# Elgin Independent School District

# Elgin Intermediate School

## 2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

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

# Table of Contents


**Comprehensive Needs Assessment** 3

Demographics 4

Student Learning 6

School Processes & Programs 10

Perceptions 12

**Priority Problem Statements** 14

**Data Documentation for CNA** 18

Improvement Planning Data 19

Accountability Data 19

Student Data: Assessments 19

Student Data: Student Groups 20

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators 20

Employee Data 21

Parent/Community Data 21

Support Systems and Other Data 21

**Goals** 23

Goal 1 : LEVER 1:PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT THROUGH STRO... 24

Goal 2 : LEVER 2: ESSENTIAL ACTIONS AND KEY PRACTICES Each lever is defined... 33

Goal 3 : LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS The campus establi... 39

Goal 4 : LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MAT... 50

Goal 5 : LEVER 5: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CAPACITY BUILDING The ca... 71

Goal 6 : LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS The campus maintains stro... 80

**Funding Summary** 85

211 - Title I-Part A 86

# Comprehensive Needs Assessment

# Demographics

## Summary

Elgin Intermediate School (EIS) is a Title I campus in Elgin Independent School District serving sixth-grade students from multiple elementary schools within the district. The campus serves a diverse student population with varying academic backgrounds, instructional needs, and levels of preparation as students transition from elementary to secondary education. During the 2025–2026 school year, EIS enrolled 455 sixth-grade students. The student population was 76.5% Hispanic (348 students), 10.3% White (47 students), 8.4% African American (38 students), 4.2% Two or More Races (19 students), 0.4% American Indian (2 students), and 0.2% Pacific Islander (1 student). Female students represented 52.5% of enrollment (239 students), while male students represented 47.5% (216 students).

EIS serves a substantial population of students requiring differentiated instructional and academic support. During the 2025–2026 school year, 56.0% of students (255) were identified as economically disadvantaged, 71.9% (327) were identified as at-risk, and 49.2% (224) were identified as emergent bilingual. Additionally, 20.9% of students (95) received special education services. The campus also served 44 students identified with dyslexia (9.7%), 15 students receiving Section 504 services (3.3%), and 53 students participating in Gifted and Talented education (11.6%).

Student mobility and transitions are additional considerations for campus planning. During the 2024–2025 school year, the student mobility rate was 14.9%, with 143 students classified as mobile, and the student attrition rate was 10.2%. Additionally, 26 students had disciplinary placements during that reporting year.

Elgin Intermediate School has approximately 37 full-time equivalent staff positions, including approximately 20 teaching positions, 6 professional support positions, 2 campus administrative positions, and 10 educational aide positions. The campus has an average of 22.9 students per teacher and an average sixth-grade class size of 24.6 students. Teachers average 7.5 years of professional experience, with 15.1% identified as beginning teachers and another 42.5% having one to five years of experience.

## Strengths

Elgin Intermediate School benefits from a diverse student population that brings a variety of cultural backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives to the campus. With 76.5% of students identifying as Hispanic and 49.2% identified as emergent bilingual, the campus has opportunities to build on students' cultural and linguistic assets while promoting an inclusive learning environment.

As a sixth-grade-only campus, EIS has the opportunity to establish consistent academic, behavioral, and social expectations for all students transitioning from multiple elementary schools. This structure allows campus staff to focus specifically on the developmental and instructional needs of sixth-grade students while building a unified campus culture and preparing students for seventh grade.

The campus has staff members serving in a variety of instructional and student support roles, including teachers, professional support personnel, administrators, and educational aides. This staffing structure provides opportunities for collaboration and coordinated support for students. Additionally, 11.6% of students participate in Gifted and Talented education, reflecting an identified population requiring advanced learning opportunities.

As a Title I campus, EIS has access to additional resources to support student learning, provide targeted academic interventions, and strengthen family engagement. These resources, combined with the campus's focus on high-quality instructional materials, collaborative planning, and data-driven instruction, provide a foundation for addressing diverse student needs and improving academic outcomes.

# Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 ★ | Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction. | Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices. |
| 2 ★ | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |
| 3 ★ | Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 15.3% of Elgin Intermediate students had missed 10% or more of school days through October 26, 2026 (15.5% at the same point in 2025-26). | The campus does not yet have a consistent early-warning system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families. |

★ = Priority

# Student Learning

## Summary

Elgin Intermediate School (EIS) continues to face significant academic challenges in reading/language arts (RLA) and mathematics. The 2026 STAAR results indicate that a substantial percentage of students are performing below grade-level expectations. In RLA, 49% of students achieved Approaches Grade Level or Above, 24% achieved Meets, and 7% achieved Masters. Mathematics performance was lower, with 46% achieving Approaches, 11% Meets, and 2% Masters. Across both subjects, the campus earned a Student Achievement component score of 23, highlighting the need to increase the number of students reaching Meets and Masters while supporting students performing below Approaches.

A comparison of 2025 and 2026 STAAR results shows that RLA Meets performance declined from 30% to 24%, while mathematics increased slightly from 10% to 11%. Academic growth showed different trends, with RLA decreasing from 47% to 39% and mathematics increasing from 44% to 56%. These results indicate that mathematics instruction is producing stronger growth, but that growth has not yet translated into substantial grade-level achievement. The decline in both RLA achievement and academic growth indicates that students are not consistently making the academic progress needed to close existing learning gaps. This makes improving the effectiveness of daily reading instruction, formative assessments, and timely instructional adjustments a critical campus priority.

The 2025–2026 NWEA MAP Growth data further support these findings. Reading average RIT scores increased from 198.8 at BOY to 201.8 at EOY, with matched students gaining an average of 2.7 RIT points. Mathematics increased from 202.0 to 208.1, with matched students gaining 5.9 points. Science increased from 199.3 to 200.4, with matched students gaining 0.9 points. When compared with STAAR results, the MAP data show that mathematics students made measurable academic gains, but those gains have not yet translated into strong grade-level achievement, with only 11% reaching Meets on STAAR. Reading demonstrated a different pattern, with declining STAAR academic growth and limited MAP growth during the second half of the year. These findings highlight the need to strengthen instructional consistency, monitor mastery of grade-level TEKS, and respond more effectively to identified learning gaps.

Student-group performance continues to demonstrate achievement gaps. On the 2026 STAAR, 23% of Hispanic students and 22% of African American students achieved Meets in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, Meets performance was 10% for Hispanic students, 6% for African American students, and 18% for White students. Students receiving special education services achieved Meets at 16% in RLA and 11% in mathematics, while emergent bilingual students achieved 13% and 5%, respectively. These results demonstrate that low grade-level achievement affects multiple student groups, with particularly significant needs among emergent bilingual students. The combination of low STAAR achievement and English language proficiency progress below the accountability target reinforces the need to strengthen grade-level content instruction alongside intentional academic language development. PLCs must examine student performance by standard and student group to identify specific learning needs and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional supports.

The campus earned a Closing the Gaps scaled score of 23 in 2026, with 4 of 32 possible academic achievement points, 9 of 32 academic growth points, 1 of 4 English language proficiency points, and 4 of 16 student success points. These results demonstrate the need to improve performance across student groups, particularly in academic achievement and growth.

## Strengths

Elgin Intermediate School demonstrated positive academic growth in mathematics during the 2025–2026 school year. STAAR academic growth increased from 44% in 2025 to 56% in 2026, a gain of 12 percentage points. NWEA MAP Growth results support this positive trend, with average mathematics RIT scores increasing from 202.0 at BOY to 208.1 at EOY. Students with matched BOY and EOY assessments demonstrated an average increase of 5.9 RIT points. The positive growth trends across both STAAR and MAP provide evidence that students are making academic progress in mathematics. This is an important campus strength, particularly given the significant number of students entering sixth grade below grade-level expectations. However, with only 11% achieving Meets Grade Level on STAAR, the campus must build on this growth by increasing the rigor and effectiveness of grade-level instruction.

Reading performance also demonstrated areas of positive growth. NWEA MAP results showed an increase in average RIT scores from 198.8 at BOY to 201.8 at EOY, with matched students gaining an average of 2.7 RIT points. Although overall RLA STAAR

performance declined, the MAP results demonstrate that students continued to make academic gains during the school year. These results provide opportunities for instructional teams to identify effective practices and strengthen the consistency of reading instruction.

