Elgin Independent School District

Elgin Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

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

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 3

Demographics 4

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 10

Perceptions 12

Priority Problem Statements 15

Data Documentation for CNA 19

Improvement Planning Data 20

Accountability Data 20

Student Data: Assessments 20

Goals 21

Goal 1 : LEVER 1: PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT THROUGH STR... 22

Goal 2 : LEVER 2: ESSENTIAL ACTIONS AND KEY PRACTICES Each lever is defined... 25

Goal 3 : LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS The campus establi... 30

Goal 4 : LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MAT... 39

Goal 5 : LEVER 5: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CAPACITY BUILDING The ca... 57

Goal 6 : LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS The campus maintains stro... 61

Funding Summary 64

211 - Title I-Part A 65

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

In 2025-26, Elgin Elementary served 364 students, down from 670 in 2024-25 because Trinity Ranch Elementary opened and attendance zones changed. Of our students, 60.2% are economically disadvantaged, 61.8% are Emergent Bilingual, 74.45% are at risk, and 10.99% receive special education services. 83 students (23%) were mobile during the year, so about one in four students did not attend EES for the full year. EES is a Title I schoolwide campus. It is in year 2 of a TEA-approved Turnaround Plan, which followed F ratings in 2023, 2024, and 2025. Our teaching staff includes 28 teachers, and 7 are in their first three years. This means that approximately 25% of our teachers need support through intentional mentoring, instructional coaching, and targeted professional development.

According to 2025–2026 data from TXschools.gov, the student demographics at EES reflect the diverse backgrounds, strengths, and unique needs of our school community. Approximately 60.2% of our students are identified as economically disadvantaged, and 61.8% are Emergent Bilingual, highlighting the importance of providing equitable access to educational opportunities, resources, and language support services. Additionally, 10.99% of our students receive special education services, 1.37% are identified as experiencing homelessness, and 12.36% participate in Gifted and Talented programs. With 74.45% of our students identified as at-risk, EES is committed to implementing targeted interventions, individualized support, and responsive instructional practices. These demographics guide our efforts to address barriers to learning, build on students' strengths, and ensure that every student has the support and opportunity needed to thrive academically and reach their full potential.

PROGRAM ENROLLMENT, ETHNICITY AND RACE	2025-2026	2024-2025
All Student Enrollment	364	670
Eco. Disadvantaged	219	586
At-Risk	271	513
Emergent Bil. (EB)	225	420
Sp. Ed.	40	87
Section 504	9	10
Gifted & Talented	45	54
Students with Dyslexia	6	11
Career and Technical Ed.	-	-
Migrant	0	1
Homeless	5	3
Foster	0	0
Title I	364	670
Mobility	83	85
Black African	9	26

PROGRAM ENROLLMENT, ETHNICITY AND RACE	2025-2026	2024-2025
Hispanic	302	571
White	45	59
American Indian	2	1
Asian	0	1
Pacific Islander	0	0
Two or More Races	6	12

Strengths

Our school is proud to have a resilient and diverse student population, which enriches the learning environment and fosters a culture of inclusivity and understanding. This diversity allows students to learn from one another's experiences and perspectives, preparing them for a global society.

- Our school community reflects a variety of cultural backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives that enrich the educational environment.
- Our diverse staff brings valuable experiences and perspectives that support positive relationships with students and families.
- We are committed to recruiting and retaining staff members who reflect the diversity of our student population.
- Our school recognizes the cultural and linguistic assets of our students and strives to create an inclusive environment where all students feel valued and supported.
- We use student demographic information to inform decision-making, identify student needs, and guide the allocation of resources and support services.
- We value partnerships with families and recognize their important role in supporting student learning and academic achievement.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.
2 ★	Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 62 of 364 students (17%) missed more than 10% of school days in 2025-26.	The campus has not yet consistently implemented a comprehensive, proactive system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families.
3 ★	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Math targets.	Math instruction does not yet consistently build conceptual understanding and fact fluency, and students have limited structured time to solve grade-level problems and explain their reasoning.
4 ★	Students who are homeless, migrant, in foster care, or at risk under the state's criteria are not always identified and coded at enrollment and each six weeks, so some may not receive the services and supplemental support they qualify for.	Residency and occupational surveys, referrals, and at-risk coding are not tracked on a set schedule with a named owner, and district student-group counts did not match in 2025-26 (the TAPR showed 45 homeless students while the McKinney-Vento count showed 125).

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

In 2026, EES earned a D (69), up 13 points from an F (56) in 2025. Our domain scores were Student Achievement 60, Academic Growth 68, Relative Performance 57, and Closing the Gaps 72. Raising Academic Growth from 68 to 70 would earn a C and end the Turnaround Plan requirement. EES met both 2025-26 Turnaround Plan goals: Reading Meets Grade Level rose from 27% to 40% (goal 37%), and Math Meets Grade Level rose from 18% to 28% (goal 28%).

On the Fall 2026 MAP BOY Reading test, 22% of 3rd-5th grade students scored below the 41st percentile, compared with 25% in fall 2025.

On the Fall 2026 MAP BOY Mathematics test, 25% of 3rd-5th grade students scored below the 41st percentile, compared with 32% in fall 2025.

