and at risk.

Booker T. Washington's attendance rate was 93.7%, and 22.8% of students were chronically absent.

With 22.8% of our students identified as chronically absent, approximately 150 of our 657 students are missing significant instructional time, limiting their access to consistent Tier 1 instruction and targeted interventions. Chronic absenteeism remains a barrier to academic achievement and closing learning gaps.

Emergent Bilingual students represent approximately 65% of Booker T. Washington Elementary's enrollment. According to our STAAR released data in Spring 2026, students taking the Spanish STAAR Reading Language Arts assessment demonstrated significant gaps in extended constructed response performance, with 65.2% of third-grade (current fourth-grade) students and 81.5% of fourth-grade (current fifth-grade) students earning an ECR score of 0 or 1, compared to 51.3% and 49.0% of students testing in English.

With 65% of our students identified as Emergent Bilingual, our greatest instructional need is ensuring that academic language development is intentionally embedded in daily Tier 1 instruction across all content areas. Students need consistent opportunities to develop academic vocabulary, engage in structured academic discourse, and strengthen their reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills to successfully access grade-level content.

Hispanic students represent 90.3% of Booker T. Washington Elementary's enrollment. Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results revealed that 45.8% of Hispanic students did not meet grade-level expectations, while only 27.9% achieved Meets Grade Level or above.

Economically disadvantaged students represent 76.9% of campus enrollment. Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results indicated that 45.8% of economically disadvantaged students did not meet grade-level expectations, identifying a significant mathematics performance need within one of the campus's largest student populations.

African American students represent approximately 3.3% of Booker T. Washington Elementary's enrollment. Spring 2026 STAAR results revealed that 66.7% of African American students tested in third and fourth grades (14 of 21) did not meet grade-level expectations in mathematics, with all six third-grade students (currently fourth-grade) performing at the Did Not Meet standard. These results identify mathematics as a significant performance concern for this student

group.

Staff experience data for 2025-2026 show that 14.1% of teachers had less than one year of experience, 37.9% had one to five years, 13.8% had six to ten years, 19.8% had 11 to 20 years, and 14.1% had 21 to 30 years.

Strengths

Booker T. Washington Elementary's diversity is a campus strength, providing opportunities to build strong relationships with students and families while celebrating their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The campus also demonstrates a commitment to improving student outcomes, moving from an F accountability rating (58) in 2024–2025 to a D rating (67) in 2025–2026.

Booker T. Washington Elementary demonstrated an 11-point increase in the Closing the Gaps accountability domain, improving from a score of 64 in 2024–2025 to 75 in 2025–2026. This improvement reflects positive progress in the campus's overall performance on accountability indicators designed to measure academic outcomes across student groups.

Booker T. Washington Elementary serves a culturally and linguistically diverse student population, with 90.3% of students identifying as Hispanic and 65% identified as Emergent Bilingual. This diversity provides opportunities to celebrate students' cultural backgrounds, promote bilingualism and biliteracy, and create meaningful learning experiences.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The campus serves a large Emergent Bilingual population, requiring consistent implementation of high-quality linguistic supports alongside rigorous grade-level instruction to ensure equitable access to the curriculum.	Linguistic accommodations, sheltered instruction strategies, and academic language development are not yet consistently planned into Tier 1 lessons in every classroom, and Emergent Bilingual resources are not consistently matched to students' English proficiency levels.
2 ★	The campus serves a high percentage of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students, requiring school systems that consistently provide equitable access to rigorous instruction, intervention, enrichment, academic resources, and additional learning opportunities.	Academic supports, enrichment opportunities, intervention, and supplemental resources are not yet consistently differentiated and monitored to ensure students with varying needs have equitable access to the supports necessary for success.
3 ★	The academic needs of students receiving specialized services require more consistent alignment between Tier 1 instruction, intervention, accommodations, and progress monitoring to ensure students have equitable opportunities to demonstrate academic growth and achievement.	Collaboration and instructional planning between general education, special education, intervention, and other support personnel are not yet sufficiently systematic to ensure accommodations, differentiation, and progress monitoring are consistently implemented.
4 ★	Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results revealed significant performance gaps among Hispanic and African American students. Of the Hispanic students tested, 45.8% performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard. Among African American students in grades 3 and 4, 66.7% (14 of 21) performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard, including 100% (6 of 6) of third-grade African American students.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently give students time to solve grade-level problems, explain their reasoning, and apply concepts on their own, and teachers do not consistently use checks for understanding to adjust instruction during the lesson.
5 ★	Spring 2026 STAAR Reading Language Arts results identified significant gaps in extended constructed response (ECR) performance. Among students with numeric ECR scores in the uploaded reports, 58.8% of third-grade students and 60.5% of fourth-grade students earned a score of 0 or 1. These results indicate a substantial need to improve students' ability to construct extended written responses.	Writing instruction has not consistently incorporated explicit modeling, structured opportunities for students to develop and support written responses with textual evidence, and timely feedback aligned to the STAAR ECR rubric. Inconsistent use of formative assessment data to identify and address writing weaknesses may contribute to low ECR performance.

6 ★	Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 22.8% of students missed 10% or more of school days in 2025-26.	The campus does not yet have a consistent early-warning system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Booker T. Washington Elementary serves students in Pre-Kindergarten through fifth grade and uses multiple assessment measures to monitor student achievement, academic growth, and instructional effectiveness. These assessments include the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), NWEA MAP Growth, district unit assessments, campus common formative assessments, and early literacy assessments. Assessment data are used to identify academic strengths, performance gaps, and instructional priorities across grade levels and student populations.

Booker T. Washington Elementary increased its overall accountability score from 58 (F) in 2025 to 67 (D) in 2026, representing a nine-point improvement.

Domain 1: Student Achievement increased from 55 (F) to 56 (F), indicating that overall academic achievement remains a significant area of need. Domain 2: School Progress increased from 53 (F) to 63 (D), while the Academic Growth component also improved from 53 to 63. Domain 3: Closing the Gaps demonstrated the greatest increase, improving from 64 (D) to 75 (C), an 11-point gain.

On the 2026 STAAR, 32% of students reached Meets Grade Level or above in Reading and 27% in Mathematics. Academic Growth remains a critical priority for improving campus accountability. Increasing Academic Growth from 63 to 70 is a targeted strategy toward achieving a C rating and exiting the Turnaround Plan requirement, provided other accountability indicators remain stable.

Additionally, 33 of the 105 students who achieved Meets or Masters in 2025 reportedly dropped at least one performance level in 2026, highlighting the need to sustain achievement while accelerating academic growth for all students.

Fall 2026 MAP Growth projections show the campus at 50 in Student Achievement, 65 in Academic Growth, 50 in Relative Performance, and 64 in Closing the Gaps, for a projected overall score of 65. That is two points below our 2026 score, so we have not yet locked in last year's gains.

In 2026, 10% of African American students and 29% of High Focus students reached Meets Grade Level or above in Reading, and 10% and 26% reached Meets Grade Level or above in Mathematics.

Although the campus demonstrated improvement in academic growth and Closing the Gaps, student achievement remains below the state's acceptable performance threshold. These results highlight the need to strengthen consistent implementation of high-quality instructional materials, rigorous grade-level instruction, formative assessment practices, and instructional adjustments based on student performance.

Spring 2026 STAAR mathematics results further identified performance concerns among Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, and African American students. These findings, together with the campus's NWEA MAP Growth results, indicate that students are demonstrating academic progress while continued attention is needed to increase grade-level achievement and mastery.

Beginning-of-Year NWEA MAP data, converted to STAAR-equivalent performance levels, project that only 21.6% of students in grades 3–5 would achieve Meets Grade Level or above in Reading and 17.5% in Mathematics. These projections fall below Spring 2026 STAAR results of 32% in Reading and 27% in Mathematics.

MAP and STAAR results both indicate that a significant percentage of students are not yet demonstrating grade-level mastery. Third grade represents a critical area of need, with only 11.1% projected to reach Meets in Reading and 8.2% in Mathematics.

Strengths

Domain 2: School Progress increased by 10 points, from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026. The Academic Growth component also increased by 10 points, demonstrating improvement in student academic progress.

Domain 3: Closing the Gaps increased by 11 points, from 64 (D) in 2025 to 75 (C) in 2026. This represents the campus's largest

domain improvement and reflects positive progress on student-group accountability measures.

During the 2025–2026 school year, the campus achieved a median NWEA mathematics growth percentile of 63, while median achievement increased from the 37th percentile in fall to the 46th percentile in spring. Third grade demonstrated particularly strong mathematics growth, reaching the 81st growth percentile and increasing median achievement from the 33rd to the 57th percentile.

Booker T. Washington Elementary increased its overall accountability score by nine points, from 58 (F) in 2025 to 67 (D) in 2026, demonstrating measurable improvement in campus accountability performance.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Despite significant improvement in the overall accountability rating, Student Achievement remains below expectations. The Student Achievement scaled score increased only one point, from 55 (F) in 2025 to 56 (F) in 2026, indicating that too few students are consistently demonstrating mastery of grade-level standards.	Tier 1 instruction is not yet consistently taught at the depth and rigor students need to master grade-level essential standards, and our instructional response has focused on students below grade level without planning for movement across every performance level.
2 ★	Campus reading data indicate a significant weakness in Extended Constructed Response performance, with approximately 42.77% of 3rd thru 5th grade students earning a zero on the ECR, resulting in 60.42% of 3rd-grade students and 60.00% of 4th-grade students scored 0 or 1 on the ECR. resulting in a substantial number of available points being left unearned.	Teachers do not yet consistently model the extended constructed response process, give students frequent independent writing practice with text evidence, or give timely feedback using the STAAR ECR rubric.
3 ★	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.
4 ★	Although Closing the Gaps increased substantially from a scaled score of 64 (D) in 2025 to 75 (C) in 2026, achievement differences among student groups remain and require continued attention.	Differentiated instruction, linguistic supports, accommodations, enrichment, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent fidelity across classrooms and student groups.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Booker T. Washington Elementary has established instructional and organizational systems designed to support student achievement, teacher development, and continuous campus improvement. The campus implements high-quality instructional materials and utilizes collaborative team meetings, instructional coaching, classroom walkthroughs, and student assessment data to guide instructional planning and delivery. Campus leadership prioritizes lesson internalization, rigorous grade-level instruction, student academic discourse, and differentiated instruction to strengthen teaching and learning.

