Elgin Independent School District

Neidig Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Generated by Plan4Learning.com
November 13, 2026 at 01:49 PM

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 3

Demographics 4

Student Learning 6

School Processes & Programs 8

Perceptions 11

Priority Problem Statements 13

Goals 16

Goal 1 : LEVER 1:PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT THROUGH STRO... 17

Goal 2 : LEVER 2: TALENT Each lever is defined by a set of Essential Actions (EA) a... 21

Goal 3 : LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS The campus establi... 27

Goal 4 : LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MAT... 38

Goal 5 : LEVER 5: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CAPACITY BUILDING The ca... 49

Goal 6 : LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS The campus maintains stro... 55

State Compensatory Education 57

Budget for Neidig Elementary School 58

Personnel for Neidig Elementary School 58

Title I Summary 59

Title I 60

1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) ESSA Section 1114(b)(6) 60

1.1 Description of CNA Process 60

2. Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) ESSA Section 1114(b) 60

2.1 Timeline for Schoolwide Program/CIP Development 1114(b)(1)(A) 60

2.2 Stakeholders 1114(b)(2) 60

2.3 Description of Plan Availability, Format, and Language 1114(b)(4) 60

2.4 Description of Plan Coordination (if Applicable) 1114(b)(5) 60

2.5 Statutorily Required Descriptions 1114(b)(7)(A) 60

3. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness ESSA Section 1114(b)(3) 61

3.1 Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation 61

Title I Personnel 61

Funding Summary 62

211 - Title I-Part A 63

255 - Title II- Part A 64

State Compensatory Education Allotment (25) 48.104 65

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Neidig Elementary serves 693 students in PK through grade 5. According to the 2025-26 TEA Student Information report, 66.8% of students are Hispanic, 15.6% African American, and 12.8% White; 55.0% are economically disadvantaged, 40.0% are emergent bilingual, and 16.3% receive special education services. The campus mobility rate was 14.6% in 2024-25. Neidig's demographics are close to the average of its 40-campus TEA comparison group (57.4% economically disadvantaged, 38.6% EB, 13.5% mobility, 17.9% special education), the group against which its Relative Performance score of 52 is measured. Neidig is a Title I schoolwide campus. After earning a C (79) in 2025, Neidig was rated F (59) in 2026, and the campus is writing a Targeted Improvement Plan for 2026-27. Neidig has no federal identification (CSI, TSI, or ATS). The fall 2026 Effective Schools Framework (ESF) diagnostic serves as the campus needs assessment for the TIP. Enrollment has changed sharply in each of the last three years: the campus served 663 students in K-4 in 2023-24, fell to 527 in 2024-25 when Trinity Ranch Elementary opened and attendance zones were redrawn (48.7% student attrition that year), and grew to 693 in 2025-26 with the addition of Pre-K and fifth grade (21.8% attrition of the 2024-25 students). Tested enrollment grew from 220 to 318 as fifth grade moved from Elgin Intermediate, so the 2026 rating reflects a substantially larger and reconfigured campus whose students are largely new to the building. Over the same three years the emergent bilingual share rose from 37% to 40% and mobility improved from 17.9% to 14.6% (2025-26 TEA Student Information reports). The reported economically disadvantaged rate fell from 78% to 55% over the same period. The student population did not change in that way; the identification system did. Once the district moved to the Community Eligibility Provision it stopped collecting meal applications, economically disadvantaged status depended on campus coding and family forms, and no one verified the count before the PEIMS snapshot, so the 55% understates the campus's actual poverty level (District Improvement Plan, Demographics Problem Statement 2). Neidig's economically disadvantaged student group, its Closing the Gaps targets, and its Title I rank-order allocation all rest on this number, and the district is correcting it under DIP Strategy 5.3.3 (verify every accountability and federal funding rate before each PEIMS snapshot and document economically disadvantaged status under CEP). Neidig's 2026-27 rate is therefore expected to rise, and the campus will treat the fall 2026 PEIMS snapshot verification as a TIP data-quality step rather than reading the drop as a demographic shift. The campus added 20 staff members for 2026-27, nine of whom were not certified teachers; sixteen of 31 teachers (52%) have five or fewer years of experience, 0% of newly hired teachers held a valid certificate in their content area in 2023, 2024, and 2025, and 28 of 44 staff (64%) returned in 2025, so much of the instructional expertise on campus is still developing. Chronic absenteeism (students absent 10% or more of enrolled days) has improved for three years but remains high: 28.7% in 2023-24 (TAPR, as cited in the ESF diagnostic), 24.8% in 2024-25 (142 students), and 19.2% in 2025-26 (142 students of a larger enrollment), per the district's PEIMS attendance data from the Director of Assessment and Accountability. In 2025-26 the rate was 23.6% for economically disadvantaged students (102 of the 142 chronically absent students, against 55% of enrollment), 20.8% for White students, 20.2% for students receiving special education services, 19.4% for Hispanic students, 19.0% for African American students, 16.4% for emergent bilingual students, and 53.8% for students experiencing homelessness (7 of 13). As of October 23, 2026, 105 students (14.5%) are already chronically absent for 2026-27, 93 of them economically disadvantaged. The most recent published attendance rate is 92.2% (2023-24). The 2025-26 attendance rate was 93.7% (district PEIMS).

Strengths

- Chronic absenteeism has improved for three straight years: 28.7% in 2023-24, 24.8% in 2024-25, and 19.2% in 2025-26.
- Mobility improved from 17.9% to 14.6% over the same three years.
- Emergent bilingual students' 2026 reading result (42% Meets) is close to the campus rate (44%).

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2 ★	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.
3 ★	The campus's reported economically disadvantaged rate fell from 78% in 2023-24 to 55% in 2025-26 with no matching change in the student population, so the student-group data used for accountability, Closing the Gaps targets, and Title I funding does not reflect the students Neidig actually serves.	Under the Community Eligibility Provision the district no longer collects meal applications, and the campus has no routine for collecting the alternative income documentation, coding students, and verifying the count before each PEIMS snapshot (aligned to DIP Demographics Problem Statement 2 and DIP Strategy 5.3.3).

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

In 2026, Neidig earned an F (59), down 20 points from a C (79) in 2025. Every domain fell: Student Achievement from 70 to 56, Academic Growth from 80 to 57, Relative Performance from 74 to 52, and Closing the Gaps from 76 to 63. On STAAR, reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and math Meets fell from 34% to 23%. In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches and 8% reached Meets. Across all subjects, 51% of tests reached Approaches, 30% Meets, and 10% Masters. Reading growth was 62% and math growth was 41%, the lowest of the five elementary campuses; every student group with 10 or more math tests fell between 38% and 46%. Academic Growth is the shortest path back: raising the raw growth score from 51 to 56 returns Neidig to a D if the other scores hold, which takes about 19 more growth points, nearly all from math (41% to about 50%). A C takes Growth at 63 and Closing the Gaps at 33 (now 19).

Fall 2026 MAP projections show the same pattern: 34% of students are projected to reach Meets in reading, 17% in math, and 5% in science, and the fall MAP projection of the overall rating is 59, the same as the 2026 score, so the decline has not yet turned around. The fall 2026 NWEA MAP Growth campus report (2025 norms; students with both fall 2025 and fall 2026 scores) gives the BOY baseline by grade. Achievement percentile is where the grade's average score sits against national norms; growth percentile is how much the same students grew from fall 2025 to fall 2026 compared with similar students nationally, so it reflects last year's instruction plus the summer. Every grade in math and every grade except second in reading sits below the 40th achievement percentile, and reading achievement falls with each grade: 52nd percentile in grade 2, 36th in grade 3, 25th in grade 4, and 24th in grade 5. Growth was strongest in grade 2 reading (68th percentile) and grade 4 math (63rd) and weakest in grade 2 math (26th), grade 3 reading (31st), grade 4 reading (38th), and grade 4 science (21st). Second grade enters with the strongest reading achievement on campus but the weakest math growth, and grades 3 and 4 show the drop in reading growth that the vertical-alignment root cause in Student Learning Problem Statement 1 describes. Spanish reading was administered in grades 2-5 (22, 31, 34, and 28 students) with no comparable norm percentile.