BOY mCLASS reports show that 6% of our kindergarten students are reading on grade level. STAAR data point the same way: although EES improved its overall accountability score from 56 to 69 and Reading Meets Grade Level from 27% to 40%, most students are still not meeting grade-level expectations. This highlights the need to strengthen foundational reading skills, academic language, Tier I instruction, and timely interventions across all grade levels.

On the August 28 math CFAs, 18% of 3rd graders and 10% of 5th graders reached Meets Grade Level. This tells us a significant number of students are not yet demonstrating mastery of grade level math standards, indicating a need to strengthen Tier I instruction, increase the rigor of daily learning tasks, and provide targeted interventions based on student learning needs.

MAP and STAAR assessment data agree that EES is making progress, but students still need targeted support to reach grade level expectations.

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) are being implemented across campus with district-wide guidance.

Average daily attendance for the last two school years is shown below.

All Grades Reading	25-26 All Stds.	24-25 All Stds.	25-26 Hisp.	24-25 Hisp.	25-26 White	24-25 White	25-26 Eco. Dis.	24-25 Eco. Dis.	25-26 EB	24-25 EB
App.	68%	55%	66%	51%	78%	88%	67%	51%	57%	45%
Meets	40%	27%	37%	24%	56%	56%	40%	23%	29%	17%
Masters	15%	7%	11%	4%	33%	25%	14%	6%	4%	5%
All Grades Math	25-26 All Stds.	24-25 All Stds.	25-26 Hisp.	24-25 Hisp.	25-26 White	24-25 White	25-26 Eco. Dis.	24-25 Eco. Dis.	25-26 EB	24-25 EB
App.	58%	43%	53%	29%	83%	65%	56%	38%	35%	49%
Meets	28%	18%	23%	14%	56%	53%	27%	13%	14%	21%
Masters	8%	4%	7%	2%	6%	24%	9%	4%	2%	8%

SCHOOL YEAR	ATTENDANCE AVERAGE PER YEAR
2025-2026	94.64
2024-2025	93.17

Strengths

Based on the 2025-2026 STAAR Reading and Math data, these are our student learning strengths:

- Measurable improvement in student achievement across both Reading and Math areas compared to the 2024–2025 school year.
- In Reading, the percentage of students performing at Approaches Grade Level or above increased from 55% to 68%, while Meets Grade Level or above increased from 27% to 40%.
- The percentage of students achieving Masters Grade Level also increased from 7% to 15%.
- In Math, student performance at Approaches Grade Level or above increased from 43% to 58%, Meets Grade Level or above increased from 18% to 28%, and Masters Grade Level increased from 4% to 8%.
- Hispanic and Emergent Bilingual students demonstrated improvement in Reading achievement.
- Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and Emergent Bilingual students also demonstrated improvement in Approaches and Meets performance levels.
- White students' Reading Approaches Grade Level fell from 88% to 78%. We believe this is because the number of White students tested decreased from the 24-25 to 25-26 school years, therefore, the drop affected the overall percentage.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Reading STAAR standard, still indicating a need to improve Reading proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier I reading instruction does not yet consistently use Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, purposeful student discourse, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and support their thinking with evidence from the text.
2 ★	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 58% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Math STAAR standard, indicating a significant need to improve Math proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently use rigorous questioning, purposeful student discourse, and daily fact fluency practice, so students lack the conceptual understanding and automaticity needed for grade-level problems.
3 ★	Students in kindergarten through 2nd grade are not consistently mastering foundational reading and math skills, and these gaps persist into the tested grades.	Instructional practices and expectations are not consistently vertically aligned, resulting in a gap between what students are taught in early grades and the rigor required in upper grades.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

- **Trainings provided by the Campus:**
  - 2026-2027 Campus Action Plan
  - Effective Classroom Set-Up
  - Fundamental Five
  - Understanding the A-F Accountability System
  - Guided Reading Training for new teachers to K-2nd grades
  - MTSS Campus Procedures
  - Lesson Internalization (Deep Dive Component) Protocols
  - PLC Process
- **PD provided by T&L**
  - BOY PD
  - Cite It!
  - Claim It!
- **Support provided by Curriculum & Instruction - Coordinators meeting and planning with teachers**

Strengths

- Continue to implement the EISD Teaching and Learning Curriculum Management Plan to ensure alignment across grade levels and content areas.
- Use multiple sources of student data, such as NWEA, weekly CFAs, UAs, and CUAs to inform instructional decisions, identify learning gaps, adjust teaching strategies, and monitor progress toward academic goals.
- Sustain twice a week, teacher-led PLCs focused on lesson internalization, collaborative planning, analysis of student data, and the development of effective instructional strategies to strengthen teaching and learning.
- Continue implementing randomization tools and purposeful questioning strategies to increase student engagement, accountability, and equitable participation in classroom discussions.
- Strengthen core instruction through rigorous, standards-aligned instruction, higher-order questioning, and Depth of Knowledge (DOK) strategies that promote critical thinking and grade-level learning.
- Maximize WIN (What I Need) Time to provide targeted, differentiated instruction that addresses individual learning needs, closes academic gaps, and accelerates student growth.
- Increase opportunities for structured student talk, collaborative learning, and academic discourse to strengthen content understanding, academic language development, and student ownership of learning.
- Maintain fidelity to the instructional schedule and established campus expectations to maximize learning opportunities and protect instructional time across all grade levels and content areas.
- Maximize instructional time for student success.
- Utilize the MTSS framework to systematically monitor student progress, identify students requiring additional support, and implement targeted, evidence-based interventions based on individual academic needs.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Inconsistent rigor in Tier I instruction, particularly in the use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, is limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and master grade-level standards.	Campus coaching and PLC planning have not yet focused consistently on DOK questioning, so the level of questioning varies from classroom to classroom.
2 ★	Students are experiencing challenges with Math fluency, including automaticity with basic facts and computational skills. This lack of fluency is limiting their ability to engage in higher-level problem solving and demonstrate proficiency on grade-level math standards.	Lack of Math fluency instruction has led to gaps in students' automaticity and computational efficiency, limiting their ability to successfully engage in grade-level mathematical reasoning and problem solving.
3 ★	Instructional rigor in the early grades has led to foundational learning gaps that persist and negatively impact student performance in the upper grades.	PK-2nd grade teachers have not yet had consistent coaching and collaborative planning on rigorous, standards-aligned instruction, so early-grade expectations are not aligned with the upper grades.
4 ★	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.
5 ★	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Parent, Family and Community Engagement