The campus provides a variety of academic, enrichment, and student support programs, including bilingual/ESL education, special education, gifted and talented services, ACE (Afterschool Centers on Education), and Communities In Schools (CIS). Additional initiatives include Capturing Kids' Hearts, targeted academic interventions, and the Strive for Five attendance initiative. Together, these programs and systems support students' academic, behavioral, social-emotional, and attendance needs while providing extended learning opportunities and strengthening family engagement.

Core instruction uses HMH for reading and English language development and STEMscopes for math. Grade-level teams meet in Collaborative Team Meetings (CTMs/PLCs) twice a week using the four PLC questions and the Lesson Internalization Guide. Campus leaders (principal, assistant principals and instructional coach) attend every CTM. Teachers are tiered for observation: Tier 1 teachers are observed and receive written feedback every three weeks, and Tier 2 every two weeks, and Tier 3 teachers weekly.

Students take NWEA MAP Growth three times a year, two comprehensive unit assessments (CUAs), unit assessments, and district-written common formative assessments (CFAs). The campus receives support from district curriculum, bilingual, and special education staff and from Solution Tree.

Strengths

Booker T. Washington Elementary offers a variety of academic and student support programs, including bilingual/ESL education, special education, gifted and talented services, ACE, and Communities In Schools (CIS), to address diverse student needs and provide additional learning opportunities.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.
2 ★	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.
3 ★	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.
4 ★	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.
5 ★	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

Perceptions

Summary

Booker T. Washington Elementary utilizes staff feedback to evaluate campus culture, instructional support, leadership practices, communication, and organizational effectiveness. Results from the May 2026 End-of-Year Staff Survey identified strengths in instructional coaching, collaborative planning, leadership accessibility, and student support services. Staff members recognized the value of professional development, instructional coaching, and opportunities to collaborate with colleagues.

Survey responses also identified opportunities to strengthen campuswide communication, consistency of expectations, staff collaboration, and morale. Several staff members requested clearer communication, more timely information, consistent follow-through, and greater opportunities for meaningful professional learning. Feedback regarding Collaborative Team Meetings (CTMs) reflected both appreciation for structured planning and a need for more consistent use of student data, clearer meeting expectations, and protected instructional planning time.

Staff feedback regarding student support services was mixed. While respondents recognized the contributions of counseling, intervention, and instructional support personnel, some identified concerns related to scheduling, service consistency, and communication regarding student progress.

Overall, the survey indicates that Booker T. Washington Elementary has established systems to support staff and students, while opportunities remain to strengthen communication, collaboration, consistency, and organizational effectiveness. These findings will inform campus improvement efforts focused on building a supportive professional culture and improving the effectiveness of instructional and student support systems.

At our CAC meeting on July 30, 2026, we reviewed STAAR, NWEA MAP, discipline, attendance, and Capturing Kids' Hearts data, and parents gave the following feedback. Families expressed a desire for increased tutoring opportunities to provide additional academic support for students. Parents also emphasized the importance of continued professional growth and instructional support for new teachers to ensure high-quality instruction across all classrooms. Families responded positively to the upward trends in student data and expressed optimism about the campus's continued progress. This feedback reinforces the need to expand targeted academic interventions, strengthen teacher development through coaching and professional learning, and maintain transparent communication with families regarding student achievement and campus improvement efforts.

Strengths

Staff feedback identified instructional coaching as a valuable resource for professional growth, instructional planning, and classroom support. Respondents highlighted the benefits of coaching, collaboration, and practical instructional guidance.

Several staff members identified Collaborative Team Meetings as beneficial for instructional planning, sharing resources, and reviewing student performance data.

Positive staff feedback recognized campus leadership for being approachable, listening to concerns, providing guidance, and supporting teachers and students.

Staff recognized the contributions of intervention, counseling, and student support personnel in addressing students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	There is an inconsistent campuswide understanding that academic success includes not only supporting students who are below grade level, but also maintaining and advancing students who have already demonstrated proficiency at the Meets and Masters levels.	Campus conversations, intervention, and CTM planning have focused mostly on students below grade level, so we have not consistently planned enrichment and extension for students who are already at Meets or Masters.
2 ★	There is a need to strengthen collective ownership of student achievement so that all staff understand their role in ensuring students grow, reach higher levels of achievement, and maintain previously demonstrated levels of proficiency.	Staff understanding and implementation of campus instructional priorities--including growth, achievement, intervention, enrichment, and progress monitoring--are not yet consistent across all classrooms and grade levels.
3 ★	Parent participation in campus engagement nights remains low, with approximately 15% of families attending, limiting opportunities for the school to build strong home-school partnerships and provide families with information and resources to support student learning.	Family engagement events are scheduled from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. and follow one format, and the campus has not yet asked families which times, formats, and languages work best for them.
4 ★	Parent participation in PTA membership and leadership remains limited, resulting in an imbalance between staff and parent representation within the organization. During the 2024-2025 school year, PTA membership consisted primarily of teaching staff.	The campus has not yet explained to families what PTA does, how to join, and how PTA gives parents a voice in campus decisions, so membership has stayed mostly teaching staff.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Despite significant improvement in the overall accountability rating, Student Achievement remains below expectations. The Student Achievement scaled score increased only one point, from 55 (F) in 2025 to 56 (F) in 2026, indicating that too few students are consistently demonstrating mastery of grade-level standards.	Tier 1 instruction is not yet consistently taught at the depth and rigor students need to master grade-level essential standards, and our instructional response has focused on students below grade level without planning for movement across every performance level.
2 ★	Campus reading data indicate a significant weakness in Extended Constructed Response performance, with approximately 42.77% of 3rd thru 5th grade students earning a zero on the ECR, resulting in 60.42% of 3rd-grade students and 60.00% of 4th-grade students scored 0 or 1 on the ECR. resulting in a substantial number of available points being left unearned.	Teachers do not yet consistently model the extended constructed response process, give students frequent independent writing practice with text evidence, or give timely feedback using the STAAR ECR rubric.
3 ★	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.
4 ★	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.
5 ★	There is an inconsistent campuswide understanding that academic success includes not only supporting students who are below grade level, but also maintaining and advancing students who have already demonstrated proficiency at the Meets and Masters levels.	Campus conversations, intervention, and CTM planning have focused mostly on students below grade level, so we have not consistently planned enrichment and extension for students who are already at Meets or Masters.

6

The academic needs of students receiving specialized services require more consistent alignment between Tier 1 instruction, intervention, accommodations, and progress monitoring to ensure students have equitable opportunities to demonstrate academic growth and achievement.

Collaboration and instructional planning between general education, special education, intervention, and other support personnel are not yet sufficiently systematic to ensure accommodations, differentiation, and progress monitoring are consistently implemented.

7

Spring 2026 STAAR Reading Language Arts results identified significant gaps in extended constructed response (ECR) performance. Among students with numeric ECR scores in the uploaded reports, 58.8% of third-grade students and 60.5% of fourth-grade students earned a score of 0 or 1. These results indicate a substantial need to improve students' ability to construct extended written responses.

Writing instruction has not consistently incorporated explicit modeling, structured opportunities for students to develop and support written responses with textual evidence, and timely feedback aligned to the STAAR ECR rubric. Inconsistent use of formative assessment data to identify and address writing weaknesses may contribute to low ECR performance.

8

Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results revealed significant performance gaps among Hispanic and African American students. Of the Hispanic students tested, 45.8% performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard. Among African American students in grades 3 and 4, 66.7% (14 of 21) performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard, including 100% (6 of 6) of third-grade African American students.

Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently give students time to solve grade-level problems, explain their reasoning, and apply concepts on their own, and teachers do not consistently use checks for understanding to adjust instruction during the lesson.

9

New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.

Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

10

The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.

Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.

11

A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.

A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.

12

The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.

Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.

13

The campus serves a large Emergent Bilingual population, requiring consistent implementation of high-quality linguistic supports alongside rigorous grade-level instruction to ensure equitable access to the curriculum.

Linguistic accommodations, sheltered instruction strategies, and academic language development are not yet consistently planned into Tier 1 lessons in every classroom, and Emergent Bilingual resources are not consistently matched to students' English proficiency levels.

14

The campus serves a high percentage of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students, requiring school systems that consistently provide equitable access to rigorous instruction, intervention, enrichment, academic resources, and additional learning opportunities.

Academic supports, enrichment opportunities, intervention, and supplemental resources are not yet consistently differentiated and monitored to ensure students with varying needs have equitable access to the supports necessary for success.

15

Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 22.8% of students missed 10% or more of school days in 2025-26.

The campus does not yet have a consistent early-warning system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families.

16

Although Closing the Gaps increased substantially from a scaled score of 64 (D) in 2025 to 75 (C) in 2026, achievement differences among student groups remain and require continued attention.

Differentiated instruction, linguistic supports, accommodations, enrichment, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent fidelity across classrooms and student groups.

17 ★

There is a need to strengthen collective ownership of student achievement so that all staff understand their role in ensuring students grow, reach higher levels of achievement, and maintain previously demonstrated levels of proficiency.

Staff understanding and implementation of campus instructional priorities--including growth, achievement, intervention, enrichment, and progress monitoring--are not yet consistent across all classrooms and grade levels.

18 ★

Parent participation in campus engagement nights remains low, with approximately 15% of families attending, limiting opportunities for the school to build strong home-school partnerships and provide families with information and resources to support student learning.

Family engagement events are scheduled from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. and follow one format, and the campus has not yet asked families which times, formats, and languages work best for them.

19 ★

Parent participation in PTA membership and leadership remains limited, resulting in an imbalance between staff and parent representation within the organization. During the 2024-2025 school year, PTA membership consisted primarily of teaching staff.

The campus has not yet explained to families what PTA does, how to join, and how PTA gives parents a voice in campus decisions, so membership has stayed mostly teaching staff.