Grade	Math students	Math achievement %ile	Math growth %ile	Reading students	Reading achievement %ile	Reading growth %ile	Science students	Science achievement %ile	Science growth %ile
2	76	27	26	56	52	68	—	—	—
3	86	31	41	86	36	31	—	—	—
4	81	36	63	81	25	38	82	28	21
5	97	30	44	94	24	46	93	35	46

Elgin ISD MAP BOY 26-27 Campus report (Dr. Amanda Hardwick), NWEA MAP Student Growth Summary Report, Fall 2026, 2025 norms. Neidig's Closing the Gaps groups for 2027 are All Students, African American, Hispanic, and High Focus. Gaps are largest for students receiving special education services and for African American students: African American students reached Meets in reading at 35% and in math at 14%; Hispanic students at 43% and 21%; High Focus students at 39% and 20%. African American, Hispanic, and High Focus students already met their 2027 reading targets, a strength to protect.

Closing the Gaps indicator	2026 result	2027 target (3 points)
Reading at Meets, all students	44%	46%
Math at Meets, all students	23%	49% (40.5% earns 2 points)
Reading growth, all students	62%	64%
Math growth, all students	41%	69% (59.5% earns 2 points)
TELPAS progress, emergent bilingual	37%	40%
STAAR score, all subjects	30	47 (43.5 earns 2 points)

Strengths

- African American, Hispanic, and High Focus students already met their 2027 Closing the Gaps reading targets (35%, 43%, and 39% Meets).
- Grade 2 reading growth reached the 68th percentile and grade 4 math growth the 63rd percentile on the fall 2026 MAP Growth report.
- Second grade enters with the strongest reading achievement on campus (52nd percentile).

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2 ★	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3 ★	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.
4 ★	Academic Growth fell from 80 in 2025 to 57 in 2026. Only 62% of students met their growth target in reading and 41% in math.	Teachers did not consistently use progress-monitoring data to regroup students and adjust instruction during the year, so students who fell behind early were not caught up before the next unit.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Core instruction uses HMH for reading and STEMscopes for math. Grade-level PLCs meet twice a week on the four PLC questions, moving to the Elgin ISD PLC Teacher Guide protocols (unit and module internalization, lesson internalization, lesson rehearsal, student work analysis) in 2026-27, and the Instructional Leadership Team meets weekly to review walkthrough and assessment data. The campus receives support from ESC Region 13, Engage2Learn, and district curriculum staff. Students take MAP Growth three times a year, plus two comprehensive unit assessments (CUAs) and unit assessments. The campus partners with Communities in Schools and ACE and implements Capturing Kids' Hearts.

The ESF diagnostic (fall 2026). Five of six levers rated Developing and Lever 6 rated Exemplary. The findings that drive this plan:

Lever and key practice	Score	Finding
1. Planning and Performance Management (2/6)	1.2.2 Goals: 1; 1.4.4 Performance management: 1	The CIP does not disaggregate data by grade or student group, analyze longitudinal trends, define campus leadership roles, or document how resources align to priority strategies. Twice-weekly PLC and weekly leadership data reviews exist; no formal data dashboard.
2. Talent (5/9)	2.1.3 Staffing for impact: 3; 2.3.1 Appraisal: 2; 2.3.2 Advancement and retention: 0	Teachers are tiered and the highest-rated teachers placed in grades 3-5 and high-needs classrooms; T-TESS calibration is weekly. No written advancement and retention plan; retention data is not used systematically.
3. Integrated Student Support (1/9)	3.1.1 Student support teams: 0; 3.2.2 Routines: 1 design, 0 implementation	Interventionist position vacant; MTSS referral process not clearly understood by staff; individual student data-tracking inconsistent. 100% of students follow school-wide expectations, but only 30% of teachers were observed communicating, modeling, or reinforcing routines; no tool or meeting structure for reviewing routine data.
4. Academic Experience (10/24)	4.1.2 Tier 1 strategies: 1 design, 0 implementation; 4.1.3 Extended time: 1, 3; 4.2.1 Materials: 2, 1; 4.2.2 Monitoring: 2; 4.3.3 Advising: 0	0% of observed RLA and math classrooms scored 3 or higher on the TEA observation tool for instructional delivery. 100% of classrooms engaged in intervention during the 50-minute block, but intervention data is not maintained. LCR: math materials not aligned to the district adoption; 80% of math and 60% of RLA classrooms used adopted materials for Tier 1. RLA teachers have RBIS training; math teachers do not.
5. Instructional Leadership (5/18)	5.2.1 Culture training: 0; 5.2.2 Curriculum PL: 0; 5.2.4 Planning supports: 0, 0; 5.2.5 Observation and feedback: 2, 3	No professional learning calendar; no HMH-specific training this year. 100% of PLCs use the district agenda, but 75% of observed PLCs were lesson planning and 25% internalization, rehearsal, or student work analysis; no special populations teachers observed in common planning. All four instructional leaders meet the district observation frequency targets with weekly calibration.
6. Finance and Operations (3/3)	6.1.2 Master schedule: 3	Master schedule exceeds required RLA and math minutes, aligns to adopted materials, protects intervention and PLC time, and is reviewed annually with stakeholders.

Strengths

- The master schedule rated Exemplary on the ESF diagnostic (Lever 6, 3 of 3): it exceeds required RLA and math minutes, protects intervention and PLC time, and aligns to adopted materials.
- All four instructional leaders meet the district observation frequency targets and calibrate weekly.
- Teachers are tiered, and the highest-rated teachers are placed in grades 3-5 and high-needs classrooms.
- 100% of PLCs use the district agenda, and 100% of classrooms were engaged in intervention during the 50-minute block.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.
2 ★	No observed RLA or math classroom met the expected performance level on the TEA observation tool for instructional delivery.	Teachers have not received curriculum-specific professional learning on HMH or math RBIS this year, PLC time is spent on planning rather than internalizing and rehearsing lessons, and coaching cycles have not been focused on one delivery refinement at a time.
3 ★	Students identified for intervention do not have consistent individual progress tracking, and the MTSS referral process is not consistently understood by staff.	The interventionist position is vacant, the MTSS referral process was presented once at BOY without follow-up, and the campus has no student-level tracking tool or regular Student Support Team meeting for reviewing intervention data.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Perceptions data for 2026-27 come from the November 4, 2026 campus public meeting, the bilingual community feedback form (open through November 13, 2026), and the fall 2026 ESF diagnostic. The fall 2026 ESF diagnostic staff survey and interviews found that staff understand school-wide expectations and that students follow them, but that the MTSS process and intervention guidance have not been consistently understood by staff. Families at the November 4, 2026 public meeting and on the feedback form (three responses as of November 5) rated the goals very clear and named student support and teacher training as the parts most likely to help students. They asked about teacher certification and retention, when families receive benchmark and MAP results, curriculum resources and regular curriculum nights for families, classes for parents including adult ESL, how students already on grade level will be challenged, and more adult help in classes of more than 20 students. Answers are posted in a bilingual family FAQ, and the requests are summarized for the Campus Advisory Council and used at the MOY formative review.

Strengths

- Staff understand school-wide expectations, and 100% of students observed followed them (fall 2026 ESF diagnostic).
- Families have a bilingual feedback form and a November 4 public meeting with interpretation to shape the plan.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Families and staff do not yet share a consistent understanding of how the campus identifies and supports students who need intervention, families do not receive their child's benchmark and MAP results on a set timeline, and family participation in campus events is not tracked consistently enough to measure engagement.	The campus has not had a written MTSS process, defined Student Support Team roles, or a consistent system for communicating with families and tracking their participation.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.
4	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
5	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.
6	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

7 ★

The campus's reported economically disadvantaged rate fell from 78% in 2023-24 to 55% in 2025-26 with no matching change in the student population, so the student-group data used for accountability, Closing the Gaps targets, and Title I funding does not reflect the students Neidig actually serves.

Under the Community Eligibility Provision the district no longer collects meal applications, and the campus has no routine for collecting the alternative income documentation, coding students, and verifying the count before each PEIMS snapshot (aligned to DIP Demographics Problem Statement 2 and DIP Strategy 5.3.3).

8 ★

Academic Growth fell from 80 in 2025 to 57 in 2026. Only 62% of students met their growth target in reading and 41% in math.

Teachers did not consistently use progress-monitoring data to regroup students and adjust instruction during the year, so students who fell behind early were not caught up before the next unit.

9 ★

Families and staff do not yet share a consistent understanding of how the campus identifies and supports students who need intervention, families do not receive their child's benchmark and MAP results on a set timeline, and family participation in campus events is not tracked consistently enough to measure engagement.

The campus has not had a written MTSS process, defined Student Support Team roles, or a consistent system for communicating with families and tracking their participation.

10 ★

No observed RLA or math classroom met the expected performance level on the TEA observation tool for instructional delivery.