Elgin ISD is dedicated to nurturing communication and fostering positive relationships with parents, families, and all community members. Our strong foundation as One Team, One Town, One Family forms the basis for collaborative and supportive interactions between the district, schools, families, and the community. As we continue to grow, we strive to integrate everyone into our Elgin ISD family, offering numerous opportunities at both campus and district levels for involvement and input in decision-making processes.

Elgin ISD connects with families and the community through various mediums such as the school website/social media, PawPrints newsletter, email, automated calls, and campus updates. Communications are provided in both English and Spanish to ensure accessibility. Additionally, the district and campuses utilize Reach The E, an online platform for gathering input and feedback. Several special program departments involve families and community members in decision-making processes and activities through advisory groups, special events, meetings, and community gatherings.

Student Engagement

Attendance

Student attendance rates across all student groups ranged from 93.17% in the 2024-2025 to 94.64% in the 2025-2026 academic year, with the Two or More Races student group achieving the highest rate at 96.3%. Special Ed students had the lowest attendance rate at 93.4%, while Emergent Bilingual students had a 94.4%. Our attendance rate rose from 93.17% in 2024-2025 to 94.64% in 2025-2026.

Teacher Engagement

CKH Campus Culture and Climate Survey results for the 2025–2026 school year indicate that EES has a strong foundation of teacher engagement, positive relationships, and a shared commitment to student success. Staff demonstrate a strong belief in the potential of every student, with ratings of 4.8–4.9 for the importance of positive student relationships, positive learning experiences, and student success. Survey results also reflect a collaborative staff culture in which colleagues support one another and campus leadership promotes professional respect and collaboration. These strengths contribute to a positive campus climate centered on relationships, teamwork, and student growth.

Moving forward, EES will continue building on these strengths by expanding opportunities for staff voice in decision-making, strengthening staff belonging, sustaining meaningful recognition, and promoting effective communication and conflict resolution. These efforts will support continued teacher engagement, collective efficacy, and a positive school culture.

Strengths

- Families demonstrate a commitment to advocating for their children’s educational needs and supporting their academic success.
- The campus provides multiple opportunities and formats for families to share feedback, communicate concerns, and contribute to campus improvement efforts.
- Campus staff prioritize building respectful, trusting relationships with students and families to foster a welcoming, inclusive, and supportive school environment.
- Campus administrators provide motivational leadership and promote a safe, supportive, and student-centered environment that encourages collaboration and positive relationships among staff, students, and families.
- EES cultivates partnerships with local businesses and community organizations, including Bastrop County Cares, Frontier Bank, Ally Emergency, the PTA, Southside, and other community supporters, to strengthen school-community connections and support student and campus needs.
- Events such as the Wildcat Showcase, Literacy, Math, and STEM Family Nights provide meaningful opportunities for families to engage in learning, explore instructional programs, and support academic growth at home.

- The campus maintains a positive online presence through social media to celebrate student and staff accomplishments, share important information, highlight campus initiatives, and strengthen connections with families.
- School-sponsored events are positively received and well attended, demonstrating opportunities for family engagement, relationship-building, and a strong connection between the school and its community.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	The campus has not yet offered events at varied times and gathered family input on what would help them participate, so participation depends on families' ability to attend in person in the evening.	The campus has not yet established a consistent, systematic process for assessing family needs and using feedback to plan and deliver opportunities that are accessible, culturally responsive, and responsive to families' preferred languages, schedules, and circumstances.
2 ★	Campus practices and expectations have not consistently established a culture of high academic expectations, shared accountability, and a collective commitment to improving learning outcomes for all students.	Inconsistent communication and reinforcement of academic expectations from the campus, limited stakeholder ownership of accountability outcomes, and inconsistent use of data to drive improvement efforts may contribute to the acceptance of current performance levels rather than a sustained urgency to improve.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.
2 ★	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Math targets.	Math instruction does not yet consistently build conceptual understanding and fact fluency, and students have limited structured time to solve grade-level problems and explain their reasoning.
3 ★	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Reading STAAR standard, still indicating a need to improve Reading proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier I reading instruction does not yet consistently use Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, purposeful student discourse, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and support their thinking with evidence from the text.
4 ★	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 58% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Math STAAR standard, indicating a significant need to improve Math proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently use rigorous questioning, purposeful student discourse, and daily fact fluency practice, so students lack the conceptual understanding and automaticity needed for grade-level problems.
5 ★	Students in kindergarten through 2nd grade are not consistently mastering foundational reading and math skills, and these gaps persist into the tested grades.	Instructional practices and expectations are not consistently vertically aligned, resulting in a gap between what students are taught in early grades and the rigor required in upper grades.
6 ★	Inconsistent rigor in Tier I instruction, particularly in the use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, is limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and master grade-level standards.	Campus coaching and PLC planning have not yet focused consistently on DOK questioning, so the level of questioning varies from classroom to classroom.