★ = 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] **Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)**
- [x] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**
- [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] **Results Driven Accountability (RDA)**

Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **State and federally required assessment information**
- [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] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**

- [x] **Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data**

Student Data: Student Groups

- [x] **Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups**
- [x] **Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group**
- [x] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability**
- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Discipline records**

Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

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

- [x] **Study of best practices and high yield strategies**
- [x] **Action research results**

Goals

Goal 1

LEVER 1:PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT THROUGH STRONG LEADERSHIP
The campus aligns its goals and priorities with the district's vision for student success. It develops actionable campus plans that include key strategies and incorporates planning and performance management routines to monitor initiative progress and student achievement.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1:1 : VISION AND MISSION
Understand the district's vision for student success.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of BTW staff can explain the campus vision and TAP strategy (BOY and EOY staff surveys).

Evaluation Data Source: Agendas and minutes from campus staff meetings and professional development sessions that explicitly show training on the district's vision. Another primary evaluation source is a staff survey or reflection log that directly assesses teachers' and leaders' understanding and alignment with the district's student success goals.

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 1.1.1: Vision and Mission
Campus messages, policies, and practices reflect the district's mission and vision, demonstrating high expectations and shared responsibility for student success.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Campus Handbook and formative reviews of Campus Improvement Plan

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1, 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 1.1.2: Campus Leadership
Campus leadership ensures alignment to the district's mission and vision by ensuring that all campus messages, policies, and practices consistently reflect and uphold that mission and vision.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA:
100% of weekly Campus Leadership Team (CLT) agendas and meeting minutes document routine reviews of campus practices, student data, and performance milestones to ensure strict alignment with ELGIN ISD
100% of campus-wide communications, principal newsletters, and professional development calendars explicitly frame campus initiatives and expectations .
A minimum of 90% alignment is achieved on campus-level policy reviews (e.g., grading, attendance, and student handbooks), verifying that no campus-specific practice dilutes or contradicts district-wide expectations for student success.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal(s), and Campus Instructional Coaches (Campus Leadership Team)

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1, 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There is an inconsistent campuswide understanding that academic success includes not only supporting students who are below grade level, but also maintaining and advancing students who have already demonstrated proficiency at the Meets and Masters levels.	Campus conversations, intervention, and CTM planning have focused mostly on students below grade level, so we have not consistently planned enrichment and extension for students who are already at Meets or Masters.
2	There is a need to strengthen collective ownership of student achievement so that all staff understand their role in ensuring students grow, reach higher levels of achievement, and maintain previously demonstrated levels of proficiency.	Staff understanding and implementation of campus instructional priorities--including growth, achievement, intervention, enrichment, and progress monitoring--are not yet consistent across all classrooms and grade levels.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION: 1.2 CAMPUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Develop a Campus Improvement Plan aligned to the district's strategic plan.
Target: By June 2027, BTW will review its CIP and TAP milestones in December, February, April, and June and adjust any strategy rated Some or No Progress.

Evaluation Data Source: 1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) Stakeholder Consultation (Minimum of 1 Meeting)

* Dated CNA Meeting Agenda explicitly detailing the collaboration process with stakeholders to analyze campus data and establish plan priorities.
* Dated Stakeholder Roster detailing names and explicit organizational roles (e.g., administrator, teacher, parent, community member, business representative).
* Dated & Signed Attendance Pages (or certified digital sign-in logs) verifying physical or virtual participation.
* Dated Follow-up/Makeup Meeting Documentation (as needed) including agendas, sign-ins, and notes for required stakeholders unable to attend the primary session.
* Detailed Meeting Minutes capturing the discussions, data analysis conclusions, and evidence of meaningful consultation and stakeholder input.
* CNA Presentation Materials (e.g., PowerPoint slides or shared data packets) used to guide stakeholder review.

2. Campus Advisory Meetings for CIP Formative Reviews (Minimum of 3 Meetings)

* Three Distinct Sets of Dated Agendas corresponding to the scheduled quarterly formative review windows, outlining the evaluation of CIP strategy milestones.
* Dated Stakeholder Rosters with Roles for each of the three mandatory review cycles to verify a consistently compliant advisory composition.
* Dated Signature Pages (or verified electronic signatures) for each of the three individual review meetings.
* Quarterly Makeup Meeting Evidence (agendas, sign-ins, minutes) documenting compliance outreach for absent members.
* Three Sets of Detailed Meeting Minutes explicitly recording stakeholder feedback, progress ratings on active strategies, and any approved mid-course plan adjustments.
* Formative Review Presentation Materials (e.g., quarterly milestone reports or PPT presentations) used to inform the advisory committee of current performance data.

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 1.2.1: Campus Improvement Plan
Campus has a focused improvement plan with clearly defined strategy and priorities, timelines, milestones, metrics, and task owners that directly address the root causes of low performance.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA:
100% of required state and federal program documentation--consisting of dated agendas, stakeholder rosters with roles, signature pages, meeting minutes, presentations, and makeup notes for a minimum of one CNA meeting and three Campus Advisory formative review meetings--is fully uploaded and verified in the CRATE.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - Perceptions 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 1.2.2: Goals

Campus goals are specific to the campus, focused on improving student outcomes, and directly aligned to the district's multi-year student outcomes.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus academic goals are specific, student-focused, and directly mapped to Elgin ISD's multi-year outcome targets within the plan, with formative review logs, student performance data, and special program compliance tracking documents fully uploaded and verified in the CRATE.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - Perceptions 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

KEY PRACTICE: 1.2.3: Strategic Priorities
Campus strategic priorities are specific to the needs of the campus and aligned to the district's strategic priorities, ensuring campus-level actions support the district's vision for student success.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus strategic priorities are explicitly justified by data from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and directly mapped to Elgin ISD's strategic priorities within the plan, with evidence of aligned campus action steps, resource allocations, and milestone reviews fully uploaded and verified in the CRATE.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - Perceptions 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Despite significant improvement in the overall accountability rating, Student Achievement remains below expectations. The Student Achievement scaled score increased only one point, from 55 (F) in 2025 to 56 (F) in 2026, indicating that too few students are consistently demonstrating mastery of grade-level standards.	Tier 1 instruction is not yet consistently taught at the depth and rigor students need to master grade-level essential standards, and our instructional response has focused on students below grade level without planning for movement across every performance level.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	There is a need to strengthen collective ownership of student achievement so that all staff understand their role in ensuring students grow, reach higher levels of achievement, and maintain previously demonstrated levels of proficiency.	Staff understanding and implementation of campus instructional priorities--including growth, achievement, intervention, enrichment, and progress monitoring--are not yet consistent across all classrooms and grade levels.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1.3: Campus Implementation Planning and Project Management
Plan for and project manage implementation of prioritized district initiatives
Target: By May 2027, BTW will complete each TAP action step by its due date, checked at the December, February, and April reviews.

Evaluation Data Source: District project implementation timelines, master calendars, and staff initiative launch logs.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 1.3.1 Implementation Planning
Campus develops clear implementation plans with roles, responsibilities, timelines, and project management structures, as outlined in their Campus Improvement Plan.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: CRATE documents show 100% completion of implementation plans that list explicit roles, responsibilities, timelines, and tracking structures for all campus initiatives.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 1.3.2 Project Management
Campus establishes and uses project management structures and tools to plan, monitor, and ensure timely, high-quality completion of campus initiatives and accountability for progress.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: CRATE documents show 100% usage of project management logs, monitoring tools, and progress trackers that confirm timely completion of campus initiatives.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1.4: Performance Management
By June 2027, Booker T. Washington Elementary will complete 100% of Title I schoolwide planning requirements, with evidence for every meeting uploaded to CRATE within 10 school days.

Evaluation Data Source: * Program evaluation reports, federal compliance documentation, and data reviews.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 1.4.1 Measurement Plan
Campus leaders monitor implementation of improvement plans/goals by reflecting on progress and hold task owners accountable for execution of the work.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of at-risk student groups--including migrant, 504, specialized support, and students who failed STAAR or baseline assessments--have their academic progress monitored through leadership reviews, ensuring timely completion of required interventions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

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

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 1.4.2 Data Collection
Campus leaders use data systems to collect and analyze data that tracks progress toward campus goals and improvement plan outcomes.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of student growth trackers and data dashboards are updated and reviewed by campus leaders following state, local, and baseline assessments to identify progress trends for at-risk student groups and drive intervention decisions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

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

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 1.4.3 Data-Driven Decisions
Campus leaders use data to analyze progress, identify barriers, and adjust strategies when

milestones and benchmarks are not met to ensure goals are achieved.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus action plans show documented adjustments and corrective interventions whenever milestones or benchmarks are missed, ensuring student progress is continuously monitored

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

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

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 1.4.4 Performance Management Routines
Campus establishes systems that routinize initiative progress reflection and iteration on implementation tactics as needed.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: CRATE documents show 100% completion of scheduled leadership meetings to analyze student data alongside the Campus Improvement Plan and adjust strategies when benchmarks are missed

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

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

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

New Key Practice:
Conduct at least three stakeholder CNA meetings covering four CNA areas and relevant student groups; convene BOY/MOY/EOY CAC; conduct make-up consultation when representation is insufficient; publish English/Spanish CIP and complete November/January/March/June reviews. Include TAP Year 2 milestone monitoring.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of Title I schoolwide planning and stakeholder consultation requirements documented; all required meeting evidence uploaded within 10 school days; quarterly CIP reviews completed and low-progress strategies revised.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and CAC/Guiding Coalition

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 6

New Key Practice:
Create a one-page evaluation plan for each federal/SCE-funded program; assess implementation and impact and document continue/modify/discontinue decisions at EOY.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of applicable funded programs have documented evaluations and end-of-year continuation decisions.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 1: Planning and Performance Management through Strong Leadership

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.
4	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.

Goal 2

LEVER 2: ESSENTIAL ACTIONS AND KEY PRACTICES
Each lever is defined by a set of Essential Actions (EA) and Key Practices (KP) that describe what effective implementation looks like on a campus. Together, these components provide clear guidance for how systems and practices come to life to support strong student outcomes.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.1: Intentional Roles and Staffing
Staff are strategically hired and placed to deliver on the envisioned student experience.
Target: By August 2027, BTW will fill 100% of teacher vacancies before the first day and, as in the TAP, place its most effective teachers in high-need classrooms.