Teachers have not received curriculum-specific professional learning on HMH or math RBIS this year, PLC time is spent on planning rather than internalizing and rehearsing lessons, and coaching cycles have not been focused on one delivery refinement at a time.

11 ★

Students identified for intervention do not have consistent individual progress tracking, and the MTSS referral process is not consistently understood by staff.

The interventionist position is vacant, the MTSS referral process was presented once at BOY without follow-up, and the campus has no student-level tracking tool or regular Student Support Team meeting for reviewing intervention data.

★ = Priority

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 1.4: Performance Management (TIP)
By June 2027, Neidig Elementary will complete 100% of Targeted Improvement Plan requirements on time (public meeting November 4, 2026; Board public hearing and approval November 16, 2026; plan in Plan4Learning by November 20, 2026; quarterly TEA check-ins; EOY reflection by June 30, 2027) and will review student data disaggregated by grade and student group at every nine-week checkpoint against the interim targets set in Milestone 1 (ESF Key Practice 1.2.2 rated 1 of 3; 1.4.4 rated 1 of 3).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Plan4Learning submission confirmation; public meeting notice, sign-ins, minutes, and comment form; Board minutes; quarterly check-in documentation; campus milestone tracker; nine-week data review agendas with a status for every milestone.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Maintain a campus milestone tracker and data dashboard (Eduphoria walkthrough data, MAP, mCLASS, CIRCLE, unit and semester assessments, attendance) disaggregated by grade and student group, reviewed weekly by campus leadership and each nine weeks with the principal supervisor, DCSI, and Director of Assessment and Accountability. (ESF Key Practices 1.2.2, 1.4.4)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of nine-week reviews are held with a documented status (on track, needs adjustment, needs district support) for every milestone. The dashboard is live by January 29, 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach; DCSI

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Hold the TIP public meeting at the campus with the Campus Intervention Team, the site-based

committee, parents, and community members; collect public comment; secure Board approval at the November 16, 2026 special meeting; submit the plan in Plan4Learning; post it in English and Spanish on the campus website and in the front office. (TEC 39A.053, 39A.055, 39A.057; ESF Key Practice 1.4.4)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Notice sent home and posted in both languages by October 20, 2026; public meeting held November 4, 2026 with interpreter and translated handouts; bilingual feedback form open November 5-13 with responses summarized for the Board packet; public comment summary added to the TIP and the CNA Perceptions section by November 5; Board approval November 16; plan submitted by November 20; posted within two weeks of Board approval.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: DCSI; Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 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 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	No observed RLA or math classroom met the expected performance level on the TEA observation tool for instructional delivery.	Teachers have not received curriculum-specific professional learning on HMH or math RBIS this year, PLC time is spent on planning rather than internalizing and rehearsing lessons, and coaching cycles have not been focused on one delivery refinement at a time.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Families and staff do not yet share a consistent understanding of how the campus identifies and supports students who need intervention, families do not receive their child's benchmark and MAP results on a set timeline, and family participation in campus events is not tracked consistently enough to measure engagement.	The campus has not had a written MTSS process, defined Student Support Team roles, or a consistent system for communicating with families and tracking their participation.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1.4: Performance Management (Title I Schoolwide Planning)
By June 2027, Neidig Elementary will complete 100% of its Title I schoolwide planning requirements: a comprehensive needs assessment built in at least three stakeholder meetings, Campus Advisory Council meetings at BOY, MOY, and EOY, every Plan4Learning formative and summative review, and complete evidence for each meeting uploaded to CRATE within 10 school days (2025-26 baseline: Title I campus stakeholder evidence incomplete at the October 2025 validation).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: CNA meeting agendas, signed sign-in sheets, minutes, and slides (at least 3 meetings); CAC BOY, MOY, and EOY evidence with stakeholder names and roles; Plan4Learning formative reviews (December, February, April) and summative review (June); CRATE upload log; 2026-27 Title I evidence checklist; posted English and Spanish CIP.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Build the campus comprehensive needs assessment with the CAC in at least three meetings starting at BOY, covering all four CNA areas with 2025-26 data and prior-year comparisons. At Neidig, the ESF diagnostic serves as the needs assessment. Hold CAC meetings at BOY, MOY, and EOY with teachers, paraprofessionals, parents not employed by the district, community members, and business representatives; if any stakeholder group has two or fewer attendees, hold a make-up meeting within the same week. (EDF Key Practices 1.1.1, 1.2.5; TEC 11.253; ESSA 1114(b))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: BOY (by October 30, 2026), MOY (by January 29, 2027), and EOY (by May 28, 2027) meetings are held, make-up meetings are documented, and 100% of evidence is in CRATE within 10 school days. The 2026-27 Title I evidence checklist and any outstanding 2025-26 close-out evidence go to the Federal and State Programs Coordinator by November 20, 2026.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principal; Instructional Coach; Campus Title I contact

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Funding Sources: Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

Review the CIP at each Plan4Learning checkpoint with the campus leadership team, rate every strategy, and record an adjustment for any strategy rated Some Progress or No Progress. Write a one-page evaluation plan for each federally or SCE-funded campus program (Title I interventionist and tutors, Age of Learning, extended-day or summer programs, PK curriculum, Title II training) naming the intended outcome, implementation measure, student outcome measure, and decision date, and make a continue, modify, or discontinue decision at EOY. (EDF Key Practices 1.4.1, 1.4.4; ESSA 1114(b)(3); TEC 29.081(c))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Formative reviews complete in December 2026, February 2027, and April 2027, and the summative review by June 4, 2027; 100% of strategies rated Some or No Progress have a recorded adjustment within 10 school days, checked at the next review, with each formative review summary shared at the next Campus Advisory Council meeting; 100% of funded programs have an evaluation plan by December 18, 2026 and a data-based decision at EOY.

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Families and staff do not yet share a consistent understanding of how the campus identifies and supports students who need intervention, families do not receive their child's benchmark and MAP results on a set timeline, and family participation in campus events is not tracked consistently enough to measure engagement.	The campus has not had a written MTSS process, defined Student Support Team roles, or a consistent system for communicating with families and tracking their participation.

Goal 2

LEVER 2: TALENT
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 2.3: Growth and Retention Strategies (TIP)
By May 2027, Neidig Elementary will adopt a written teacher advancement and retention plan, 100% of teachers with fewer than two years of experience or on an individual support plan will be observed weekly with coaching, and staff retention will increase from 64% (28 of 44 returned in 2025) to at least 75% for 2027-28 (ESF Key Practice 2.3.2 rated 0 of 3; 0% of new teachers certified in content area in 2023, 2024, and 2025).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Written advancement and retention plan; coaching logs and individual support plans; certification plans and exam pass rates; spring stay-interview summary; 2027-28 return rate.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Continue tiering teachers and placing the highest-rated teachers in grades 3-5 and high-needs classrooms; assign intervention and acceleration groups to the teachers with the strongest results on the relevant TEKS; fill vacancies at Neidig first in the district hiring cycle with the principal supervisor and DCSI participating in interviews. (ESF Key Practice 2.1.3)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Interventionist vacancy filled by December 18, 2026; 100% of grade 3-5 classrooms staffed with certified or tier-1 teachers for the spring semester.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Principal Supervisor; DCSI

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2

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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Write and adopt a campus advancement and retention plan covering onboarding for new hires,

mentor pairing, teacher-leader roles (team leads, Guiding Coalition, Campus Advisory Council), a written certification plan for every uncertified teacher, and a spring stay interview for every teacher. (ESF Key Practice 2.3.2)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Plan adopted by January 29, 2027; 100% of uncertified teachers have a certification plan by November 20, 2026; stay interviews complete by March 26, 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2

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 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.1: Intentional Roles and Staffing (Right to Know and Certification)
By June 2027, Neidig Elementary will meet 100% of Parents' Right to Know requirements (beginning-of-year notice, answers to qualification requests, and 4-week letters), and 100% of its uncertified teachers will have a written certification plan, with the number of uncertified core teachers decreasing by at least half from the fall 2026 Human Resources certification report by June 2027.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Dated BOY Right to Know notice and distribution proof; request log; certification check (September and January) with dated 4-week letters; written certification plans and exam pass rates.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Send every family the beginning-of-year notice that they may request the professional qualifications of their child's teachers and paraprofessionals, in English and Spanish, in the handbook and on the website, and to new enrollees at registration; answer each request within 10 school days. Check teacher certification for every class roster in September and January with Human Resources and send the required parent letter whenever a student has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet state certification requirements. (EDF Key Practice 2.1.4; ESSA 1112(e)(1))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Notice home by the end of the first six weeks and to 100% of new enrollees; certification checks complete by September 30, 2026 and January 29, 2027; 100% of required 4-week letters home within five school days, with copies in CRATE.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principal; Campus Registrar