7

Students are experiencing challenges with Math fluency, including automaticity with basic facts and computational skills. This lack of fluency is limiting their ability to engage in higher-level problem solving and demonstrate proficiency on grade-level math standards.

Lack of Math fluency instruction has led to gaps in students' automaticity and computational efficiency, limiting their ability to successfully engage in grade-level mathematical reasoning and problem solving.

8

Instructional rigor in the early grades has led to foundational learning gaps that persist and negatively impact student performance in the upper grades.

PK-2nd grade teachers have not yet had consistent coaching and collaborative planning on rigorous, standards-aligned instruction, so early-grade expectations are not aligned with the upper grades.

9

The campus has not yet offered events at varied times and gathered family input on what would help them participate, so participation depends on families' ability to attend in person in the evening.

The campus has not yet established a consistent, systematic process for assessing family needs and using feedback to plan and deliver opportunities that are accessible, culturally responsive, and responsive to families' preferred languages, schedules, and circumstances.

10

Campus practices and expectations have not consistently established a culture of high academic expectations, shared accountability, and a collective commitment to improving learning outcomes for all students.

Inconsistent communication and reinforcement of academic expectations from the campus, limited stakeholder ownership of accountability outcomes, and inconsistent use of data to drive improvement efforts may contribute to the acceptance of current performance levels rather than a sustained urgency to improve.

11

Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 62 of 364 students (17%) missed more than 10% of school days in 2025-26.

The campus has not yet consistently implemented a comprehensive, proactive system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families.

12

Students who are homeless, migrant, in foster care, or at risk under the state's criteria are not always identified and coded at enrollment and each six weeks, so some may not receive the services and supplemental support they qualify for.

Residency and occupational surveys, referrals, and at-risk coding are not tracked on a set schedule with a named owner, and district student-group counts did not match in 2025-26 (the TAPR showed 45 homeless students while the McKinney-Vento count showed 125).

13 ★

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

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

14 ★

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

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

★ = Priority

Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

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

Improvement Planning Data

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

Accountability Data

- ☑ **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- ☑ **Student Achievement Domain**
- ☑ **Student Progress Domain**
- ☑ **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- ☑ **Effective Schools Framework data**

Student Data: Assessments

- ☑ **State and federally required assessment information**
- ☑ **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- ☑ **STAAR released test questions**
- ☑ **STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data**
- ☑ **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- ☑ **Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Tejas LEE, or other alternate early reading assessment results**

Goals

Goal 1

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, EES will complete 100% of its Title I schoolwide planning requirements, with evidence for every meeting in CRATE within 10 school days.

Evaluation Data Source: Agendas, signed sign-ins, minutes, and slides in CRATE; December, February, and April formative and June summative reviews; one-page program evaluation plans

Strategy 1

Build the CNA with the CAC/Guiding Coalition in at least 3 meetings, starting at BOY, covering all four CNA areas and every student group at EES.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Agendas, signed Sign-ins, Minutes, Slides; December, February, and April formative and June summative reviews; posted English and Spanish CIP

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and CAC Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Hold CAC/Guiding Coalition meetings at BOY, MOY, and EOY; hold a make-up meeting that week if any stakeholder group has 2 or fewer attendees.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Agendas, signed Sign-ins, Minutes, Slides; December, February, and April formative and June summative reviews; posted English and Spanish CIP

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and CAC Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Review the CIP at each Plan4Learning checkpoint and adjust any strategy rated Some or No Progress; add TIP, TAP, or LIP requirements.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Agendas, signed Sign-ins, Minutes, Slides; December, February, and April formative and June summative reviews; posted English and Spanish CIP

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and CAC Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

The campus plan will be reviewed at December, February, and April checkpoints with the June summative.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Agendas, signed Sign-ins, Minutes, Slides; December, February, and April formative and June summative reviews; posted English and Spanish CIP

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and CAC Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

Write a one-page evaluation plan for each federally or SCE-funded program and decide continue, modify, or discontinue at EOY.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A one-page evaluation plan is on file for each federally or SCE-funded program, with a continue, modify, or discontinue decision recorded at EOY.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

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

Goal 2

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, EES will meet 100% of Right to Know requirements, and every uncertified teacher will have a written certification plan.

Evaluation Data Source: Dated Right to Know notices and request log, 4-week letters, and teacher certification plans

Strategy 1

Send the BOY Right to Know notice in English and Spanish; answer requests within 10 school days.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Certification plan, exam date, and a coach for every uncertified teacher.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Executive Director of Human Resources

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

ESL Academy - training and pay for successful certification attainment.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Executive Director of Human Resources

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

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

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

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, at least 90% of staff targeted for Title II training will complete it, and classroom use of the practice will rise from 75% to 100%.