Evaluation Data Source: HR vacancy tracking lists, new hire data, recruitment/retention records, and Grow Your Own enrollment logs--including LASO Grant college partnership participation and new teacher support data--will be evaluated in coordination with the Executive Director of Human Resources, with State and Federal ensuring all matching compliance evidence is placed in the CRATE

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 2.1.1: Performance Expectation-Setting
Campus sets and reinforces high performance expectations by following district guidance during hiring, onboarding/induction, professional learning, and coaching structures.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of newly hired and onboarded campus staff demonstrate a clear understanding of Elgin ISD performance expectations through their active participation in the LASO grant "Grow Your Own" teacher pipeline and required new-to-role campus coaching structures

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 2.1.2 Hiring and Evaluation

Campus leadership follows district defined selection criteria and evaluation processes to identify and hire candidates best suited for specific roles

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of newly hired campus personnel are selected and evaluated using district-defined criteria, ensuring all open positions are filled by candidates best suited for their specific roles to support student outcomes

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

KEY PRACTICE: 2.1.3: Staffing for Greatest Impact
Campus leaders ensure that the most effective educators are placed in classrooms with higher student support needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: * 100% of the campus's most effective educators are strategically assigned to classrooms with higher student support needs to maximize academic intervention and narrow performance gaps for at-risk student populations

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

New Key Practice:
Distribute annual Right to Know notice in English and Spanish; maintain request log; review teacher certification in September and January; issue required notices; maintain written certification plans, exam dates, and coaching supports for uncertified teachers.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of Right to Know requirements completed; 100% of uncertified teachers have documented certification support plans.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.
4	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.
5	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.2: Staff Selection
Intentionally selects educators well-prepared to provide high-quality instruction and services to each

student.
Target: In 2026-27, 100% of BTW hires will go through district screening, and every uncertified teacher (4 of 15 in October 2026) will have a certification plan, mentor, and coaching, as the TAP requires.

Evaluation Data Source: T-TESS appraisals, Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) designations, leadership development rosters, and staff retention reports--including professional learning feedback surveys and staff growth plans--will be evaluated in coordination with the Executive Director of Human Resources, with State and Federal ensuring all matching compliance evidence is placed in the CRATE

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 2.2.1: Staffing Projections
Campus uses enrollment trends and program needs to anticipate staffing requirements and collaborates with the district to inform recruitment and hiring decisions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Campus enrollment trends and specialized program needs are analyzed annually to accurately forecast staffing requirements and drive proactive, aligned recruitment and hiring decisions before the start of the school year

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 2.2.2: Selection and Screening
Campus uses district-defined screening processes, tools, and selection criteria to effectively evaluate a candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus candidate evaluations utilize district-defined screening processes, tools, and selection criteria to effectively measure each candidate's knowledge, skills, and abilities for optimal role placement

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
5	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.3: Growth and Retention Strategies
Systems in place to support teacher professional growth, advancement opportunities, and retention.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of new, inexperienced, and uncertified BTW teachers will receive the TAP's intensive coaching and mentoring.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA) designations, staff climate and wellness surveys, employee engagement data, staff absenteeism reports, leadership campus visibility logs, annual teacher retention rate tables, campus leadership development rosters, and staff satisfaction surveys will be evaluated by campus administration to track teacher growth and campus retention trends

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 2.3.1: Appraisal
Campus leadership conducts annual staff appraisals using multiple measures such as competencies and student growth to assess performance.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus staff appraisals are completed annually using multiple measures, including T-TESS competencies and student growth data, to accurately assess performance and guide professional development

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 2.3.2 Advancement and Retention
Campus leaders implement advancement and retention strategies aligned to district and campus performance expectations.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: High-performing educators are successfully retained and provided with clear leadership advancement opportunities that align with district and campus performance expectations

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

KEY PRACTICE: 2.3.2 Advancement and Retention
Provide targeted CKH, Literacy First K-2, MAP growth and accountability training; follow up with walkthroughs; collect Title II consultation input.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 90% of targeted staff complete assigned training; documented use of targeted practices increases from 76% to 90%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.
5	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

Goal 3

LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS
The campus establishes proactive and responsive student support systems aligned to the district's MTSS framework, promoting a positive school culture, supports for all students, and family engagement.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.1: Multi-tiered System of Supports
Implement the district's integrated multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) framework aligned to evidence-based prevention and intervention practices to support the academic and non-academic needs of all students, providing guidance on routine progress monitoring and data-driven decision making.
Target: By June 2027, 100% of BTW students identified by CFA, screener, or at-risk data will be in a documented WIN intervention group, adjusted after each CFA cycle as set in the TAP.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of students identified under the 17 state at-risk criteria--with explicit monitoring for migrant students--are tracked within the district's integrated MTSS framework, with CRATE documents showing regular progress monitoring logs and data-driven intervention plans that verify the consistent use of evidence-based academic and non-academic support practices

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.1: Student Support Teams
ELGIN ISD sets expectations for implementing student support teams to use data to identify individual student strengths and needs, implementing individualized support strategies, and using a case management system to monitor student progress.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: A written list of student interventions and copies of student support team meeting logs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Counselors, and Assistant Superintendent of Student Services

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KP 3.1.2 Universal Screening

BTW - Campus administers district-wide universal screeners for academic, optional mental health, and behavior to support early identification and intervention.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: A completed master professional learning calendar and training attendance rosters verifying all staff are trained in MTSS academic, behavioral, and mental health intervention tiers.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Instructional Coaches, and Assistant Superintendent of Student Services

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KP 3.1.3 Family Engagement
BTW Campus fosters an inclusive environment by actively engaging families in supporting students' academic growth and overall well-being through regular, personalized communication, which is outlined as an expectation for all teachers.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Parent Family Engagement activities through ESC 13 and campus planning will occur.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Administrators, and Staff

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3, 4

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.4: Strengthening Family Engagement Through Academic Learning Nights

Booker T. Washington Elementary will host Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) events throughout the school year, including Math Night, STEM Night, and Literacy Night, to strengthen partnerships between home and school. During these events, teachers will model effective, hands-on instructional strategies and provide families with practical tools and resources they can use at home to support their child's academic learning. These opportunities will empower

families to take an active role in their child's education and reinforce classroom learning at home.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased family participation, stronger home-school partnerships, and improved student academic achievement through consistent learning support at home.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3, 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

State Compensatory Education (SCE) supplements the regular program for students who meet the state at-risk criteria (TEC 29.081). Booker T. Washington Elementary's 2026-27 SCE budget (fund 199, PIC 30) totals $223,178.71: Communities In Schools case management $36,430; teacher salaries $125,350; paraprofessional salary $25,776.08; benefits and stipends $35,622.63. SCE-funded positions: Teachers (2.0 FTEs) and Paraprofessional (1.0 FTE). Each SCE-funded staff member serves identified at-risk students in reading and math intervention, and their time and effort is documented in CRATE.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of identified eligible students are accurately referred, coded, and served; attendance increases by 1.5 percentage points from 93.7%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Counselor; Registrar

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 6

Hold the annual Title I meeting at least twice at flexible times with Spanish interpretation; develop and distribute the campus parent and family engagement policy and the school-parent compact with parents; spend the 1% parent and family engagement set-aside on activities parents help choose; and evaluate parent and family engagement each spring with a survey and parent focus group. Evidence is uploaded to CRATE within 10 school days. Paid from the campus Title I, Part A 1% parent and family engagement set-aside ($1,570).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting agendas, sign-ins, and slides; signed policy and compact distribution records; and spring survey results are in CRATE. Family attendance at campus engagement events rises from about 15% of families to at least 30%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Counselor

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The campus serves a high percentage of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students, requiring school systems that consistently provide equitable access to rigorous instruction, intervention, enrichment, academic resources, and additional learning opportunities.	Academic supports, enrichment opportunities, intervention, and supplemental resources are not yet consistently differentiated and monitored to ensure students with varying needs have equitable access to the supports necessary for success.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Parent participation in campus engagement nights remains low, with approximately 15% of families attending, limiting opportunities for the school to build strong home-school partnerships and provide families with information and resources to support student learning.	Family engagement events are scheduled from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. and follow one format, and the campus has not yet asked families which times, formats, and languages work best for them.
4	Parent participation in PTA membership and leadership remains limited, resulting in an imbalance between staff and parent representation within the organization. During the 2024-2025 school year, PTA membership consisted primarily of teaching staff.	The campus has not yet explained to families what PTA does, how to join, and how PTA gives parents a voice in campus decisions, so membership has stayed mostly teaching staff.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION: 3.2 School-wide Culture, Behavior, Safety
Establish strong school culture, behavior, and safety systems.
Target: By May 2027, BTW will keep out-of-school suspension days at 0 (0 as of November 3, 2026) and review discipline data by student group monthly.