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2

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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Give every uncertified teacher a written certification plan with an exam date and testing support (Elevate Elgin, TeachWorthy, Grow Your Own, or the ESL Academy with pay for successful certification), and pair each with the instructional coach or a mentor for observation and feedback at least every two weeks. (EDF Key Practices 2.1.5, 2.2.4; ESSA 1112(b)(2))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of uncertified teachers have a certification plan by November 20, 2026 and a mentor or coach assigned; at least 50% pass their certification exam by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2

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 Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.3: Growth and Retention Strategies (Title II Professional Learning)
By May 2027, at least 90% of Neidig Elementary staff targeted for Title II, Part A-funded professional learning will complete it, and the share of observed classrooms implementing the practices from that training will increase from the BOY walkthrough baseline to at least 80% by EOY.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Title II training sign-ins and completion records; Capturing Kids' Hearts and Literacy First walkthrough data; NWEA growth report use in PLCs; Title II consultation survey participation.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Send staff to the Title II-funded professional learning assigned to the campus (Capturing Kids' Hearts, Literacy First K-2, NWEA growth report training, and the four-day accountability calibration training) and follow each training with walkthroughs that check whether the practice is in place. Send the campus administrator selected for the GCA Conference in San Antonio (November 11-12, 2026, corrective action). Have teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents complete the spring Title II consultation survey and discuss campus professional learning needs at the EOY CAC meeting. (EDF Key Practices 2.3.1, 2.3.4, 5.2.2; ESSA 2102(b)(3), 2103)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of staff complete Capturing Kids' Hearts, 100% of K-2 teachers complete Literacy First, and 100% of core teachers and coaches complete NWEA growth report training by December 18, 2026; walkthroughs show the practice in at least 80% of classrooms by March 2027; at least 75% of staff respond to the Title II survey by April 30, 2027.

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

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

Funding Sources: Title II, Part A: Literacy First K-2 $1,588; NWEA growth report training (NWEA portion) $2,300; Center for Collaborative Classroom PK teacher training $2,400. Capturing Kids' Hearts is paid from district Title funds for the elementary campuses. 255 - Title II- Part A, $6,288

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 Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

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 (TIP)
By May 2027, 100% of Neidig Elementary students identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention will have a documented plan and progress-monitoring record in the campus tracking tool (2025-26 baseline: student-level intervention data not tracked consistently; interventionist position vacant; ESF Key Practice 3.1.1 rated 0 of 3).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Intervention tracking tool; MTSS referral log; Student Support Team minutes; written SST roles and qualifications; MAP growth to projection for intervention students.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Re-train all staff on the MTSS referral process and the Tier 2 Bridges document by November 30, 2026; provide MTSS-specific training to the instructional coach, principal, and teachers with the District Director of MTSS; define Student Support Team roles, responsibilities, and qualifications in writing; implement a student-level intervention tracking tool in Panorama; meet as an SST every two weeks to review progress-monitoring data. Supports: District Director of MTSS, Director of School Improvement, MTSS Handbook, Panorama, funding for the interventionist position. (ESF Key Practices 3.1.1, 4.1.3)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of students below benchmark at BOY have a tracked plan by December 18, 2026; SST meets every two weeks with minutes; 100% of intervention students have participation and progress data entered weekly.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principal; Counselor; Interventionist; Instructional Coach

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

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: Title I paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE, $28,474 (salary and benefits); State Compensatory Education: SCE paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez). Interventionist, 1.0 FTE (vacant): Local (general operating) funds. 211 - Title I-Part A, $28,474, State Compensatory Education: SCE paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez) State Compensatory Education Allotment (25) 48.104,

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 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Academic Growth fell from 80 in 2025 to 57 in 2026. Only 62% of students met their growth target in reading and 41% in math.	Teachers did not consistently use progress-monitoring data to regroup students and adjust instruction during the year, so students who fell behind early were not caught up before the next unit.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.
3	Students identified for intervention do not have consistent individual progress tracking, and the MTSS referral process is not consistently understood by staff.	The interventionist position is vacant, the MTSS referral process was presented once at BOY without follow-up, and the campus has no student-level tracking tool or regular Student Support Team meeting for reviewing intervention data.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.2: School Culture, Behavior and Safety (TIP)
By May 2027, chronic absenteeism at Neidig Elementary will decrease from 19.2% in 2025-26 (142 students; 24.8% in 2024-25 and 28.7% in 2023-24) to at most 12%, with the rate for economically disadvantaged students falling from 23.6% to at most 18% and for students receiving special education services from 20.2% to at most 16%, and the campus attendance rate will hold at or rise at least 1

percentage point above the 2025-26 rate of 93.7%, toward the CIP's 95% goal. Source: district PEIMS attendance data (Director of Assessment and Accountability, October 2026); the ESF diagnostic cited the 2023-24 TAPR figures. School-wide routines (ESF Key Practice 3.2.2) are addressed through LIFT campus coaching under the Campus Leader Critical Actions for Schoolwide Routines rather than as a TIP objective.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Monthly attendance and chronic absenteeism report by grade and student group; attendance team minutes; attendance plans for students at 10% or more absences; family contact log.

Strategy 1 ✅ Results Driven Accountability

Run a monthly campus attendance team (assistant principal, counselor, attendance clerk, CIS) that reviews attendance by grade and student group, builds a plan for every student at 10% or more absences, and makes counselor or CIS contact with the family at the third absence; report attendance by student group on the campus dashboard and review it at each nine-week checkpoint. (ESF Key Practice 3.2.2; TEC 25.085)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Attendance plans for 100% of chronically absent students (105 as of October 23, 2026) by January 29, 2027; chronic absenteeism at or below 12% by EOY, measured against the 2025-26 baseline of 19.2%, with economically disadvantaged students at or below 18% and students receiving special education services at or below 16%; campus attendance rate at or above the 2025-26 rate plus 1 percentage point.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principal; Counselor; Attendance Clerk

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: State Compensatory Education: Communities in Schools campus program, $42,500; Local (campus attendance team staff time). State Compensatory Education Allotment (25) 48.104, $42,500

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
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.1: Multi-Tiered System of Supports (Key Practice 3.1.4: Parent and Family Engagement)
By May 2027, Neidig Elementary will meet 100% of its ESSA 1116 parent and family engagement (PFE) requirements, and the number of families attending PFE events will increase by at least 20% over 2025-26 attendance, measured by Watch Party QR attendance and campus sign-ins.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Annual Title I meeting evidence; campus PFE policy and school-parent compact with meeting evidence showing a parent majority; distribution records; Watch Party QR attendance and campus event sign-ins; staff PFE training sign-ins; spring PFE evaluation survey and results; PFE set-aside spending with parent input.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Hold the annual Title I meeting at least twice at flexible times with Spanish interpretation; jointly develop, review, and revise the campus PFE policy and school-parent compact with parents in parent-majority meetings and distribute both through the handbook, website, annual meeting, and fall conferences; train all staff on working with families as equal partners at the October 14, 2026 staff meeting with a make-up the following week; send parents of emergent bilingual students the required language instruction program notice and all school information in English and Spanish. (EDF Key Practices 3.1.4, 5.1.1; ESSA 1116(b)-(e), 1112(e)(3))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting held by September 30, 2026 with a second session by November 20 if only one was held; policy and compact distributed in both languages by November 20, 2026 with signed compacts on file; 100% of staff complete PFE training; 100% of EB parent notices home within 30 days of the start of school.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Counselor; Bilingual/ESL Lead; Campus Title I contact

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Funding Sources: parent and family engagement set-aside, $1,570; Title III, Part A: interpretation and translation (district Title III allocation). 211 - Title I-Part A, $1,570

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Build families' capacity to support learning by promoting and hosting the six ESC Region 13 PFE Watch Parties (October 8, 20, 27; November 5, 17; December 1; 6:00 to 7:00 PM, campus or Zoom) and at least one campus reading or math night per semester; give every family its child's STAAR and MAP results with an explanation, and its child's MAP and benchmark results within two weeks of each testing window; use each semester's family night to walk through HMH Into Reading and STEMscopes vocabulary and send home family resources; evaluate the PFE program each spring through a family survey and parent focus group and use the results to revise the policy, compact, and next year's PFE spending. (EDF Key Practices 1.4.1, 3.1.4, 4.2.6; ESSA 1116(a)(2)(D)-(E), 1116(e)(1)-(2))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All six Watch Parties and at least two campus events hosted with attendance tracked; family attendance up at least 20% over 2025-26; 100% of families receive their child's STAAR report; survey given by April 16, 2027 and results shared by May 14, 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Counselor; Campus Title I contact