Evaluation Data Source: Title II training sign-ins and walkthrough data on classroom use of the practice

Strategy 1

Capturing Kids' Hearts, Literacy First K-2, and NWEA growth report training, followed by walkthroughs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1, 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

GCA Conference, San Antonio, Nov 11-12 - Title I campus leaders attend - corrective action.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Spring Title II consultation survey and EOY CAC discussion.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and CAC Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

4-day accountability calibration training.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Inconsistent rigor in Tier I instruction, particularly in the use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, is limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and master grade-level standards.	Campus coaching and PLC planning have not yet focused consistently on DOK questioning, so the level of questioning varies from classroom to classroom.
4	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.
5	New and uncertified teachers need a certification plan, coaching, and training in the adopted materials so that every classroom delivers strong Tier 1 instruction.	Elgin ISD's teacher turnover (24.9% compared with 18.8% statewide) means the campus hires new and alternatively certified teachers each year, and support for each of them has not been planned and tracked teacher by teacher.

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

By May 2027, EES will meet 100% of its ESSA Section 1116 PFE requirements, and family attendance at PFE events will grow from 30% to at least 50%.

Evaluation Data Source: Annual Title I meeting evidence, PFE policy and compact sign-ins, family event attendance (Watch Party QR), staff training sign-ins, and the spring PFE survey and focus group

Strategy 1

Hold the annual Title I meeting at least twice at flexible times, with Spanish interpretation. This is paid from the campus Title I, Part A 1% parent and family engagement set-aside ($1,570).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Develop the PFE policy and school-parent compact with parents (parent majority) and distribute them - Title I campuses only.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Promote the ESC Region 13 Watch Parties: Oct 8, 20, 27, Nov 5, 17, and Dec 1, 6-7 PM, campus or Zoom - Title I campuses (corrective action).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Title I campus leaders attend GCACon - November 2026 (Corrective action).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, and Student Support Specialist

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

Train all staff on working with families at the October 22 staff meeting, with a make-up on

October 26, 2026.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 6

Title I Policies and Parent Student Compacts - for publication (evidence to CRATE).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 7

Evaluate PFE each spring with a survey and parent focus group.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

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 School Processes & Programs

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The campus has not yet offered events at varied times and gathered family input on what would help them participate, so participation depends on families' ability to attend in person in the evening.	The campus has not yet established a consistent, systematic process for assessing family needs and using feedback to plan and deliver opportunities that are accessible, culturally responsive, and responsive to families' preferred languages, schedules, and circumstances.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

By June 2027, 100% of homeless, migrant, foster care, and at-risk students will be identified, coded in PEIMS, and served, and their attendance will rise by 1.5 points.

Evaluation Data Source: Residency questionnaires and occupational surveys, referral logs, at-risk roster checked against PEIMS, and attendance by student group

Strategy 1

Residency questionnaire and occupational survey for every enrolling family

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, and Registrar

Problem Statements: Demographics 4

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Refer to the McKinney-Vento liaison, migrant recruiter, and foster care contact.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 4

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Identify students who meet the 17 state-at-risk criteria each six weeks and code them in PEIMS. SCE - funded positions: Teacher (1 FTE) and Campus Support Paraprofessional (2 FTEs).

State Compensatory Education (SCE) supplements the regular program for students who meet the state at-risk criteria (TEC 29.081). Elgin Elementary's 2026-27 SCE budget (fund 199, PIC 30) totals $147,611: Communities In Schools case management $36,430; teacher salary $65,680; paraprofessional salary $25,536.72; benefits, stipends, and extra duty $19,964.29. Each SCE-funded staff member serves identified at-risk students in reading and math intervention, and their time and effort is documented in CRATE.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data.

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 4

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
4	Students who are homeless, migrant, in foster care, or at risk under the state's criteria are not always identified and coded at enrollment and each six weeks, so some may not receive the services and supplemental support they qualify for.	Residency and occupational surveys, referrals, and at-risk coding are not tracked on a set schedule with a named owner, and district student-group counts did not match in 2025-26 (the TAPR showed 45 homeless students while the McKinney-Vento count showed 125).

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, EES will keep instructional days lost to disciplinary removals at 0.

Evaluation Data Source: Monthly discipline and removal data (PEIMS), office referral data, at-risk roster, attendance by student group

Strategy 1

Capturing Kids' Hearts with Tier 2 supports before any removal.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Check-in/check-out, FBAs, and BIPs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Monthly discipline review by student group

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, and Sp. Ed. Teacher

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Campus practices and expectations have not consistently established a culture of high academic expectations, shared accountability, and a collective commitment to improving learning outcomes for all students.	Inconsistent communication and reinforcement of academic expectations from the campus, limited stakeholder ownership of accountability outcomes, and inconsistent use of data to drive improvement efforts may contribute to the acceptance of current performance levels rather than a sustained urgency to improve.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, 100% of K-5 students will receive at least 135 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity each week through PE and recess.

Evaluation Data Source: FitnessGram results, PE and recess schedules, and attendance by student group.

Strategy 1

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

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve FitnessGram results

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, PE teacher, and school nurse

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 62 of 364 students (17%) missed more than 10% of school days in 2025-26.	The campus has not yet consistently implemented a comprehensive, proactive system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families.