Evaluation Data Source: School counselor referral logs, wrap-around service coordination tracking, and social-emotional wellness metrics are updated weekly to demonstrate that strong school culture, behavior, and safety systems are actively established across the campus

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 3.2.1: School-wide Culture
Campus-level culture-setting aligned to district-level guiding commitments and vision and supports student readiness to learn.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus classrooms and common areas actively reflect school-wide culture systems that align with the Elgin ISD vision, directly supporting student readiness to learn and lowering behavior incidents across all grade levels

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, and Counselors

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 3.2.2: Routines for a Productive Learning Environment
Campus staff follow clear expectations for implementing school-wide and classroom-level procedures, with opportunities to practice, to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus staff and students consistently execute established school-wide and classroom-level procedures, providing clear opportunities to practice routines that ensure a safe, predictable, and productive learning environment

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ✅ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE:3.2.3: Universal Behavior and Discipline Strategies
Campus leaders establish and communicate clear expectations for prevention, incentives, and consequences that promote positive behavior for all students.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus staff and students understand and follow clear expectations for behavior prevention, positive incentives, and consistent consequences that promote a positive school climate for all students

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Assistant Principals, and Counselors

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Implement CKH and Tier 2 supports including check-in/check-out, FBA/BIP when appropriate; review discipline and removal days monthly by student group.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instructional days lost to removals decrease by at least 5% from 7%; monitor student-group gaps against campus rate.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals; Counselor

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

Protect daily Tier 2/3 intervention and tutoring blocks; monitor progress every two weeks; document HB 1416 plans and required hours; reteach unmastered standards within 48 hours; monitor MAP/CFA/STAAR by group. Include subgroup-specific strategies where required.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Existing Reading target: Meets 32% to 42%, Masters 14% to 19%. Existing Math target: Meets 27% to 37%, Masters 10% to 15%. Intervention participation and progress monitored biweekly; HB 1416 services documented.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals; Instructional Coach; Interventionists

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The campus serves a high percentage of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students, requiring school systems that consistently provide equitable access to rigorous instruction, intervention, enrichment, academic resources, and additional learning opportunities.	Academic supports, enrichment opportunities, intervention, and supplemental resources are not yet consistently differentiated and monitored to ensure students with varying needs have equitable access to the supports necessary for success.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	There is a need to strengthen collective ownership of student achievement so that all staff understand their role in ensuring students grow, reach higher levels of achievement, and maintain previously demonstrated levels of proficiency.	Staff understanding and implementation of campus instructional priorities--including growth, achievement, intervention, enrichment, and progress monitoring--are not yet consistent across all classrooms and grade levels.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.3: Interventions and Supports
Staff identify and respond to needs of all students and provide timely targeted responses to reduce barriers to learning and promote trust, belonging, safety, growth mindset, and self-regulation.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of BTW students referred for academic or non-academic barriers will begin a targeted support within 10 school days.

Evaluation Data Source: 100% of students facing academic or non-academic barriers receive immediate, targeted interventions that improve behavioral outcomes, increase attendance, and promote trust, belonging, safety, growth mindset, and self-regulation across all campus classrooms

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.3.1 Case Management
Campus leaders ensure that a case management system is used to monitor student progress by reviewing academic data, universal screener results, behavior, attendance, student well-being, and access to support, enabling timely and targeted interventions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA:100% of case management data profiles show consistent updates and regular leadership reviews of academic metrics, universal screeners, behavior tracking, and attendance logs to guarantee timely, targeted interventions for struggling students

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.3.2 Integrated Mental Health and Crisis Response
Campus provides proactive, policy-aligned mental health education for all students and uses evidence-based practices (interventions) to address threat concerns through district-designated crisis teams that conduct structured threat assessments and provide trauma-informed postvention and re-entry support.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of crisis response and mental health protocols follow structured, district-designated threat assessment procedures, resulting in policy-aligned mental health education, trauma-informed postvention, and seamless re-entry support for all affected students

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Assistant Superintendent of Student Services

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE:3.3.3: Threat Assessment
ELGIN ISD establishes threat assessment teams integrated into ongoing student support structures, provides aligned staff and student training, communicates the responsibility to report, and establishes mental health crisis response protocols.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: * SUCCESS CRITERIA: In accordance with TEC SS 37.0831 and HB 121, Elgin ISD will implement threat assessment protocols that explicitly enforce zero-tolerance standards for bullying, cyberbullying, and dating violence. Success will be verified by completed threat assessment documentation, safety planning logs, immediate parent/guardian notification receipts, and mandatory student/staff safety training logs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Assistant Superintendent of Student Services

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	The campus serves a high percentage of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students, requiring school systems that consistently provide equitable access to rigorous instruction, intervention, enrichment, academic resources, and additional learning opportunities.	Academic supports, enrichment opportunities, intervention, and supplemental resources are not yet consistently differentiated and monitored to ensure students with varying needs have equitable access to the supports necessary for success.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, 100% of PK-5 students at Booker T. Washington Elementary will receive at least 135 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity each week through PE and recess, as required by TEC 28.002(l-1). Chronic absenteeism will decrease from 22.8% in 2025-26 to at most 18%, supporting the district target of 22% or lower.

Evaluation Data Source: FitnessGram results, PE and recess schedules, attendance and chronic absenteeism reports by student group, and School Health Advisory Council (SHAC) input.

Strategy 1

The PE teacher, school nurse, and counselor will review FitnessGram, attendance, and recess data each semester, share the results with the campus improvement committee and the district SHAC, and use the district's coordinated school health program to plan PE lessons, recess routines, and family health activities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: PE and recess schedules show at least 135 minutes of physical activity each week for every PK-5 class, and the percentage of students in the FitnessGram Healthy Fitness Zone rises from the fall to the spring testing window.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, PE Teacher, and School Nurse

Problem Statements: Demographics 6

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

The attendance committee will review attendance every two weeks, contact the family of every student who misses 5% of school days, hold an attendance conference with the family by the time a student misses 10% of school days, and connect families with the counselor, nurse, or Communities In Schools for barriers to attendance.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Attendance logs show a family contact for every student who reaches 5% absences within one week, and chronic absenteeism falls each six weeks toward the 18% target.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Counselor

Problem Statements: Demographics 6

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
6	Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 22.8% of students missed 10% or more of school days in 2025-26.	The campus does not yet have a consistent early-warning system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families.

Goal 4

LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
The campus implements the district's framework for strong instruction by applying research-based strategies and using high-quality instructional materials and assessments to deliver a rigorous academic experience for all students, ensuring they are supported and prepared for college, career, or military pathways.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Essential Action 4.1:

STAAR Academic Achievement Reading: Students receiving special education services will increase from 2% to at least 12% at Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 24% to at least 30%, supporting the district HB 3 early literacy goal.

Evaluation Data Source: Unit Assessments (UAs) and Common Unit Assessments (CUAs); Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); NWEA MAP Growth BOY, MOY, EOY achievement data and 2027 STAAR Reading data.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.1.1: Multi-tiered System of Supports
Campus leaders ensure teachers are supported in delivering strong tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 academic supports for all students.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of teacher lesson plans and intervention schedules document the consistent delivery of strong Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 academic supports, with classroom walkthrough data verifying that differentiated instructional practices match individual student needs
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students demonstrate increased reading achievement from BOY to MOY and EOY MAP, with progress toward Meets Grade Level or Above on 2027 STAAR Reading.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Assistant Principal, and Instructional Coach

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.1.2: Tier 1 Instructional Strategies and Supports for All Learners
Campus leadership ensures that all staff understand and implement the district's instructional framework, which is grounded in research-based Tier 1 strategies aligned to core content areas (e.g., math, reading).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of classroom walkthrough logs and lesson plans show consistent implementation of the district's research-based instructional framework and core content Tier 1 strategies across all classrooms
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students demonstrate improved mastery of grade-level reading standards on CFAs and CUAs, with increased reading achievement on MOY and EOY MAP.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE:4.1.3 Our campus will provide targeted extended day tutoring, additional instructional time, and interventions aligned to our identified student achievement and Closing the Gaps needs. Using student performance data, we will identify students needing additional support and provide focused instruction to close learning gaps, strengthen grade-level skills, and increase academic achievement.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Students identified for targeted academic support will receive data-driven tutoring, additional instructional time, and interventions aligned with the district's MTSS framework. Student progress will be monitored regularly through CFAs, unit assessments, and NWEA MAP data to evaluate intervention effectiveness, adjust instruction, and demonstrate measurable academic growth toward grade-level proficiency and Closing the Gaps targets.
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students receiving interventions demonstrate improved CFA and CUA performance and increased MAP Reading achievement from BOY to MOY and EOY, progressing toward Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Funding Sources: 211 - Title I-Part A, $39,962

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Key Practice 4.1.4
Booker T. Washington Elementary teachers will utilize Common Planning Time (CTM/PLC) to analyze student performance on Common Formative Assessments (CFAs), unit assessments, and NWEA MAP data to identify learning gaps, plan targeted instructional responses, and adjust instruction to increase student achievement. Administration and Instructional will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs, coaching cycles, and student work analysis, with an emphasis on grade-level rigor, student discourse, checks for understanding, and differentiated small-group instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student mastery of grade-level standards, improved instructional effectiveness, and measurable growth in STAAR performance, with campuswide achievement increasing to 70% Approaches, 37% Meets, and 12% Masters by May 2027.
Student result: Each identified group demonstrates increased mastery of priority reading standards and improved performance on subsequent assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coaches

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Key Practice 4.1.5
Teachers in grades 3-5 will explicitly model the ECR process each week (central idea or claim, choosing text evidence, explaining evidence, and revising), give students independent ECR practice at least twice a week, and score samples together in CTMs using the STAAR ECR rubric.

Adult practice: CTM agendas show scored student samples every two weeks.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved student performance on Extended Constructed Responses (ECR) through consistent modeling, independent writing practice, and teacher calibration using the STAAR ECR rubric. Increased student ability to develop a clear central idea or claim, select relevant text evidence, explain reasoning, and revise written responses. A measurable reduction in the percentage of students scoring 0 or 1 on ECRs, as evidenced by CUA results and the 2027 STAAR Reading Language Arts assessment.
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students demonstrate improved ECR performance, measured by a reduction in scores of 0 or 1 and an increase in students earning higher rubric scores on CUAs and the 2027 STAAR Reading assessment.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 5 - Student Learning 2

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 6 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Key Strategy 4.1.6
Reading: After BOY MAP and each CUA, teachers will set a growth target for every student in grades 3-5 based on last year's STAAR performance level, and CTMs will plan extension lessons for students at Meets and Masters as well as reteaching for students below. Adult practice: a campus growth tracker lists every student's 2026 level and target and is updated after BOY, CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2. Student result: students who scored Meets or Masters in 2026 hold or raise their level on CUA 2, and MOY MAP shows more students on track to meet their growth targets than BOY did.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased academic growth and student achievement in grades 3-5 through individualized growth targets, differentiated instruction, and consistent progress monitoring. Students previously achieving Meets or Masters Grade Level will maintain or improve their performance, while students performing below grade level will demonstrate progress toward higher achievement levels. Success will be evidenced by an increased percentage of students on track to meet their growth targets on MOY NWEA MAP compared to BOY, improved CUA performance, and increased Meets and Masters percentages on the 2027 STAAR assessments.
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students demonstrate increased MAP Reading achievement from BOY to MOY and improved CUA performance, with more students progressing toward or maintaining Meets and Masters Grade Level.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 5 - Student Learning 2, 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 7 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Special education teachers and interventionists will join grade-level CTMs at least twice a month to plan accommodations and small-group instruction for students receiving special education services, and progress-monitoring data will be reviewed together. Adult practice: CTM sign-ins and lesson plans show co-planned accommodations. Student result: students receiving special education services raise their MAP RIT scores from BOY to MOY.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved academic growth for students receiving special education services through collaborative instructional planning, consistent implementation of accommodations, and targeted small-group instruction. Increased alignment between general education, special education, and intervention services will strengthen instructional effectiveness and student support. Success will be measured by documented instructional collaboration, progress-monitoring data, and increased NWEA MAP RIT scores from BOY to MOY.
Student result: Students receiving special education services, including those also identified as Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, or continuously enrolled, demonstrate increased MAP Reading RIT scores from BOY to MOY and improved mastery of targeted reading standards.