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: parent and family engagement set-aside (included in the $1,570 above). 211 - Title I-Part A,

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
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Families and staff do not yet share a consistent understanding of how the campus identifies and supports students who need intervention, families do not receive their child's benchmark and MAP results on a set timeline, and family participation in campus events is not tracked consistently enough to measure engagement.	The campus has not had a written MTSS process, defined Student Support Team roles, or a consistent system for communicating with families and tracking their participation.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.3: Systems to Identify and Respond to Student Needs
By June 2027, 100% of Neidig Elementary students who are economically disadvantaged, homeless, migrant, in foster care, or meet the state at-risk criteria will be identified, documented, and coded accurately in PEIMS; the campus economically disadvantaged rate will be reconciled with source documentation before the fall 2026 PEIMS snapshot (2025-26 reported rate 55%, down from 78% in 2023-24 with no matching population change); 100% of identified students will receive a documented service; and the attendance rate for these students will increase by at least 1.5 percentage points over the 2025-26 rate.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Economically disadvantaged documentation under the Community Eligibility Provision (household income forms, direct certification matches, and other allowable documentation) reconciled with the PEIMS count before each snapshot, with the district PEIMS verification checklist signed off; residency questionnaires and referrals to the district McKinney-Vento liaison; occupational surveys and migrant referrals; foster care referrals; at-risk roster by the 17 state criteria checked against PEIMS; SCE entry and exit records; attendance by student group.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Collect economically disadvantaged documentation for every family at enrollment and again in a campus-wide fall collection window before the PEIMS snapshot: the household income form under the Community Eligibility Provision in English and Spanish, direct certification matches (SNAP, TANF, Medicaid), and other allowable documentation; code students in Skyward; and reconcile the campus count with source documentation and sign the district PEIMS verification checklist before each snapshot, following DIP Strategy 5.3.3. Give every enrolling family the residency questionnaire and the occupational survey; refer students who may qualify as homeless to the McKinney-Vento liaison, possible migrant students to the migrant recruiter, and foster care students to the district foster care contact; provide the services each plan calls for. Identify students who meet the 17 state at-risk criteria at enrollment and each six weeks, code them in PEIMS, enter and exit them from SCE services by district procedure, and list every SCE-funded campus position as an FTE in the CIP. (EDF Key Practices 3.1.1, 3.3.2, 5.3.3; ESSA 1112(b)(6), 1112(c)(5); TEC 29.081)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of new enrollees complete the income form, residency questionnaire, and occupational survey; the fall 2026 economically disadvantaged count is reconciled with source documentation and the PEIMS verification checklist is signed before the snapshot, and no student-group identification rate changes more than 5 points year to year without a documented reason; 100% of referrals within five school days and 100% of identified students have a documented service plan within 30 days; at-risk roster verified before the fall PEIMS snapshot and updated every six weeks; campus counts match PEIMS at every submission.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Counselor; State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A (homeless reservation); Title I, Part C; State Compensatory Education; Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

3	The campus's reported economically disadvantaged rate fell from 78% in 2023-24 to 55% in 2025-26 with no matching change in the student population, so the student-group data used for accountability, Closing the Gaps targets, and Title I funding does not reflect the students Neidig actually serves.	Under the Community Eligibility Provision the district no longer collects meal applications, and the campus has no routine for collecting the alternative income documentation, coding students, and verifying the count before each PEIMS snapshot (aligned to DIP Demographics Problem Statement 2 and DIP Strategy 5.3.3).

Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.2: School Culture, Behavior and Safety (Discipline)
By May 2027, instructional days lost to disciplinary removals at Neidig Elementary will decrease by at least 25% from the 2025-26 PEIMS baseline, with no student group removed at a rate more than 10% above the campus rate.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Monthly discipline data by student group; PBIS fidelity checks; Capturing Kids' Hearts walkthroughs; Tier 2 behavior support logs.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Implement PBIS and Capturing Kids' Hearts with Tier 2 behavior supports (check-in/check-out, functional behavior assessments, behavior intervention plans) before any removal, and review discipline data by student group monthly with the campus behavior team. (EDF Key Practices 3.2.1, 3.2.3; ESSA 1112(b)(11))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instructional days lost to removals fall at least 25% from 2025-26; any student group more than 10% above the campus rate has a written response plan within 30 days.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principal; Counselor

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Title II, Part A; Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 5 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

Performance Objective 6

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.2: School Culture, Behavior and Safety (Coordinated School Health)
By May 2027, 100% of PK-5 students at Neidig 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), as part of the coordinated school health program required by TEC 11.253(d)(10).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: FitnessGram results; PE and recess schedules; attendance by student group; School Health Advisory Council (SHAC) input.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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; School Nurse; Counselor

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 6 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

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: Framework for a Rigorous Multi-tiered Academic Experience (Reading)
By June 2027, the percentage of Neidig Elementary students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 44% to at least 50%, and Masters Grade Level will increase from 16% to at least 20% (TEA 2027 Closing the Gaps target: 46%; fall 2026 MAP projects 34%; African American, Hispanic, and High Focus students hold their 2026 results of 35%, 43%, and 39%). Students receiving special education services will increase from 30% to at least 36% at Meets Grade Level or above in reading. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 32% to at least 38%, supporting the district HB 3 early literacy goal.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Unit assessments; CUA 1 and CUA 2; MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY by student group; MAP Fluency; mCLASS; 2027 STAAR Reading by student group.

Strategy 1

☑ **Results Driven Accountability**

Implement the campus assessment plan: CIRCLE (PK), Amplify mCLASS (K), NWEA MAP Growth reading and mathematics (grades 1-5), MAP Growth science (grades 3-5), and MAP Fluency (grades 1-2, plus grade 3 students below grade level at BOY) at BOY, MOY, and EOY; two semester comprehensive assessments on the TEKS taught; common unit assessments and formative checks within each unit. The Director of Assessment and Accountability disaggregates every administration by grade and student group and flags any student who drops a performance level. (ESF Key Practices 1.4.4, 5.3.1)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Disaggregated reports within two weeks of each window; 100% of flagged students reviewed by the principal and instructional coach within one week with a documented adjustment.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach; DCSI

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Title II, Part A: NWEA (portion), $2,300; Local: NWEA MAP Growth K-12 district license $80,875; Amplify mCLASS, CIRCLE, and interim assessments (district assessment budget). 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

Deliver daily Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention and enrichment in the protected 50-minute block, delivered by the interventionist and Title I tutors with district-approved supplemental materials, with HB 1416 accelerated instruction for every student who did not pass STAAR in 2026 (15 or 30 hours, groups of no more than four, aligned to the HQIM, tracked every six weeks), groups regrouped after each unit, and progress monitored every two weeks. (ESF Key Practice 4.1.3; EDF Key Practices 4.1.1, 4.1.3; TEC 28.0211; ESSA 1114(b)(7))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of students below the 40th percentile on MAP Growth, below benchmark on mCLASS or CIRCLE, or at Did Not Meet on the prior-year STAAR in intervention by October 30, 2026; 100% of HB 1416 students scheduled by October 30 and complete before the spring STAAR; at least 50% of those students reach Approaches in 2027; at least 60% of intervention students meet their MAP growth projection by EOY. Student result: students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading intervention increase their MAP RIT scores from BOY to MOY, and the percentage reaching Meets on CUA 2 rises above CUA 1.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Interventionist; Instructional Coach

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

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: Title I paraprofessional and tutors; State Compensatory Education: SCE paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez), and SCE campus budget. 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

Use Literacy First in K-2 and extend learning time for students not yet meeting standards by recruiting them for extended-day tutoring, Summer Jump Start Math (rising grade 4), Summer School, and Bilingual Summer School 2027. In PK3 and PK4, use the centralized digital access, small-group lab resources, and specialized units of instruction, and ease the move to kindergarten with Head Start through shared records and a spring kindergarten round-up. (EDF Key Practices 3.4.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 6.1.1; ESSA 1112(b)(8), 1114(b)(7), 1119)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 85% average attendance for invited students; at least 70% of participants show growth from pre-test to post-test; 100% of PK classrooms use the curriculum by November 20, 2026; the percentage of PK4 students on track on CLI Engage rises at least 20 percentage points from BOY to EOY; a kindergarten transition event by May 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principal; Bilingual/ESL Lead; PK Lead Teacher

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: extended-day tutoring (HB 1416 accelerated instruction) $12,500, extended-day snacks $4,500, instructional supplies $8,000; Title II, Part A: Literacy First K-2 $1,588; Title I, Part A (carryover): PK materials, a share of $13,950 across the five elementary campuses estimated Neidig share $2,790. 211 - Title I-Part A, $27,790

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	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

ESSENTIAL ACTION 4.1: Framework for a Rigorous Multi-tiered Academic Experience (Mathematics) By June 2027, the percentage of Neidig Elementary students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 23% to at least 40.5%, Approaches Grade Level or above will increase from 43% to at least 55%, and the percentage of mathematics tests showing expected growth will increase from 41% to at least 50% (TEA 2027 Closing the Gaps targets: 49% Meets, 69% growth; fall 2026 MAP projects 17% Meets). Students receiving special education services will increase from 23% to at least 33% at Meets Grade Level or above in mathematics. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 24% to at least 31%, supporting the district HB 3 early mathematics goal.