Goal 4

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

Performance Objective 1

☑ **High Priority** ☑ **HB3 Goal**

Essential Action 4.1: By June 2027, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 40% to at least 50% for all students, from 37% to at least 47% for Hispanic students, from 56% to at least 66% for White students, from 40% to at least 50% for economically disadvantaged students, and from 29% to at least 39% for Emergent Bilingual students, and from 27% to at least 37% for students receiving Special Education services. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 31% to at least 37%, supporting the district HB 3 early literacy goal.

Evaluation Data Source: Weekly CFAs, UAs, CUAs, MOY and EOY NWEA

Strategy 1

Strengthen Tier I Reading Instruction by implementing the EISD Teaching and Learning Curriculum Management Plan with fidelity to ensure standards-aligned, rigorous Reading instruction across grade levels.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Every reading teacher brings an internalized lesson to twice a week PLCs, shown by PLC agendas and lesson plan checks. The percentage of students reaching Meets on reading CFAs rises each unit toward the 2027 target.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Integrate explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured student discourse, oral language development, and evidence-based discussion into daily Reading lessons.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: PK-5th grade teachers will help students strengthen academic language, vocabulary knowledge, comprehension, and ability to communicate understanding using text evidence, supporting improved Reading achievement across identified accountability groups. The percentage of K-2 students reading on grade level rises from BOY to EOY.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Use state and local assessment Reading data to identify TEKS-specific learning gaps among students in identified accountability groups and implement targeted instruction during small groups and WIN Time to address student needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 3rd-5th grade teachers will use the data to provide students instruction that is aligned to their individual learning needs. Students will demonstrate measurable growth in identified Reading skills, and increase proficiency on common assessments and the 2027 Reading STAAR.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Teachers will incorporate regular, grade-level STAAR-aligned Reading tasks into core instruction, model how to analyze questions, and use student work analysis and feedback to address misconceptions of the Reading TEKS.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: K-5th grade teachers will help students develop greater confidence and proficiency in applying Reading skills to complex assessment tasks. The percentage of students reaching Meets on CFAs, UAs, CUAs, and STAAR rises.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

K-2nd grade teachers will teach daily guided reading groups, using running records to place and move students, with coaching from the instructional coach.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Guided reading groups are seen in every K-2nd grade classroom during walkthroughs. The percentage of K-2 students reading on grade level rises from BOY to EOY.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 6

Teachers in Kindergarten through 5th grade will teach and practice short and extended constructed responses each week using a common campus routine.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Weekly writing tasks appear in lesson plans at every grade level. Students' scores on constructed-response items rise on each CUA.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 7

After each major assessment, teachers will update student data cards, and teachers and the principal will hold goal-setting conferences with students in grades 3rd-5th.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Conference logs show every 3rd-5th grade student met with a teacher after BOY, CUA 1, and CUA 2. Students meet their individual growth goals on MOY and EOY MAP.

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 8

Students in grades 3-5 who are below Meets on CUA 1 will attend after-school tutoring from January through April, with groups set from CUA data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Tutoring rosters, lesson plans, and attendance logs. Tutored students increase their CUA 2 scores compared with CUA 1.

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

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

Funding Sources: After-school Tutorials 211 - Title I-Part A, $3,000

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

Strategy 9

The principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach will observe every teacher at least every two weeks and give written feedback in Strive within 2 school days.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strive logs show each teacher observed at least twice a month. Walkthrough look-fors (DOK questioning, student talk, WIN groups) rise each month.

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

ESF Levers: Lever 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	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Reading STAAR standard, still indicating a need to improve Reading proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier I reading instruction does not yet consistently use Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, purposeful student discourse, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and support their thinking with evidence from the text.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Inconsistent rigor in Tier I instruction, particularly in the use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, is limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and master grade-level standards.	Campus coaching and PLC planning have not yet focused consistently on DOK questioning, so the level of questioning varies from classroom to classroom.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Essential Action 4.1: By June 2027, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Math will increase from 28% to at least 38% for all students, from 23% to at least 33% for Hispanic students, from 56% to at least 66% for White students, from 27% to at least 37% for economically disadvantaged students, and from 21% to at least 31% for Emergent Bilingual students, and from 23% to at least 33% for students receiving Special Education services. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 29% to at least 36%, supporting the district HB 3 early mathematics goal.

Evaluation Data Source: Weekly CFAs, unit assessments (UAs and CUAs), math fluency checks, and MOY and EOY NWEA MAP.

Strategy 1

Strengthen Tier I Math Instruction and Math fluency by implementing the EISD Teaching and Learning Curriculum Management Plan with fidelity to ensure standards-aligned, rigorous Math instruction across all grade levels.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers use twice a week PLCs to internalize math lessons and plan daily fluency practice, shown by PLC agendas and walkthroughs. Students' fluency scores rise each grading period, and math CFA Meets rates increase toward the 2027 target.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Use state and local assessment Math data to identify TEKS-specific learning gaps among students in identified accountability groups and implement targeted instruction during small groups and WIN Time to address student needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will receive instruction aligned to their individual learning needs, demonstrate measurable growth in identified Math skills, and increase proficiency on common assessments and the 2027 Math STAAR.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Implement daily, purposeful Math fluency practice using Math Fluency Practice Folders.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate how to improve their reasoning and foundational Math skills, enabling them to solve grade-level problems more accurately and efficiently and demonstrate increased Math achievement.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Integrate STAAR-aligned, grade-level math tasks into Tier I instruction that require students to apply mathematical concepts, analyze information, and solve multi-step problems through structured student talk opportunities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate how to explain their reasoning, compare strategies, use models and representations, and justify solutions using academic vocabulary.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

After each major assessment, teachers will update student data cards, and teachers and the principal will hold goal-setting conferences with students in grades 3rd-5th.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Conference logs show every 3rd-5th grade student met with a teacher after BOY, CUA 1, and CUA 2. Students meet their individual growth goals on MOY and EOY MAP.