English language proficiency also showed improvement, with TELPAS progress increasing from 18% in 2025 to 21% in 2026. Additionally, several student groups demonstrated positive mathematics growth, including African American students, whose academic growth rate increased from 39% to 67%, and Hispanic students, whose growth rate increased from 43% to 55%. These improvements demonstrate progress among student groups and provide a foundation for strengthening instructional practices, targeted interventions, and data-driven instruction across the campus.

# Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 ★ | On the 2026 STAAR mathematics assessment, only 11% of EIS students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, and 2% achieved Masters Grade Level. These results demonstrate that the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations in mathematics, making mathematics achievement a significant campus improvement priority. | Mathematics instructional planning and monitoring have not consistently ensured that teachers internalize the adopted HQIM, implement rigorous grade-level tasks, and use formative assessments to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction. This has limited the campus's ability to ensure consistent, high-quality mathematics instruction across classrooms. |
| 2 ★ | On the 2026 STAAR RLA assessment, only 24% of students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, while 51% performed below Approaches Grade Level. This level of performance contributes to the campus's low Student Achievement score and creates a significant gap between current performance and the campuswide achievement goals. | The midyear adoption of HMH during the 2025-2026 school year limited the time available to establish consistent teacher training, lesson internalization routines, and instructional monitoring. The campus had not yet developed a fully established system to support consistent implementation of the new curriculum across RLA classrooms. |
| 3 ★ | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, only 13% of current emergent bilingual students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, while 5% achieved Meets in mathematics. These results represent significant gaps in grade-level achievement and create an additional challenge in meeting the campus's Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps goals. | Campus instructional planning and PLC processes have not consistently included a structured review of emergent bilingual students' academic language needs or the integration of ELPS-aligned instructional supports into daily lessons. As a result, opportunities for intentional vocabulary development, academic discussion, and language development have varied across classrooms. |
| 4 ★ | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, 23% of Hispanic students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, 10% of Hispanic students achieved Meets, compared with 18% of White students. These gaps contribute to the campus's Closing the Gaps performance and must narrow to support the campus goal of a 70 scaled score in Domain 3. | Campus PLC and assessment review processes have not consistently required instructional teams to disaggregate performance by student group, identify the specific TEKS contributing to achievement gaps, and monitor whether reteaching improves student outcomes. Consequently, instructional responses have not consistently addressed the standards and misconceptions identified through student data. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5 ★ | Although TELPAS progress increased from 18% in 2025 to 21% in 2026, the campus remained 9 percentage points below the 30% accountability target. Of the 210 students evaluated, only 45 demonstrated English language proficiency progress. Continued improvement is necessary to sustain progress on the English Language Proficiency indicator within Domain 3. | he campus has not consistently established expectations or monitoring processes for integrating the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) into daily content instruction. Without a consistent process for planning, observing, and providing feedback on academic language development, students' opportunities to practice listening, speaking, reading, and writing have varied across classrooms. |

★ = Priority

# School Processes & Programs

## Summary

Elgin Intermediate School (EIS) is focused on strengthening instructional practices and campus systems to improve student achievement and academic growth. The campus has adopted high-quality instructional materials (HQIM), including HMH for Reading/Language Arts, implemented after winter break during the 2025–2026 school year, and STEMscopes for mathematics, adopted during the 2024–2025 school year. These resources provide a consistent foundation for TEKS-aligned instruction.

Teachers participate in weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused on curriculum planning, lesson internalization, assessment analysis, and targeted reteaching. The campus uses common formative assessments, unit assessments, STAAR, and NWEA MAP Growth data to guide instructional decisions. Administrators support these practices through classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, professional development, and instructional feedback.

EIS provides additional academic support and enrichment through its ACE grant, which supports morning and after-school programming. The campus also provides targeted academic interventions, special education services, emergent bilingual support, and counseling services to address student needs.

## Strengths

Elgin Intermediate School has established instructional systems that provide a foundation for continuous improvement. Weekly PLC meetings, collaborative lesson planning, and classroom walkthroughs are in place to support instruction and student achievement. While these structures existed last year, the quality of implementation, instructional feedback, and follow-through were inconsistent. During the 2026–2027 school year, the campus has made strengthening PLC practices, improving the quality of instructional planning, and providing more specific, actionable feedback to teachers a priority.

The adoption of high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics has provided greater consistency in curriculum and instructional expectations. Teachers are developing stronger practices in lesson internalization, analyzing student data, and planning instructional responses. Campus leadership has increased its emphasis on monitoring instructional quality and following up on identified areas for refinement.