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Unit assessments; CUA 1 and CUA 2; MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY by student group; Age of Learning usage reports; 2027 STAAR Mathematics by student group.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Bring 100% of mathematics classrooms into alignment with STEMscopes as the Tier I material, with SAVVAS and Lowman restricted to intervention; complete math RBIS training through Engage2Learn for all mathematics teachers by January 29, 2027; check materials alignment and RBIS evidence in RLA and math in every walkthrough using the RLA- and math-specific observation tools in Strive within Eduphoria; review internalization protocols and ensure student work is analyzed in PLCs; progress monitor the MAP Growth screeners and, with the Director of Assessment and Accountability, determine whether unit assessments are the best interim data points. Supports: Director of Assessment and Accountability, Director of School Improvement, Assistant Superintendent of C&I, HQIM, the district math and literacy frameworks. (ESF Key Practices 4.2.1, 4.2.2; LCR finding: math materials not aligned to the district adoption)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of mathematics and RLA classrooms use adopted materials for Tier I by MOY (from 80% and 60%); math RBIS training complete; MAP mathematics growth to projection reviewed at every nine-week checkpoint.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach; DCSI

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Local and Instructional Materials Allotment: STEMscopes materials and vendor training (district Instructional Materials Allotment); LIFT (LASO 4): math RBIS through Engage2Learn (district LIFT contract). 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

Use Age of Learning for Tier 1 and Tier 2 math practice at the weekly usage target, calibrate math common formative assessments to STAAR rigor, and reteach unmastered standards within 48 hours, with structured time in every math lesson for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models. (EDF Key Practices 4.1.3, 4.2.4; ESSA 1114(b)(7))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: At least 80% of students meet the weekly Age of Learning usage target by December 18, 2026; the percentage of students meeting MAP math growth projection increases by at least 10 percentage points from MOY to EOY.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: Age of Learning (Tier 1 and Tier 2 math), $16,000 (district-paid). 211 - Title I-Part A, $16,000

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
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.

2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 4.1: Framework for a Rigorous Multi-tiered Academic Experience (Science)
By June 2027, fifth grade STAAR Science results will increase from 28% to at least 45% at Approaches Grade Level or above, from 8% to at least 18% at Meets, and from 2% to at least 5% at Masters (fall 2026 MAP projects 5% Meets).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Science unit assessments; CUA 1 and CUA 2; MAP Science BOY, MOY, and EOY; 2027 STAAR Science.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Teachers in grades 3-5 teach weekly hands-on investigations with explicit science vocabulary and data interpretation, and science results are reviewed in PLCs after each unit and each MAP Science administration. (ESF Key Practice 4.1.2)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Adult practice: lesson plans and walkthroughs show weekly investigations. Student result: the percentage of fifth graders reaching Meets on science unit assessments and MAP Science rises from BOY to MOY.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coach; Principal; grade 3-5 science teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Funding Sources: Local; Instructional Materials Allotment 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 4.1: Framework for a Rigorous Multi-tiered Academic Experience (Academic Growth) By June 2027, Neidig Elementary's Academic Growth score will increase from 57 to at least 63, as measured by STAAR Reading and Math growth in the 2027 state accountability system (2026 baseline: 62% of reading tests and 41% of math tests showed expected growth; a scaled score of 60 returns the campus to a D if other domains hold).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: MAP Growth MOY and EOY growth to projection; CUA 1 and CUA 2 by spiraled standard; student data folders; 2027 STAAR growth measures.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Identify the essential standards that need continued reinforcement across grade levels, build spiraled review and retrieval practice into daily HMH and STEMscopes lessons, and use CUA data to catch regression; vertical teams meet monthly to review spiraled standards. (ESF Key Practices 4.1.2, 5.2.4)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Adult practice: vertical team notes and lesson plans show spiraled standards each week. Student result: students maintain or raise their performance on spiraled standards from CUA 1 to CUA 2.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Coach; Principal; grade-level team leads

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

After each major assessment (BOY, CUA 1, MOY, CUA 2), students in grades 3-5 record their results in data folders and set goals with their teachers; teachers use the folders in intervention grouping and parent conferences. (ESF Key Practice 5.3.2)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Adult practice: data folders updated after BOY, CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2. Student result: students meet their individual MAP growth goals at MOY and EOY.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principal; Instructional Coach; grade 3-5 teachers

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Local 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

In January, teams use MOY MAP and CUA data to regroup students for intervention; from February through April, provide targeted small-group acceleration on the standards students have not mastered, with HB 1416 hours complete before STAAR. (ESF Key Practice 4.1.3; TIP Milestones 8 and 9)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Adult practice: revised intervention rosters and acceleration schedules in place by February 15, 2027. Student result: students in acceleration groups raise their CUA 2 scores compared with CUA 1; math growth to projection rises from MOY to EOY.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach; Interventionist

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

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: extended-day tutoring (HB 1416), $12,500 (listed under Goal 4, PO 1, Strategy 3); State Compensatory Education: campus SCE budget for accelerated instruction. 211 - Title I-Part A,

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	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

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 5.2: Instructional Planning and Delivery (TIP)
By May 2027, the percentage of observed Neidig Elementary RLA and mathematics classrooms scoring 3 or higher on the TEA observation tool will increase from 0% to at least 50% by MOY and 75% by EOY, and the share of observed PLC time spent on lesson internalization, rehearsal, or student work analysis will increase from 25% to at least 60% (ESF Key Practice 4.1.2 rated 1 and 0; 5.2.4 rated 0 and 0).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Eduphoria walkthrough and coaching records; LIFT Companion Guide calibration records; PLC observation data on the LIFT PLC tool; professional learning calendar and sign-ins.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Run twice-weekly grade-level PLCs using the Elgin ISD PLC Teacher Guide (the district's adaptation of the LIFT PLC protocols): unit and module internalization before each unit, lesson internalization weekly, lesson rehearsal at least every other week per team, and student work analysis after each CFA, unit assessment, and screener window, with the four critical questions as the purpose statement; every PLC opens with prework from the curriculum and closes with a classroom-action record (change, owner, teach date, evidence, review date); reteach within 48 hours and maintain-or-advance work for students at Meets and Masters come out of the student work analysis; special education, bilingual, and intervention teachers attend weekly and co-plan access and accommodations; administrators observe at least one PLC per team each week with the LIFT PLC Observation Tool and check that each PLC's decisions change instruction. (ESF Key Practices 5.2.4, 5.3.1, 5.3.2; EDF Key Practice 5.2.4)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of teams hold two PLCs per week with completed agendas; at least 60% of observed PLCs engaged in internalization, rehearsal, or student work analysis by MOY; special populations teachers present in 100% of data PLCs; PLCs score proficient on the LIFT PLC tool by March 2027; reteach plans recorded for 100% of CFAs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: LIFT (LASO 4): Engage2Learn PLC coaching and monthly ILT sessions (district LIFT contract with Engage2Learn); Title II, Part A; Local. 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Sustain the observation and feedback system with the Title I-funded instructional coach: every teacher is observed at least every two weeks using the TEA observation tool in Strive within Eduphoria, with T-TESS-aligned feedback within 24 hours and two-week coaching cycles on one refinement tied to CFA data; teachers in their first two years, uncertified teachers, and teachers on support plans are observed weekly with lesson modeling and co-planning. The principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach calibrate weekly with the LIFT Companion Guide, with biweekly district calibration walks, and the Instructional Leadership Team reviews walkthrough trends weekly. (ESF Key Practice 5.2.5; EDF Key Practices 5.1.2, 5.2.5; ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of core teachers on a coaching caseload by October 30, 2026; every teacher observed at least every two weeks and first- and second-year teachers weekly; at least 80% of action steps re-observed within two weeks; 100% of identified teachers on a support plan by November 30, 2026; observation-tool scores reach the objective targets at MOY and EOY.