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - Student Learning 2

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December **February** **April** **June**

Strategy 6

Students in grades 3rd-5th who are below Meets on CUA 1 will attend after-school tutoring from January through April, with groups set from CUA data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Tutoring rosters, lesson plans, and attendance logs. Tutored students increase their CUA 2 scores compared with CUA 1.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December **February** **April** **June**

Strategy 7

The principal, assistant principal, and instructional coach will observe every teacher at least every two weeks and give written feedback in Strive within 2 school days.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strive logs show each teacher observed at least twice a month with a focus on (DOK questioning, student talk, WIN groups) with an increase of Walk-throughs each month.

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December **February** **April** **June**

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Math targets.	Math instruction does not yet consistently build conceptual understanding and fact fluency, and students have limited structured time to solve grade-level problems and explain their reasoning.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 58% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Math STAAR standard, indicating a significant need to improve Math proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently use rigorous questioning, purposeful student discourse, and daily fact fluency practice, so students lack the conceptual understanding and automaticity needed for grade-level problems.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Inconsistent rigor in Tier I instruction, particularly in the use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, is limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and master grade-level standards.	Campus coaching and PLC planning have not yet focused consistently on DOK questioning, so the level of questioning varies from classroom to classroom.
2	Students are experiencing challenges with Math fluency, including automaticity with basic facts and computational skills. This lack of fluency is limiting their ability to engage in higher-level problem solving and demonstrate proficiency on grade-level math standards.	Lack of Math fluency instruction has led to gaps in students' automaticity and computational efficiency, limiting their ability to successfully engage in grade-level mathematical reasoning and problem solving.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By Spring 2027, Elgin Elementary School will increase its English Language Proficiency score in the Closing the Gaps domain from 0 to at least 1 of 4 points by increasing the percentage of Emergent Bilingual students who make progress on TELPAS.

Evaluation Data Source: Summit K12 reports for 3rd-5th grade, formative assessments, and 2027 TELPAS data

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Teachers will incorporate individualized TELPAS proficiency goals into EB student data folders and monitor student progress regularly throughout the school year.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Earn at least 1 of the 4 possible points on the 2027 TELPAS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Elgin Elementary School will implement two campuswide TELPAS Preparation Camps (Camp 1: Nov. 2026 and Camp 2: Jan. 2027) to provide targeted, intensive language-development instruction for Emergent Bilingual (EB) students. Camp activities will focus on strengthening listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills through ELPS-aligned lessons, TELPAS-format practice activities, academic vocabulary development, and targeted instruction based on student assessment data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Earn at least 1 of the 4 possible points on the 2027 TELPAS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By June 2027, Elgin Elementary School's Academic Growth score will increase from 68 to at least 72, as measured by STAAR Reading and Math growth in the 2027 state accountability system.

Evaluation Data Source: MOY and EOY NWEA MAP growth, CUAs, and 2027 STAAR

Strategy 1

After each major assessment, teachers will update student data cards, and teachers and the principal will hold goal-setting conferences with students in grades 3rd-5th.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Conference logs show every 3rd-5th grade student met with a teacher after BOY, CUA 1, and CUA 2. Students meet their individual growth goals on MOY and EOY MAP.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach, and grade level teachers

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Students in grades 3-5 who are below Meets on CUA 1 will attend after-school tutoring from January through April, with groups set from CUA data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Tutoring rosters, lesson plans, and attendance logs. Tutored students increase their CUA 2 scores compared with CUA 1.

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.
3	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Math targets.	Math instruction does not yet consistently build conceptual understanding and fact fluency, and students have limited structured time to solve grade-level problems and explain their reasoning.

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Reading STAAR standard, still indicating a need to improve Reading proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier I reading instruction does not yet consistently use Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, purposeful student discourse, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and support their thinking with evidence from the text.

2	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 58% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Math STAAR standard, indicating a significant need to improve Math proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently use rigorous questioning, purposeful student discourse, and daily fact fluency practice, so students lack the conceptual understanding and automaticity needed for grade-level problems.

Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By June 2027, 100% of the 53 students now in grades 4-5 who did not reach Approaches Grade Level on 2026 STAAR Reading or Math will receive accelerated instruction under HB1416, and at least 50% of them will reach Approaches Grade Level or above on 2027 STAAR.

Evaluation Data Source: HB 1416 accelerated instruction logs, Tier 2 and Tier 3 progress monitoring every two weeks, MOY, EOY NWEA MAP, and 2027 STAAR.