A significant campus strength is the willingness of teachers and administrators to reflect on existing practices and make adjustments. Rather than creating additional programs, EIS is focused on improving the effectiveness of systems already in place. This progress provides a stronger foundation for sustained instructional improvement and increased student achievement.

# Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 ★ | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |
| 2 ★ | EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning. | The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning. |
| 3 ★ | 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. |

★ = Priority

# Perceptions

## Summary

Elgin Intermediate School uses student, staff, and family surveys to evaluate campus culture, relationships, communication, and school climate. The 2025–2026 Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) surveys demonstrated improvement across all three stakeholder groups compared with 2024–2025. Overall student perceptions increased from 2.6 to 3.1, staff perceptions increased from 4.3 to 4.5, and family perceptions increased from 3.5 to 4.1. These results indicate positive progress in campus culture, relationships, and schoolwide practices.

Staff surveys identified leadership support and collaboration as strengths. Staff ratings of opportunities to provide input into campus decisions increased from 3.7 to 4.7, while perceptions of administrative support increased from 3.9 to 4.6. However, the EIS End-of-Year Staff Survey identified continued concerns with PLC effectiveness, consistent campus procedures, and follow-through. Only 42% of respondents agreed that PLCs were purposeful and time was used effectively, while 46% agreed that discipline procedures were clear and consistently implemented.

Student perceptions improved across all 26 CKH survey questions, particularly in student leadership, positive classroom interactions, and teacher relationships. However, students continued to report concerns with peer respect (2.5), comfort approaching an adult with a problem (2.4), and enjoyment of school (2.3). Family surveys reflected improved perceptions of student care and school culture, but consistent communication (3.8) and awareness of Social Contracts (3.6) remain areas for improvement. Overall, EIS has demonstrated progress in school culture while identifying the need to strengthen consistent campus expectations, student relationships, instructional collaboration, and communication with families.

## Strengths

Elgin Intermediate School demonstrated positive improvement in campus culture and stakeholder perceptions during the 2025–2026 school year. Student, staff, and family CKH survey averages all increased compared with the previous year. Staff reported particularly strong improvement in leadership communication, collaboration, and professional respect. Opportunities for staff input increased from 3.7 to 4.7, and perceptions of leadership support increased from 3.9 to 4.6, reflecting progress in campus leadership.

Student perceptions improved across all 26 CKH survey questions. Students reported increased opportunities to participate in Good Things, classroom leadership, and positive relationship-building activities. Students' ratings of teacher respect increased from 3.4 to 4.0, while perceptions that teachers care about them increased from 3.1 to 3.6. These results demonstrate progress toward creating a more positive and supportive learning environment.

Family perceptions also improved, with the overall survey average increasing from 3.5 to 4.1. Families reported stronger perceptions of student care, communication, and positive school experiences. The rating for consistent school communication increased from 3.0 to 3.8, while perceptions of school-family partnerships increased from 3.4 to 3.9. These improvements provide a foundation for continued efforts to strengthen relationships, family engagement, and a positive campus culture.

# Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 ★ | The 2025-2026 End-of-Year Staff Survey found concerns with campus procedures and collaboration: only 46% of respondents agreed discipline procedures were clear and consistently implemented, and 42% agreed PLCs were purposeful and used time well. These results show a need to strengthen consistency, accountability, and follow-through in campus procedures and PLCs. | The campus previously focused on establishing structures and procedures without consistently defining expectations for implementation, monitoring effectiveness, and ensuring follow-through. As a result, the quality and consistency of campus practices varied, affecting staff confidence in established systems. |
| 2 ★ | Although student perceptions improved in 2025-2026, students still report concerns with connectedness and relationships. Students rated comfort approaching a school adult with a problem at 2.4, respectful peer interactions at 2.5, and enjoyment of attending school at 2.3. These results indicate a continued need to strengthen student trust, belonging, and connection with adults on campus. | The campus needs to strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of relationship-building practices, student support systems, and opportunities for student voice. Although Capturing Kids' Hearts practices are established, implementation has not consistently resulted in students feeling connected, supported, and comfortable seeking assistance from adults. |