Problem Statements: Demographics 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The campus serves a large Emergent Bilingual population, requiring consistent implementation of high-quality linguistic supports alongside rigorous grade-level instruction to ensure equitable access to the curriculum.	Linguistic accommodations, sheltered instruction strategies, and academic language development are not yet consistently planned into Tier 1 lessons in every classroom, and Emergent Bilingual resources are not consistently matched to students' English proficiency levels.

2	The campus serves a high percentage of economically disadvantaged and at-risk students, requiring school systems that consistently provide equitable access to rigorous instruction, intervention, enrichment, academic resources, and additional learning opportunities.	Academic supports, enrichment opportunities, intervention, and supplemental resources are not yet consistently differentiated and monitored to ensure students with varying needs have equitable access to the supports necessary for success.
3	The academic needs of students receiving specialized services require more consistent alignment between Tier 1 instruction, intervention, accommodations, and progress monitoring to ensure students have equitable opportunities to demonstrate academic growth and achievement.	Collaboration and instructional planning between general education, special education, intervention, and other support personnel are not yet sufficiently systematic to ensure accommodations, differentiation, and progress monitoring are consistently implemented.
5	Spring 2026 STAAR Reading Language Arts results identified significant gaps in extended constructed response (ECR) performance. Among students with numeric ECR scores in the uploaded reports, 58.8% of third-grade students and 60.5% of fourth-grade students earned a score of 0 or 1. These results indicate a substantial need to improve students' ability to construct extended written responses.	Writing instruction has not consistently incorporated explicit modeling, structured opportunities for students to develop and support written responses with textual evidence, and timely feedback aligned to the STAAR ECR rubric. Inconsistent use of formative assessment data to identify and address writing weaknesses may contribute to low ECR performance.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Despite significant improvement in the overall accountability rating, Student Achievement remains below expectations. The Student Achievement scaled score increased only one point, from 55 (F) in 2025 to 56 (F) in 2026, indicating that too few students are consistently demonstrating mastery of grade-level standards.	Tier 1 instruction is not yet consistently taught at the depth and rigor students need to master grade-level essential standards, and our instructional response has focused on students below grade level without planning for movement across every performance level.

2	Campus reading data indicate a significant weakness in Extended Constructed Response performance, with approximately 42.77% of 3rd thru 5th grade students earning a zero on the ECR, resulting in 60.42% of 3rd-grade students and 60.00% of 4th-grade students scored 0 or 1 on the ECR. resulting in a substantial number of available points being left unearned.	Teachers do not yet consistently model the extended constructed response process, give students frequent independent writing practice with text evidence, or give timely feedback using the STAAR ECR rubric.
3	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.

3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Essential Action 4.2:
STAAR Academic Achievement Math: Students receiving special education services will increase from 4% to at least 14% at Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 30% to at least 37%, supporting the district HB 3 early mathematics goal.

Evaluation Data Source: Math unit assessments, CUA 1 and CUA 2, CFAs, MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY, and 2027 STAAR Math.
Student result: Each identified group demonstrates increased MAP Math achievement from BOY to MOY, improved performance on CUAs, and progress toward the 2027 STAAR Mathematics Meets Grade Level target of 37% campuswide.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Key Strategy 4.2.1
Math: After BOY MAP and each CUA, teachers will set a growth target for every student in grades 3-5 based on last year's STAAR performance level, and CTMs will plan extension lessons for students at Meets and Masters as well as reteaching for students below. Adult practice: a campus growth tracker lists every student's 2026 level and target and is updated after BOY, CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2. Student result: students who scored Meets or Masters in 2026 hold or raise their level on CUA 2, and MOY MAP shows more students on track to meet their growth targets than BOY did.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased academic growth and student achievement in grades 3-5 through individualized growth targets, differentiated instruction, and consistent progress monitoring. Students previously achieving Meets or Masters Grade Level will maintain or improve their performance, while students performing below grade level will demonstrate progress toward higher achievement levels. Success will be evidenced by an increased percentage of students on track to meet their growth targets on MOY NWEA MAP compared to BOY, improved CUA performance, and increased Meets and Masters percentages on the 2027 STAAR assessments.
Student result: Each identified group demonstrates increased MAP Math achievement from BOY to MOY, improved performance on CUAs, and progress toward the 2027 STAAR Mathematics Meets Grade Level target of 37% campuswide.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Special education teachers and interventionists will join grade-level CTMs at least twice a month to plan accommodations and small-group instruction for students receiving special education services, and progress-monitoring data will be reviewed together. Adult practice: CTM sign-ins and lesson plans show co-planned accommodations. Student result: students receiving special education services raise their MAP RIT scores from BOY to MOY.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved academic growth for students receiving special education services through collaborative instructional planning, consistent implementation of accommodations, and targeted small-group instruction. Increased alignment between general education, special education, and intervention services will strengthen instructional effectiveness and student support. Success will be measured by documented instructional collaboration, progress-monitoring data, and increased NWEA MAP RIT scores from BOY to MOY.
Student result: Students receiving special education services, including those who also belong to the four TSI groups, demonstrate increased MAP Mathematics RIT scores from BOY to MOY and improved performance on grade-level mathematics assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 3, 4

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Protect daily Tier 2/3 intervention and tutoring blocks; monitor progress every two weeks; document HB 1416 plans and required hours; reteach unmastered standards within 48 hours; monitor MAP/CFA/STAAR by group. Include subgroup-specific strategies where required.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Existing Reading target: Meets 32% to 42%, Masters 14% to 19%. Existing Math target: Meets 27% to 37%, Masters 10% to 15%. Intervention participation and progress monitored biweekly; HB 1416 services documented.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals; Instructional Coach; Interventionists

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - School Processes & Programs 2

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	The academic needs of students receiving specialized services require more consistent alignment between Tier 1 instruction, intervention, accommodations, and progress monitoring to ensure students have equitable opportunities to demonstrate academic growth and achievement.	Collaboration and instructional planning between general education, special education, intervention, and other support personnel are not yet sufficiently systematic to ensure accommodations, differentiation, and progress monitoring are consistently implemented.
4	Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results revealed significant performance gaps among Hispanic and African American students. Of the Hispanic students tested, 45.8% performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard. Among African American students in grades 3 and 4, 66.7% (14 of 21) performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard, including 100% (6 of 6) of third-grade African American students.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently give students time to solve grade-level problems, explain their reasoning, and apply concepts on their own, and teachers do not consistently use checks for understanding to adjust instruction during the lesson.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.3:
Math Academic Growth

By May 2027, Booker T. Washington Elementary will increase the Mathematics Academic Growth score for all students from 51% to 69%, Hispanic students from 51% to 68%, and High Focus students from 50% to 66%, as measured by the 2027 TEA Academic Growth calculation.

Evaluation Data Source: NWEA MAP Growth Mathematics BOY, MOY, and EOY results disaggregated by All Students, Hispanic, and High Focus groups; district Math UAs/CUAs; and CFAs.
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students demonstrate increased MAP Mathematics achievement from BOY to MOY and improved mastery of grade-level TEKS on CFAs and CUAs, supporting the campus's mathematics academic growth targets.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.2.1 Strengthening Tier 1 Math Instruction Through HQIM
Teachers will consistently implement High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) in mathematics (STEMSCOPES) to provide rigorous, grade-level instruction aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). Through lesson planning sessions and collaborative planning, teachers will focus on effective instructional delivery, student discourse, problem-solving, and checks for understanding to strengthen conceptual understanding and increase academic growth for all student groups.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student engagement, stronger mathematical understanding, and improved academic growth across all student groups.
Student result: Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students demonstrate increased MAP Mathematics achievement from BOY to MOY and improved mastery of grade-level TEKS on CFAs and CUAs, supporting the campus's mathematics academic growth targets.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.2.2 Data-Driven Instruction and Student Progress Monitoring
Teachers and instructional leaders will regularly analyze Common Formative Assessments (CFAs), unit assessments, and NWEA MAP data during CTMs/PLCs to identify learning gaps and monitor student growth. Particular attention will be given to Hispanic and High Focus student groups to ensure instructional adjustments are responsive to their academic needs. Teachers will use the data to plan reteaching, enrichment, and targeted instructional support.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved instructional decision-making, timely responses to student learning needs, and increased mathematics academic growth for all identified student groups. Student result: Each identified group demonstrates increased mastery of targeted mathematics standards on subsequent CFAs and CUAs and improved MAP Mathematics performance from BOY to MOY and EOY. Hispanic students will progress toward the campus academic growth target of 68%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE 4.2.3: Data-Driven Small-Group Math Instruction
Our campus will provide intentional, data-driven small-group mathematics instruction and interventions aligned to identified student achievement and Closing the Gaps needs. Teachers will use student performance data to group students according to specific skill gaps, provide targeted instruction using HQIM-aligned resources, and regularly monitor progress to adjust instructional support. Priority will be given to students who are not demonstrating expected academic growth.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Reduced learning gaps, improved mastery of essential math skills, and increased academic growth for students performing below grade-level expectations. Student result: Students receiving small-group instruction demonstrate improved mastery of identified mathematics skills, increased CUA performance, and growth on MAP Mathematics from BOY to MOY and EOY.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - School Processes & Programs 2

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results revealed significant performance gaps among Hispanic and African American students. Of the Hispanic students tested, 45.8% performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard. Among African American students in grades 3 and 4, 66.7% (14 of 21) performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard, including 100% (6 of 6) of third-grade African American students.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently give students time to solve grade-level problems, explain their reasoning, and apply concepts on their own, and teachers do not consistently use checks for understanding to adjust instruction during the lesson.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.
3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.4:
English Language Proficiency

By Spring 2027, Booker T. Washington Elementary will increase the percentage of eligible Emergent Bilingual students demonstrating progress in English language proficiency from 21% to 40%, as measured by TELPAS and the TEA Closing the Gaps English Language Proficiency indicator.