Strategy 1

HB 1416 accelerated instruction: 15 or 30 hours, groups of 4 or fewer, tracked every six weeks.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, and Intervention teacher

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Interventionists and tutors in protected daily intervention block.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, and Intervention teacher

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Daily Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention in a protected block, progress monitored every two weeks.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, and Instructional teacher

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Age of Learning Math at the weekly usage target; reteach unmastered standards within 48 hours.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December **February** **April** **June**

Strategy 5

Literacy First - K-2 (Math/Reading)

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Literacy Specialist, and District Coordinator

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December **February** **April** **June**

Strategy 6

Extended learning: extended-day tutoring, Summer Jump Start Math (3rd grade), Summer School, and Bilingual Summer School.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

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

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

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December **February** **April** **June**

Strategy 7

PK: Collaborative Classrooms resources and Head Start transition with a spring round-up.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: STAAR and MAP by student group; Age of Learning reports; HB 1416 logs; extended-day attendance; CLI Engage, Literacy First, Summer School, BIL Summer School

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.
3	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Math targets.	Math instruction does not yet consistently build conceptual understanding and fact fluency, and students have limited structured time to solve grade-level problems and explain their reasoning.

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Reading STAAR standard, still indicating a need to improve Reading proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier I reading instruction does not yet consistently use Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, purposeful student discourse, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and support their thinking with evidence from the text.

2	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 58% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Math STAAR standard, indicating a significant need to improve Math proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently use rigorous questioning, purposeful student discourse, and daily fact fluency practice, so students lack the conceptual understanding and automaticity needed for grade-level problems.
3	Students in kindergarten through 2nd grade are not consistently mastering foundational reading and math skills, and these gaps persist into the tested grades.	Instructional practices and expectations are not consistently vertically aligned, resulting in a gap between what students are taught in early grades and the rigor required in upper grades.

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**

By May 2027, 100% of core teachers will get observation and feedback every two weeks, at least 80% of action steps will be re-observed within two weeks, and ELPS language objectives will appear in 85% of bilingual and ESL walkthroughs.

Evaluation Data Source: Strive observation and feedback logs, re-observation records, and bilingual and ESL walkthrough data on ELPS language objectives

Strategy 1

Title I coaches run observation and feedback cycles every two weeks, with priority to new and uncertified teachers (meets the TAP requirement).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strive observation records; coaching caseloads; LIFT PLC tool; bilingual and ESL walkthroughs; coach time and effort

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1, 5

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Twice a week data PLCs: CFA and MAP growth, reteach within 48 hours, internalize HQIM lessons

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strive observation records; coaching caseloads; LIFT PLC tool; bilingual and ESL walkthroughs; coach time and effort

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

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

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Title III training on ELPS-aligned language objectives and structured academic talk, checked in walkthroughs

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strive observation records; coaching caseloads; LIFT PLC tool; bilingual and ESL walkthroughs; coach time and effort

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

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 4

Campus administrators will complete the district's four-day accountability calibration training and calibrate T-TESS walkthrough ratings with district leaders each semester so evaluation ratings are consistent across all campuses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strive observation records; coaching caseloads; LIFT PLC tool; bilingual and ESL walkthroughs; coach time and effort

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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	Student achievement and growth data from state assessments and beginning-of-year screeners indicate that our Hispanic, White and High Focus groups (Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged student groups) continue to struggle to meet STAAR Reading targets.	Teachers do not yet consistently provide explicit instruction in foundational literacy, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses, and small-group instruction is not consistently matched to progress-monitoring data.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Reading STAAR standard, still indicating a need to improve Reading proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier I reading instruction does not yet consistently use Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, purposeful student discourse, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and support their thinking with evidence from the text.
2	Although there was improvement from the previous year, 58% of our 3rd-5th grade students met the Math STAAR standard, indicating a significant need to improve Math proficiency at these grade levels.	Tier 1 math instruction does not yet consistently use rigorous questioning, purposeful student discourse, and daily fact fluency practice, so students lack the conceptual understanding and automaticity needed for grade-level problems.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Inconsistent rigor in Tier I instruction, particularly in the use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questioning, is limiting students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking and master grade-level standards.	Campus coaching and PLC planning have not yet focused consistently on DOK questioning, so the level of questioning varies from classroom to classroom.

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

Goal 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

By June 2027, 100% of Federal and SCE spending will tie to a CIP strategy, at least 75% of the allocation will be spent or obligated by March 31, and 100% of time and effort will be in CRATE.

Evaluation Data Source: Budget-to-strategy crosswalk, monthly expenditure reports (spent or obligated by March 31), and time-and-effort records in CRATE

Strategy 1

Build the Title I and SCE budget from the CNA and name the fund source on every strategy with a cost.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus budget; quarterly reviews; time and effort in CRATE; SCE FTE list; inventory

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Review Title I, II, III, and SCE spending quarterly with the Federal and State Programs Coordinator.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus budget; quarterly reviews; time and effort in CRATE; SCE FTE list; inventory

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Spend the 1% PFE set-aside ($1,570) on activities parents helped choose.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus budget; quarterly reviews; time and effort in CRATE; SCE FTE list; inventory

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Time and effort: semiannual certifications or monthly reports, plus a signed job description for each funded position (time and effort will go through PowerSchool/Fed Programs will upload to CRATE).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus budget; quarterly reviews; time and effort in CRATE; SCE FTE list; inventory

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

Inventory federally funded equipment and confirm it is used as the CIP describes.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus budget; quarterly reviews; time and effort in CRATE; SCE FTE list; inventory

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and State and Federal Programs

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

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

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I-Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
4	1	8	After-school Tutorials	--	$3,000.00
				Sub-Total	$3,000.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$3,000.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00