★ = Priority

# Priority Problem Statements

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |
| 2 | On the 2026 STAAR mathematics assessment, only 11% of EIS students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, and 2% achieved Masters Grade Level. These results demonstrate that the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations in mathematics, making mathematics achievement a significant campus improvement priority. | Mathematics instructional planning and monitoring have not consistently ensured that teachers internalize the adopted HQIM, implement rigorous grade-level tasks, and use formative assessments to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction. This has limited the campus's ability to ensure consistent, high-quality mathematics instruction across classrooms. |
| 3 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, 23% of Hispanic students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, 10% of Hispanic students achieved Meets, compared with 18% of White students. These gaps contribute to the campus's Closing the Gaps performance and must narrow to support the campus goal of a 70 scaled score in Domain 3. | Campus PLC and assessment review processes have not consistently required instructional teams to disaggregate performance by student group, identify the specific TEKS contributing to achievement gaps, and monitor whether reteaching improves student outcomes. Consequently, instructional responses have not consistently addressed the standards and misconceptions identified through student data. |
| 4 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, only 13% of current emergent bilingual students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, while 5% achieved Meets in mathematics. These results represent significant gaps in grade-level achievement and create an additional challenge in meeting the campus's Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps goals. | Campus instructional planning and PLC processes have not consistently included a structured review of emergent bilingual students' academic language needs or the integration of ELPS-aligned instructional supports into daily lessons. As a result, opportunities for intentional vocabulary development, academic discussion, and language development have varied across classrooms. |
| 5 | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |

6

On the 2026 STAAR RLA assessment, only 24% of students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, while 51% performed below Approaches Grade Level. This level of performance contributes to the campus's low Student Achievement score and creates a significant gap between current performance and the campuswide achievement goals.

The midyear adoption of HMH during the 2025-2026 school year limited the time available to establish consistent teacher training, lesson internalization routines, and instructional monitoring. The campus had not yet developed a fully established system to support consistent implementation of the new curriculum across RLA classrooms.

7

Although TELPAS progress increased from 18% in 2025 to 21% in 2026, the campus remained 9 percentage points below the 30% accountability target. Of the 210 students evaluated, only 45 demonstrated English language proficiency progress. Continued improvement is necessary to sustain progress on the English Language Proficiency indicator within Domain 3.

he campus has not consistently established expectations or monitoring processes for integrating the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) into daily content instruction. Without a consistent process for planning, observing, and providing feedback on academic language development, students' opportunities to practice listening, speaking, reading, and writing have varied across classrooms.

8

The 2025-2026 End-of-Year Staff Survey found concerns with campus procedures and collaboration: only 46% of respondents agreed discipline procedures were clear and consistently implemented, and 42% agreed PLCs were purposeful and used time well. These results show a need to strengthen consistency, accountability, and follow-through in campus procedures and PLCs.

The campus previously focused on establishing structures and procedures without consistently defining expectations for implementation, monitoring effectiveness, and ensuring follow-through. As a result, the quality and consistency of campus practices varied, affecting staff confidence in established systems.

9

Although student perceptions improved in 2025-2026, students still report concerns with connectedness and relationships. Students rated comfort approaching a school adult with a problem at 2.4, respectful peer interactions at 2.5, and enjoyment of attending school at 2.3. These results indicate a continued need to strengthen student trust, belonging, and connection with adults on campus.

The campus needs to strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of relationship-building practices, student support systems, and opportunities for student voice. Although Capturing Kids' Hearts practices are established, implementation has not consistently resulted in students feeling connected, supported, and comfortable seeking assistance from adults.

10

Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction.

Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices.

**11** ★

Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 15.3% of Elgin Intermediate students had missed 10% or more of school days through October 26, 2026 (15.5% at the same point in 2025-26).

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

**12** ★

EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning.

The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning.