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A: instructional coach, 1.0 FTE (Selena Cacho), $81,414 (salary and benefits); LIFT (LASO 4): Engage2Learn observation and feedback training (district LIFT contract); Local. 211 - Title I-Part A, $81,414

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

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Publish a campus professional learning calendar for spring 2027 (January through May), aligned to the District Improvement Plan professional learning priorities and to this plan's objectives, and follow it: district PD days (January 4-5 and February 12, 2027); HMH and STEMscopes curriculum-specific sessions; math RBIS through Engage2Learn; culture and routines training; data-response sessions within two weeks of the MOY window and CUA 2; monthly Engage2Learn ILT sessions; LIFT-supported sessions (December 7, 2026; January 25, February 1, March 1, April 12, and May 10, 2027). Determine needs from student data, walkthrough data, PLC trends, and the MOY staff survey, compiled by the instructional coach, and build the 2027-28 calendar on the same alignment before August 2027 pre-service. (ESF Key Practices 5.2.1, 5.2.2)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Spring 2027 calendar published by December 18, 2026 with each session tied to a DIP or CIP objective; 100% of staff complete curriculum-specific and routines training by February 26, 2027; walkthroughs show the trained practice in at least 80% of classrooms by April 2027; 2027-28 calendar drafted by June 2027.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Coach; DCSI

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: LIFT (LASO 4) (district LIFT contract); Title II, Part A; Local: substitutes for PLC release and learning walks (campus substitute budget). 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.2: Instructional Planning and Delivery (Title III Language Objectives)
By May 2027, ELPS-aligned language objectives will be observed in at least 85% of Neidig Elementary bilingual and ESL walkthroughs, and the percentage of emergent bilingual students advancing at least one TELPAS composite level will increase from 37% to at least 40% (the 2027 Closing the Gaps target).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: Bilingual and ESL walkthrough data; Title III training sign-ins; TELPAS composite results.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Train bilingual, ESL, and general education teachers to plan ELPS-aligned language objectives, content-based language instruction, and structured academic talk into Tier 1, using supplemental Title III professional learning and the Bilingual Education team's RDA focus on math and science for dual language and ESL students, and check for them in walkthroughs. (EDF Key Practice 5.3.5; ESSA Title III, Part A)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: ELPS-aligned language objectives observed in at least 85% of bilingual and ESL walkthroughs by March 2027; TELPAS progress at or above 40%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Bilingual/ESL Lead; Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Funding Sources: Title III, Part A 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Emergent bilingual students reached Meets in reading at 42% and in math at 22%, and 37% of emergent bilingual students advanced a TELPAS level against a 40% target.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured academic discourse, and language supports in every content area, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data for emergent bilingual students.
2	Students receiving special education services reached Meets in reading at 30% and in math at 23%; economically disadvantaged students reached 36% and 17%.	Differentiated instruction is not consistently aligned to the specific gaps found in assessment data, and PLCs do not consistently use progress-monitoring results to adjust interventions for students in special education and economically disadvantaged students.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Reading performance declined in 2026. STAAR reading Meets Grade Level or above fell from 54% to 44%, and Masters fell from 18% to 16%.	Grade-level mastery was not maintained from one grade to the next because instruction did not consistently spiral previously taught skills, and teams did not use vertical alignment to address recurring weaknesses before students moved to the next grade.
2	Math performance declined in 2026. STAAR math Meets Grade Level or above fell from 34% to 23%, and 57% of students did not reach Approaches.	Math instruction was not consistently differentiated to the gaps shown in assessment data, especially for emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and special education students, and teachers had limited structured time for students to explain their reasoning and use visual models.
3	In fifth grade science, 28% of students reached Approaches, 8% Meets, and 2% Masters.	Science instruction in grades 3-5 does not yet consistently include hands-on investigations, data interpretation, and explicit science vocabulary, and science data is not regularly reviewed in PLCs.

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 6.2: Budget and Finance (TIP Resources and Federal Program Compliance)
By June 2027, 100% of Neidig Elementary TIP strategies with a cost will carry an itemized estimate and funding source; 100% of Title I, Title II, Title III, and SCE expenditures will tie to a CIP strategy and CNA need; at least 75% of the campus allocation will be spent or obligated by March 31, 2027; and 100% of time and effort records for federally and SCE-funded campus staff will be complete and in CRATE (the district's 2025-26 compliance report was out of compliance).

Evaluation Data Source: SUCCESS CRITERIA: TIP cost and funding table; campus budget with a fund source on every CIP strategy with a cost; quarterly expenditure reviews; time and effort certifications and monthly reports in CRATE; SCE FTE list and signed job descriptions; PFE set-aside spending with parent input; federal equipment inventory; LASO 5 application record.

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Build the TIP cost table and the campus Title I and SCE budget from the CNA priorities; name the fund source on every strategy with a cost; keep the Lever 6 master schedule (protected twice-weekly PLC time and the 50-minute intervention block) in place; apply for LIFT continuation through LASO 5 by December 1, 2026; review Title I, II, III, and SCE spending quarterly with the Federal and State Programs Coordinator; spend the 1% PFE set-aside ($1,570) on activities parents helped choose. (ESF Key Practices 6.1.2, 6.2.2; EDF Key Practices 6.2.2, 6.2.4; ESSA 1114(b), 1116(a)(3))

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Cost table complete before the November 20, 2026 submission; LASO 5 application submitted by December 1, 2026; 100% of CIP strategies with a cost show a fund source by January 29, 2027; quarterly reviews in December, March, and June; at least 75% of the allocation spent or obligated by March 31, 2027; 100% of the PFE set-aside spent by May 28, 2027 with parent input in minutes.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; DCSI; Campus Bookkeeper

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A $155,248 identified to date; Title II, Part A $6,288; State Compensatory Education $190,821; LIFT (LASO 4) and Local funds as listed in the TIP Resources section. See the funding summary in Part 3. 211 - Title I-Part A,

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

Collect time and effort for every campus employee paid with Title I, Title II, Title III, or SCE funds (semiannual certifications for single-cost-objective staff, monthly personnel activity reports for split-funded staff, through PowerSchool with Federal Programs uploading to CRATE), keep a signed job description for every funded position, and inventory equipment and technology bought with federal funds. (EDF Key Practices 6.2.3, 6.4.3; 2 CFR 200.313, 200.430)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of semiannual certifications submitted by January 29, 2027 and June 4, 2027, and 100% of monthly reports within 10 school days of month end; 100% of funded positions have a signed job description on file; equipment inventory complete by May 28, 2027 with no unaccounted items.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Campus Secretary; Campus Technology Specialist

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; State Compensatory Education 211 - Title I-Part A,

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 School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Tutoring and after-school support are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.	Teachers, interventionists, and ACE staff do not have a regular time to share student data, so tutoring and after-school time are not consistently aligned to the skills students missed in class.

State Compensatory Education

State Compensatory

Budget for Neidig Elementary School

Total SCE Funds: $190,821.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 1

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Neidig's 2026-27 State Compensatory Education budget (CFO's SCE budget by campus, Neidig tab, all PIC 30) totals $190,821. SCE supplements the regular program for students at risk of dropping out (TEC 29.081): Communities in Schools case management and attendance support, a paraprofessional for intervention, and supplemental instructional staff and services. Communities in Schools, Neidig program: $42,500 Professional salaries: $67,680 Paraprofessional salary (Joselin Mendez, 1.0 FTE): $53,287.52 Health insurance: $9,523.20 Medicare: $1,754.03 TRS: $4,359.13 TRS on-behalf: $10,128.97 Workers' compensation: $323.71 Unemployment: $129.44 Stipend pay: $1,000 Extra duty: $15 Substitutes: $120 Total: $190,821 SCE personnel: paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez). The $67,680 in professional salaries has no named position on the CFO's sheet, so the Business Office confirms that FTE count.