Evaluation Data Source: Summit K12, MOY TELPAS benchmark and 2027 TELPAS.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Data-Driven Language Instruction and Progress Monitoring

Teachers and instructional leaders will analyze TELPAS proficiency levels, classroom assessments, and student language samples to identify individual language development needs. During CTMs/PLCs, teachers will use this data to plan targeted language supports, monitor

progress, and adjust instruction to accelerate English language acquisition.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved identification of language development needs and increased percentages of EB students demonstrating annual English language proficiency growth.
Student result: Emergent Bilingual students demonstrate measurable improvement in English listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency from BOY to MOY, supporting the campus goal of increasing annual TELPAS English language proficiency progress from 21% to 40% by Spring 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Strengthening English Language Development (ELD) Through HMH

Teachers will intentionally utilize the designated English Language Development (ELD) instructional block to provide targeted language instruction using HMH High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM). Instruction will focus on developing students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills through structured academic conversations, vocabulary development, and meaningful language activities aligned to students' English proficiency levels. Campus instructional leaders will monitor the consistent implementation of ELD instruction through classroom walkthroughs, lesson internalization, and student progress monitoring.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased English language proficiency among Emergent Bilingual students, resulting in improved TELPAS performance and progress toward the campus goal of increasing English language proficiency growth from 21% to 40%.
Student result: Emergent Bilingual students demonstrate increased English language proficiency on Summit K12 assessments and the MOY TELPAS benchmark, progressing toward the campus TELPAS growth target of 40%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Strengthening Academic Discourse and Student Engagement
Teachers will consistently implement structured opportunities for EB students to engage in meaningful academic conversations through turn-and-talk, collaborative learning, purposeful questioning, and complete-sentence responses. Instructional leaders will monitor the quality and frequency of student discourse through classroom walkthroughs and provide actionable feedback to strengthen implementation.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student participation, stronger academic vocabulary, and improved English listening and speaking proficiency.
Student result: Emergent Bilingual students demonstrate improved listening and speaking proficiency through classroom language samples, oral-response rubrics, and TELPAS-aligned assessments, contributing to increased English language proficiency progress by Spring 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The campus serves a large Emergent Bilingual population, requiring consistent implementation of high-quality linguistic supports alongside rigorous grade-level instruction to ensure equitable access to the curriculum.	Linguistic accommodations, sheltered instruction strategies, and academic language development are not yet consistently planned into Tier 1 lessons in every classroom, and Emergent Bilingual resources are not consistently matched to students' English proficiency levels.

Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.5:

By May 2027, Booker T. Washington Elementary will increase the percentage of African American students achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR Mathematics from 10% to 33%, as measured by the 2027 STAAR Mathematics assessment.

Evaluation Data Source: MAP Growth Math BOY, MOY, and EOY, math unit assessments and CUAs, and CFAs,

disaggregated for African American students, and 2027 STAAR Math.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Data-Driven Instruction Focused on Closing the Gaps
Teachers and instructional leaders will regularly analyze CFA, unit assessment, and NWEA MAP data to monitor the mathematics performance of African American students. During CTMs/PLCs, teams will identify students who are not yet meeting grade-level expectations, determine specific learning gaps, and develop targeted instructional responses. Progress will be monitored regularly to ensure students are on track to achieve Meets Grade Level or Above.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved instructional responsiveness, reduced achievement gaps, and increased percentages of African American students performing at Meets Grade Level or Above.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 4

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Monitoring Student Progress Toward Meets Grade Level
Teachers and instructional leaders will establish individual academic goals for African American students based on their current mathematics performance and monitor progress toward the Meets Grade Level standard. Through student data conferences, assessment analysis, and ongoing progress monitoring, teachers will identify students approaching Meets and provide targeted instruction to support continued growth.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student ownership of learning, improved academic performance, and measurable progress toward the campus goal of 33% Meets Grade Level or Above.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 4 - Student Learning 4

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Spring 2026 STAAR Mathematics results revealed significant performance gaps among Hispanic and African American students. Of the Hispanic students tested, 45.8% performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard. Among African American students in grades 3 and 4, 66.7% (14 of 21) performed at the Did Not Meet Grade Level standard, including 100% (6 of 6) of third-grade African American students.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently give students time to solve grade-level problems, explain their reasoning, and apply concepts on their own, and teachers do not consistently use checks for understanding to adjust instruction during the lesson.

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Although Closing the Gaps increased substantially from a scaled score of 64 (D) in 2025 to 75 (C) in 2026, achievement differences among student groups remain and require continued attention.	Differentiated instruction, linguistic supports, accommodations, enrichment, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent fidelity across classrooms and student groups.

Performance Objective 6 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.6:
Academic Growth
By June 2027, Booker T. Washington Elementary's Academic Growth score will increase from 63 to at least 70, as measured by STAAR Reading and Math growth in the 2027 state accountability system

Evaluation Data Source: MAP Growth MOY and EOY, CUA 1 and CUA 2, and 2027 STAAR

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Growth in Reading and Math:
After BOY MAP and each CUA, teachers will set a growth target for every student in grades 3-5 based on last year's STAAR performance level, and CTMs will plan extension lessons for students at Meets and Masters as well as reteaching for students below. Adult practice: a campus growth tracker lists every student's 2026 level and target and is updated after BOY,

CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2. Student result: students who scored Meets or Masters in 2026 hold or raise their level on CUA 2, and MOY MAP shows more students on track to meet their growth targets than BOY did.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Result expected: Increased academic growth and student achievement in grades 3-5 through individualized growth targets, differentiated instruction, and consistent progress monitoring. Students previously achieving Meets or Masters Grade Level will maintain or improve their performance, while students performing below grade level will demonstrate progress toward higher achievement levels. Success will be evidenced by an increased percentage of students on track to meet their growth targets on MOY NWEA MAP compared to BOY, improved CUA performance, and increased Meets and Masters percentages on the 2027 STAAR assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

The principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach will observe Tier 1 teachers at least every three weeks and Tier 2 every 2 weeks and Tier 3 teachers at least weekly, give written feedback within 24 hours, and run coaching cycles on one action step at a time. The Instructional Leadership Team will review walkthrough trends weekly. Adult practice: walkthrough logs show every teacher observed at least twice a month.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved Tier 1 instruction and increased teacher effectiveness through frequent walkthroughs, timely feedback, and targeted coaching cycles. Teachers will demonstrate consistent growth in implementing effective checks for understanding, purposeful student discourse, and differentiated small-group instruction. Success will be measured through walkthrough data showing monthly increases in the effective implementation of instructional look-fors, documented coaching progress, and improved student engagement and academic performance.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

In January, teams will use MOY MAP and CUA 1 data to regroup students for intervention, and from February through April will give targeted small-group acceleration to students within 5 points of the next performance level.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Revised intervention rosters and acceleration schedules are in place by January 22, 2027. Students in acceleration groups raise their CUA 2 scores compared with CUA 1.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 4: Academic Experience: High Quality Instructional Materials

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	A high percentage of students continue to require intensive academic intervention in reading and mathematics, indicating a need to strengthen the campus MTSS process to ensure students receive the appropriate level, intensity, and duration of support.	A consistent campuswide process for identifying student needs, selecting targeted interventions, monitoring student response, and moving students between tiers based on evidence is not yet fully implemented. The CNA identifies concerns regarding the number of students placed in Tier 2 and Tier 3 compared with the expected tiered model.
3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.

Goal 5

LEVER 5: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CAPACITY BUILDING
The campus implements systems aligned with the district expectations to build teacher and instructional leader capacity through job-embedded opportunities such as collaborative planning and internalization, observation and feedback cycles, and data analysis protocols.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.1:Instructional Leadership
Establish expectations and campus systems for instructional leaders and teachers' coaching and development.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of BTW teachers receive observation and feedback every two weeks in Strive, as set in the TAP.

Evaluation Data Source: Instructional walkthrough logs, weekly coaching feedback entries, professional learning community (PLC) agendas, and teacher growth tracking dashboards will be evaluated by campus and district administration to verify that 100% of campus systems for instructional leaders and teachers' coaching and development are executed with consistency and fidelity

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.1.1: KP 5.1.1 Roles and Responsibilities for Distributed Leadership
Campus sets and reinforces high performance expectations by following district guidance during hiring, onboarding/induction, professional learning, and coaching structures.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus instructional leaders have defined role descriptions and schedules documenting that they follow district guidance to deliver weekly coaching, onboarding support, and professional learning routines that reinforce high performance expectations

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.1.2:Staff Development and Coaching Plan
Campus leadership ensures staff are supported through deliberately scheduled, ongoing, job-embedded coaching and professional development that supports rigorous, high-quality instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus master calendars and coaching logs document the consistent execution of deliberately scheduled, weekly, job-embedded observations and professional development sessions that directly support the delivery of rigorous, high-quality instruction

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Provide observation and feedback to core teachers every two weeks; re-observe action steps within two weeks; review HQIM internalization in weekly Lesson Internalization planning sessions; monitor ELPS-aligned language objectives in bilingual/ESL walkthroughs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of core teachers receive biweekly observation/feedback; at least 80% of action steps re-observed within two weeks; language objectives present in at least 85% of applicable walkthroughs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals; Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3, 5

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.
5	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.2: Instructional Planning for Effective Classroom Instruction
Provide job-embedded supports for teachers to effectively internalize, prepare for, and deliver instruction in a strong classroom environment.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of BTW teachers will internalize and rehearse lessons in the TAP's twice-weekly PLCs.