**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.

★ = Priority

# Data Documentation for CNA

# Data Documentation for CNA

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

## Improvement Planning Data

- [x] **District goals**
- [x] **Campus goals**
- [x] **Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)**

## Accountability Data

- [x] **Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data**
- [x] **Student Achievement Domain**
- [x] **Student Progress Domain**
- [x] **Closing the Gaps Domain**
- [x] **Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data**
- [x] **Accountability Distinction Designations**
- [x] **Federal Report Card and accountability data**
- [x] **Results Driven Accountability (RDA)**
- [x] **Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) data**

## Student Data: Assessments

- [x] **State and federally required assessment information**
- [x] **STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions**
- [x] **STAAR released test questions**
- [x] **STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data**
- [x] **Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results**
- [x] **Student failure and/or retention rates**
- [x] **Local diagnostic reading assessment data**
- [x] **Local benchmark or common assessments data**

- [x] **Observation Survey results**

## Student Data: Student Groups

- [x] **Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups**
- [x] **Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group**
- [x] **Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data**
- [x] **Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data**
- [x] **Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data**
- [x] **Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/ stability**
- [x] **Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability**
- [x] **Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant achievements by race, ethnicity, gender, etc.**
- [x] **Section 504 data**
- [x] **Homeless data**
- [x] **Gifted and talented data**
- [x] **Dyslexia data**
- [x] **Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data**
- [x] **Dual-credit and/or college prep course completion data**
- [x] **Foster Care data**

## Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- [x] **Attendance data**
- [x] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**
- [x] **Discipline records**
- [x] **Tobacco, alcohol, and other drug-use data**
- [x] **Student surveys and/or other feedback**

- [x] **Class size averages by grade and subject**
- [x] **School safety data**
- [x] **Enrollment trends**
- [x] **Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data**
- [x] **Safe and Supportive School Program Team and/or Crisis Team data (Senate Bill 11)**
- [x] **School Behavioral Threat Assessment Data (Senate Bill 11)**

## Employee Data

- [x] **Professional learning communities (PLC) data**
- [x] **Staff surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Teacher/Student Ratio**
- [x] **State certified and high quality staff data**
- [x] **Campus leadership data**
- [x] **Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data**
- [x] **T-TESS data**
- [x] **Staff mobility/stability**
- [x] **Support structures: mentors**
- [x] **Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data**
- [x] **Classroom and school walkthrough data**

## Parent/Community Data

- [x] **Community surveys and/or other feedback**
- [x] **Parent and community partnership data**

## Support Systems and Other Data

- [x] **Organizational structure data**
- [x] **Communications data**

- [x] **Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data**
- [x] **Technology and resource allocation data**
- [x] **Enrichment course/materials**
- [x] **Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents**

# Goals

# Goal 1

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

## Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1:1 : VISION AND MISSION
Understand the district's vision for student success.
Target: By May 2027, Elgin Intermediate will share its TAP goals (STAAR Meets in reading from 24% to 41% and in math from 11% to 35%) with staff and families at the BOY, MOY, and EOY Campus Advisory meetings.

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

### Strategy 1

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principal

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Strategy 2

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

vision.

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | The 2025-2026 End-of-Year Staff Survey found concerns with campus procedures and collaboration: only 46% of respondents agreed discipline procedures were clear and consistently implemented, and 42% agreed PLCs were purposeful and used time well. These results show a need to strengthen consistency, accountability, and follow-through in campus procedures and PLCs. | The campus previously focused on establishing structures and procedures without consistently defining expectations for implementation, monitoring effectiveness, and ensuring follow-through. As a result, the quality and consistency of campus practices varied, affecting staff confidence in established systems. |

## Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION: 1.2 CAMPUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Develop a Campus Improvement Plan aligned to the district's strategic plan.
Target: By June 2027, Elgin Intermediate will review this plan and its TAP at the December, February, and April checkpoints and the June summative, and adjust any strategy rated Some or No Progress within 10 school days.

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

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

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

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

## Strategy 1

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 1.2.2: Goals

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | On the 2026 STAAR mathematics assessment, only 11% of EIS students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, and 2% achieved Masters Grade Level. These results demonstrate that the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations in mathematics, making mathematics achievement a significant campus improvement priority. | Mathematics instructional planning and monitoring have not consistently ensured that teachers internalize the adopted HQIM, implement rigorous grade-level tasks, and use formative assessments to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction. This has limited the campus's ability to ensure consistent, high-quality mathematics instruction across classrooms. |
| 2 | On the 2026 STAAR RLA assessment, only 24% of students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, while 51% performed below Approaches Grade Level. This level of performance contributes to the campus's low Student Achievement score and creates a significant gap between current performance and the campuswide achievement goals. | The midyear adoption of HMH during the 2025-2026 school year limited the time available to establish consistent teacher training, lesson internalization routines, and instructional monitoring. The campus had not yet developed a fully established system to support consistent implementation of the new curriculum across RLA classrooms. |

### Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy. | Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district. |

## Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

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

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

## Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |

## Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1.4: Performance Management of Campus Improvement Plan and Goals(LEVERS)
Establish clear expectations for evaluating the effectiveness of district programs and initiatives to drive continuous improvement
Target: By May 2027, campus leaders will review data after each TAP checkpoint (December, March, and May) and record changes for any student group below target.