Personnel for Neidig Elementary School

Name	Position	FTE
Joselin Mendez	Paraprofessional	1

Title I Summary

Title I

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

1.1 Description of CNA Process

Neidig built its 2026-27 comprehensive needs assessment with the Campus Advisory Council, campus leadership, and district staff, starting at BOY and completed after the November 4, 2026 public meeting. It covers all four CNA areas with 2025-26 and fall 2026 data, and it uses the fall 2026 Effective Schools Framework diagnostic (ESC Region 13 campus visit October 14, 2026; action planning post-visit October 21, 2026) as the on-site needs assessment required by TEC 39A.053. Data are disaggregated by grade level and student group, and the priority problem statements and root causes drive every objective in this plan (Goal 1, Performance Objective 2, Strategy 1).

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

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

Neidig began its 2026-27 plan at BOY with the Campus Advisory Council and campus leadership. The ESF diagnostic visit was October 14, 2026, with action planning on October 21. The District Advisory Committee reviewed the plan November 3, families gave input at the November 4 public meeting and on the bilingual feedback form through November 13, the Board holds its public hearing and vote November 16, and the plan goes to TEA by November 20. The plan is reviewed in December 2026, February 2027, and April 2027, with a summative review in June 2027.

2.2 Stakeholders 1114(b)(2)

The plan was developed with the principal, assistant principals, instructional coach, teachers, the Campus Advisory Council (parents, community members, and staff), district leaders (DCSI, Director of School Improvement, Directors of Special Education and Bilingual Education, Director of Assessment and Accountability, Federal Programs), and ESC Region 13. Families and community members gave input at the November 4, 2026 public meeting at Neidig (with interpretation and translated handouts) and through the bilingual community feedback form open through November 13, 2026. The District Advisory Committee reviewed the improvement plans on November 3, 2026, and the Board holds its public hearing and vote on November 16, 2026.

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

The plan is posted on the Neidig and district websites in English and Spanish before the November 16, 2026 Board hearing, printed copies are available in the front office, and it is shared at Campus Advisory Council meetings and the annual Title I meetings. Interpretation is provided at every meeting, and families may request the plan in another language or format from the front office.

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

Neidig coordinates its Title I, Part A schoolwide funds with Title II, Part A (professional learning), Title III, Part A (language instruction and interpretation), State Compensatory Education (Communities in Schools, an intervention paraprofessional, and supplemental services for at-risk students), the LIFT (LASO 4) grant (Engage2Learn coaching and training), Instructional Materials Allotment and local funds (HMH and STEMscopes), and ACE after-school programming. PK coordinates with Head Start through shared records and a spring kindergarten round-up.

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

All students receive Tier I instruction in HMH RLA and STEMscopes Mathematics, internalized and rehearsed in twice-weekly PLCs, with observation and feedback every two weeks for every teacher. Students below benchmark receive Tier

2 and Tier 3 intervention in the protected 50-minute block, tracked by the Student Support Team, and students who have mastered the standards receive extension. Special education and bilingual staff plan access, accommodations, and language supports with grade-level teams. Learning time increases through extended-day tutoring (HB 1416 accelerated instruction), Summer Jump Start Math, Summer School, and Bilingual Summer School, plus small-group STAAR acceleration from February through April. Weekly hands-on science investigations in grades 3-5, Capturing Kids' Hearts, Communities in Schools, and ACE after-school programming support a well-rounded education. The MTSS process, Student Support Team, and student-level intervention tracking in Panorama identify and serve students who are not meeting standards, including students who meet the state at-risk criteria. Communities in Schools and the campus attendance team support chronically absent students and their families. Economically disadvantaged, homeless, migrant, foster, and at-risk students are identified and coded accurately and receive a documented service (Goal 3, Performance Objective 4), and State Compensatory Education funds supplemental staff and services for at-risk students.

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

3.1 Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation

Campus leadership reviews the milestone tracker weekly, and the principal, principal supervisor, DCSI, and Director of Assessment and Accountability review data against interim targets each nine weeks. Every strategy is rated at the Plan4Learning formative reviews (December 2026, February 2027, and April 2027) and the summative review (June 4, 2027), and any strategy rated Some Progress or No Progress gets a recorded adjustment. Each federally or SCE-funded program has a one-page evaluation plan with a continue, modify, or discontinue decision at EOY (Goal 1, Performance Objective 2, Strategy 2). The EOY stepback and TEA end-of-year reflection (June 30, 2027) evaluate whether the schoolwide program improved student achievement, especially for the lowest-achieving students, and the results shape the 2027-28 plan. Formative and summative reviews, program evaluation plans, EOY stepback notes, and CAC minutes are kept in Plan4Learning and uploaded to CRATE.

Title I Personnel

Name	Position	Program	FTE
Selena Cacho	Instructional Coach	Title I, Part A	1
Title I Paraprofessional	Para Professional	Title I, Part A	1

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I-Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	2	1	Local	--	$0.00
1	2	2	Local	--	$0.00
3	1	1	Title I, Part A: Title I paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE, $28,474 (salary and benefits); State Compensatory Education: SCE paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez). Interventionist, 1.0 FTE (vacant): Local (general operating) funds.	--	$28,474.00
3	3	1	parent and family engagement set-aside, $1,570; Title III, Part A: interpretation and translation (district Title III allocation).	--	$1,570.00
3	3	2	Title I, Part A: parent and family engagement set-aside (included in the $1,570 above).	--	$0.00
3	4	1	Title I, Part A (homeless reservation); Title I, Part C; State Compensatory Education; Local	--	$0.00
3	5	1	Title II, Part A; Local	--	$0.00
3	6	1	Local	--	$0.00
4	1	1	Title II, Part A: NWEA (portion), $2,300; Local: NWEA MAP Growth K-12 district license $80,875; Amplify mCLASS, CIRCLE, and interim assessments (district assessment budget).	--	$0.00
4	1	2	Title I, Part A: Title I paraprofessional and tutors; State Compensatory Education: SCE paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez), and SCE campus budget.	--	$0.00
4	1	3	Title I, Part A: extended-day tutoring (HB 1416 accelerated instruction) $12,500, extended-day snacks $4,500, instructional supplies $8,000; Title II, Part A: Literacy First K-2 $1,588; Title I, Part A (carryover): PK materials, a share of $13,950 across the five elementary campuses estimated Neidig share $2,790.	--	$27,790.00
4	2	1	Local and Instructional Materials Allotment: STEMscopes materials and vendor training (district Instructional Materials Allotment); LIFT (LASO 4): math RBIS through Engage2Learn (district LIFT contract).	--	$0.00

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
4	2	2	Title I, Part A: Age of Learning (Tier 1 and Tier 2 math), $16,000 (district-paid).	--	$16,000.00
4	3	1	Local; Instructional Materials Allotment	--	$0.00
4	4	1	Local	--	$0.00
4	4	2	Local	--	$0.00
4	4	3	Title I, Part A: extended-day tutoring (HB 1416), $12,500 (listed under Goal 4, PO 1, Strategy 3); State Compensatory Education: campus SCE budget for accelerated instruction.	--	$0.00
5	1	1	LIFT (LASO 4): Engage2Learn PLC coaching and monthly ILT sessions (district LIFT contract with Engage2Learn); Title II, Part A; Local.	--	$0.00
5	1	2	Title I, Part A: instructional coach, 1.0 FTE (Selena Cacho), $81,414 (salary and benefits); LIFT (LASO 4): Engage2Learn observation and feedback training (district LIFT contract); Local.	--	$81,414.00
5	1	3	LIFT (LASO 4) (district LIFT contract); Title II, Part A; Local: substitutes for PLC release and learning walks (campus substitute budget).	--	$0.00
5	2	1	Title III, Part A	--	$0.00
6	1	1	Title I, Part A $155,248 identified to date; Title II, Part A $6,288; State Compensatory Education $190,821; LIFT (LASO 4) and Local funds as listed in the TIP Resources section. See the funding summary in Part 3.	--	$0.00
6	1	2	Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; State Compensatory Education	--	$0.00
				Sub-Total	$155,248.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$155,248.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00

255 - Title II- Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
2	3	1	Title II, Part A: Literacy First K-2 $1,588; NWEA growth report training (NWEA portion) $2,300; Center for Collaborative Classroom PK teacher training $2,400. Capturing Kids' Hearts is paid from district Title funds for the elementary campuses.	--	$6,288.00
				Sub-Total	$6,288.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$6,288.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00

State Compensatory Education Allotment (25) 48.104

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
3	1	1	State Compensatory Education: SCE paraprofessional, 1.0 FTE (Joselin Mendez)	--	$0.00
3	2	1	State Compensatory Education: Communities in Schools campus program, $42,500; Local (campus attendance team staff time).	--	$42,500.00
				Sub-Total	$42,500.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$190,821.00
				+/- Difference	**$148,321.00**