Evaluation Data Source: 100% of teacher lesson plan submissions contain fully completed lesson internalization guides, with instructional planning minutes and weekly feedback logs verifying that leaders consistently provide job-embedded planning supports before the instruction is delivered in the classroom

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.2.1: Instructional Planning Supports
Campus leadership supports teachers in internalizing curriculum through structured individual planning time and PLCs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus master schedules and professional learning community (PLC) agendas verify that teachers receive structured individual planning time and collaborative PLC sessions dedicated to internalizing curriculum units and lesson materials with leadership support

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.2.2: Observation and Feedback
Campus instructional leaders implement observation and feedback cycles with calibration aligned to high-quality instructional material delivery and strong instructional delivery practices, leveraging action step trackers to provide clarity and track progress over time.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of walkthrough forms and observation feedback logs verify that instructional leaders execute consistent observation and feedback cycles calibrated to high-quality instructional materials, providing clear action steps to track teacher progress over time

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	The quality of Tier 1 instruction varies across classrooms and grade levels, so students do not have the same chance to engage in rigorous grade-level learning and master essential standards.	Teachers are at different levels of skill in lesson internalization: unpacking standards, anticipating misconceptions, planning rigorous questions and tasks, and adjusting instruction from checks for understanding.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5: Data-Driven Instruction, Assessment Reflection, and Targeted Supports
Campus utilizes data to support all learners.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of BTW PLCs will analyze each CFA cycle and adjust intervention groups

within one week, following the TAP milestone calendar.

Evaluation Data Source: PLC data-meeting protocols, data dashboards, standard-by-standard CFA item analysis reports, and target group intervention rosters will be evaluated by campus and district administration to verify that 100% of teachers use student performance data to drive instruction, reflect on assessments, and provide targeted student interventions.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE 5.3.1: Data-Driven Instruction with Curriculum-Embedded Assessments
Campus instructional leaders implement systems for teachers to analyze exit ticket data, review student work, and use formative assessments to identify learning gaps, plan targeted supports, and adjust instruction in alignment with high-quality instructional materials.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of CTM data-meeting artifacts and exit ticket protocols show teachers analyzing student work and formative assessments to adjust instruction, and the percentage of students at Meets Grade Level on CUA 2 is higher than on CUA 1 in reading and math for Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and continuously enrolled students.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coach

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

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE 5.3.2: Data-Driven Instruction, Assessment Reflection, and Targeted Supports
Campus instructional leaders use disaggregated data to monitor student progress, provide evidence-based feedback, and guide teachers--individually and in PLCs--through a consistent process to analyze misconceptions, identify root causes, and plan targeted instructional responses. .

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: * 100% of PLC agendas and data-analysis protocols confirm that instructional leaders guide teachers through a consistent process to analyze misconceptions and root causes using disaggregated data, with walkthrough forms verifying that targeted instructional responses and evidence-based feedback are implemented immediately in all classrooms

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction

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

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Although the Academic Growth scaled score increased from 53 (F) in 2025 to 63 (D) in 2026, the campus left potential accountability points unearned when students who had previously achieved Meets or Masters did not maintain or advance their performance level. In 2026, 33 of the 105 students who scored Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped at least one performance level.	Individual student growth is not yet consistently monitored by prior performance level to ensure that every student has an intentional growth target. Instructional planning has emphasized intervention for struggling students more consistently than enrichment and acceleration for students already demonstrating proficiency.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Teachers are still building skill in disaggregating CFA and unit assessment data, naming the specific skill gaps, and turning those gaps into small-group lessons, and CTMs do not yet consistently end with a written reteach and extension plan for each group of students.	Teachers are continuing to build capacity in disaggregating student data, identifying specific skill gaps, and translating findings into differentiated small-group instruction and intervention. The CNA identifies data analysis and effective small-group planning as an area of need, while the CIP indicates only some progress in data-driven instruction and progress monitoring.

Goal 6

LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS
The campus maintains strong financial and operational systems aligned with district systems, prioritizing strategic budget allocation to support the envisioned student experience, maximizing instructional time, fostering student-focused enrollment practices, and maintaining a safe and secure learning environment.

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 6.1: Teacher and Student Time
Campus ensures there is sufficient time in the school day for impactful student experiences, as well as staff preparation and development.
Target: In 2026-27, the BTW master schedule will protect daily WIN time and the TAP's twice-weekly PLC time.

Evaluation Data Source: Campus master schedules, teacher duty rosters, PLC meeting calendars, and instructional planning block assignments will be evaluated by campus and district administration to verify that the school day provides sufficient time for impactful student experiences, staff preparation, and ongoing professional development

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE 6.1.1 School Day Master Schedule
Campus master schedule optimizes student learning time and is centered on the envisioned student academic experience, including opportunities for enrichment.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of Skyward master schedules show maximized core instructional blocks, designated daily intervention/enrichment periods, and zero structural scheduling conflicts to prove that student learning time is fully optimized around the academic experience

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Title I: 2.5.2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Despite significant improvement in the overall accountability rating, Student Achievement remains below expectations. The Student Achievement scaled score increased only one point, from 55 (F) in 2025 to 56 (F) in 2026, indicating that too few students are consistently demonstrating mastery of grade-level standards.	Tier 1 instruction is not yet consistently taught at the depth and rigor students need to master grade-level essential standards, and our instructional response has focused on students below grade level without planning for movement across every performance level.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 6.2 Campus Budget
Strategically plans for and allocates resources in alignment with the envisioned student experience.
Target: By June 2027, 100% of BTW campus, Title I, and SCE spending will tie to a CIP or TAP strategy, with at least 75% spent or obligated by March 31.

Evaluation Data Source: Campus Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) strategy pages, Skyward ledger tracking reports, and campus-level expenditure logs will be evaluated by campus and district administration to verify that campus-allocated funds and resources are strategically planned for and spent in direct alignment with student learning needs

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE 6.2.1 Strategic Budget Allocation
Campuses ensure budget decisions are intentionally aligned to the highest-priority needs that support campus goals, enhance the student experience, and improve student outcomes.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus-level expenditures and budget allocations match the high-priority strategies outlined in the Campus Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) to verify that funds are intentionally directed toward campus goals, student experience enhancements, and improved student learning outcomes

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE 6.2.2 Compliant Budgeting, Accounting, and Financial Practices
Campus maintains sound accounting practices in accordance with statutes and local requirements to support fiscal transparency and responsibility.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus ledger tracking files and purchase showing adherence to state and federal guidelines and local Elgin ISD requirements, with zero compliance exceptions on internal reviews to ensure complete fiscal transparency and responsibility

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Title I, Part A also funds the campus instructional coach ($93,475, salary and benefits), an intervention aide ($26,615), and Age of Learning reading and math intervention licenses ($16,000).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of federal/SCE expenditures align to CIP strategies; at least 75% of allocation spent or obligated by March 31; 100% of required time-and-effort records in CRATE.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 6.3: Enrollment and Access
A clearly defined process for enrollment and access that aligns with district expectations and established procedures.
Target: In 2026-27, 100% of new BTW students will be enrolled through the district's online process, with residency and occupational surveys completed.

Evaluation Data Source: Skyward student enrollment records, registration timeline logs, and campus attendance data reports will be evaluated by campus and district administration to verify that 100% of student admissions follow the district-defined electronic process and established entry procedures

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE 6.3.1 Student-focused Enrollment Systems
Campuses implement enrollment practices that prioritize students and families, ensuring clear and transparent communication of processes to support access and informed decision-making.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus enrollment data and communications in Skyward demonstrate that registration procedures, entry requirements, and timelines are communicated transparently to families, resulting in smooth, accessible student onboarding and informed decision-making

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Curriculum and Instruction

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3, 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE 6.3.2 Student Recruitment and Communication
Campus ensures families receive clear, timely, and accessible information about available programs, clubs, and student opportunities through multiple communication channels (e.g., newsletters, websites, parent portals, and social media) to support engagement and participation.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus newsletters, website updates, parent portals, and social media postings demonstrate clear, timely, and multi-channel communication about available programs, clubs, and student opportunities to drive high levels of family engagement and student participation

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3, 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Parent participation in campus engagement nights remains low, with approximately 15% of families attending, limiting opportunities for the school to build strong home-school partnerships and provide families with information and resources to support student learning.	Family engagement events are scheduled from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. and follow one format, and the campus has not yet asked families which times, formats, and languages work best for them.
4	Parent participation in PTA membership and leadership remains limited, resulting in an imbalance between staff and parent representation within the organization. During the 2024-2025 school year, PTA membership consisted primarily of teaching staff.	The campus has not yet explained to families what PTA does, how to join, and how PTA gives parents a voice in campus decisions, so membership has stayed mostly teaching staff.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 6.4: Campus Operations
Strategically plans and allocates resources in alignment with the envisioned student experience.
Target: In 2026-27, BTW will set duty rosters and facility schedules before each semester so no WIN or

TAP PLC time is lost.

Evaluation Data Source: Skyward master schedules, campus facility usage calendars, duty roster rotations, and operational resource inventory sheets will be evaluated by campus and district administration to verify that campus operational structures and physical resources are strategically planned and allocated in alignment with the envisioned student experience

Strategy 1

KEY PRACTICE: 6.4.1 Secure Facilities
Campus leaders ensure that all facilities meet district security requirements to provide a safe and protected learning environment for students, staff, and visitors.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus safety check sheets and facility logs confirm that all building access points, visitor screening systems, and security equipment fully comply with district requirements to provide a secure learning environment

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Assistant Superintendent of Student Services

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3, 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Parent participation in campus engagement nights remains low, with approximately 15% of families attending, limiting opportunities for the school to build strong home-school partnerships and provide families with information and resources to support student learning.	Family engagement events are scheduled from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. and follow one format, and the campus has not yet asked families which times, formats, and languages work best for them.
4	Parent participation in PTA membership and leadership remains limited, resulting in an imbalance between staff and parent representation within the organization. During the 2024-2025 school year, PTA membership consisted primarily of teaching staff.	The campus has not yet explained to families what PTA does, how to join, and how PTA gives parents a voice in campus decisions, so membership has stayed mostly teaching staff.

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I-Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
4	1	3		--	$39,962.00
				Sub-Total	$39,962.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$39,962.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00