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1

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

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

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1

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

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 1.4.3 Data-Driven Decisions
Campus leaders use data to analyze progress, identify barriers, and adjust strategies when milestones and benchmarks are not met to ensure goals are achieved.

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1

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

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1

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

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, 23% of Hispanic students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, 10% of Hispanic students achieved Meets, compared with 18% of White students. These gaps contribute to the campus's Closing the Gaps performance and must narrow to support the campus goal of a 70 scaled score in Domain 3. | Campus PLC and assessment review processes have not consistently required instructional teams to disaggregate performance by student group, identify the specific TEKS contributing to achievement gaps, and monitor whether reteaching improves student outcomes. Consequently, instructional responses have not consistently addressed the standards and misconceptions identified through student data. |

### Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |

# Goal 2

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

## Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.1: Intentional Roles and Staffing
Staff are strategically hired and placed to deliver on the envisioned student experience.
Target: By June 2027, Elgin Intermediate will meet 100% of Right to Know requirements, and every uncertified teacher will have a written certification plan.

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

### Strategy 1

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

### Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 2.1.2 Hiring and Evaluation

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 4

Distribute the annual Right to Know notice in English and Spanish at the start of the year, keep a log of parent requests and responses, and send the four-week notice to parents when a student is taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who does not meet state certification requirements. Copies and logs are uploaded to CRATE.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:**
The dated notice, distribution record, request log, and any four-week notices are in CRATE by the December formative review.

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal and Campus Secretary

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

**ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction. | Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices. |

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 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 2 ☑ High Priority

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

student.
Target: By August 2027, Elgin Intermediate will fill every open teaching position using the district's screening process and selection criteria.

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

## Strategy 1

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 1

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 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 Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction. | Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices. |

## Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.3: Growth and Retention Strategies
Systems in place to support teacher professional growth, advancement opportunities, and retention.
Target: By May 2027, every teacher will be observed at least every two weeks, with feedback in Strive, as set in the TAP.

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

### Strategy 1

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 1

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, and Executive Director of Human Resources

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 1

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction. | Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices. |

# Goal 3

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

## Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.1: Multi-tiered System of Supports
Implement the district's integrated multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) framework aligned to evidence-based prevention and intervention practices to support the academic and non-academic needs of all students, providing guidance on routine progress monitoring and data-driven decision making.
Target: By May 2027, 100% of students flagged on the BOY MAP screener will have an intervention plan reviewed by the student support team each six weeks.

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 2

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.2: Professional Learning Supports

ELGIN ISD provides resources and training to enable staff to implement the comprehensive MTSS framework to address academic support, behavioral health and mental health services and support.

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 2

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.3: Universal Screening
ELGIN ISD provides procedures and training in implementing universal screening processes for academic, mental health and behavior, provides time and support for a multidisciplinary team to analyze data, and reinforces the value of universal screening with staff, students, and families.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: Calendared windows for universal screening are completed district-wide three times per year, with documented multidisciplinary team data logs and family notification templates.

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 2

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.4: Family Engagement
ELGIN ISD sets expectations and provides staff training and time to meaningfully engage

parents/caregivers, promote parent/caregiver understanding of student progress and campus expectations, and facilitate a parent/caregiver partnership to support overall student development and success.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** * SUCCESS CRITERIA: Provide Opportunities for parent Engagement, involvement and feedback Opportunities due to IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED (Title II) - Meaningful Consultation - district and campuses (Title I) will partner with ESC 13 to provide opportunities for parent involvement with appropriate evidence. Parent Engagement evidenced in Bilingual, CTE/CCMR. Advanced Academics

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 5

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

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Annual meeting agendas, sign-ins, and slides; signed policy and compact distribution records; and spring survey results are in CRATE. The family survey rating for consistent school communication rises from 3.8 to at least 4.0.

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 6

Hold the annual Title I meeting at least twice at flexible times with Spanish interpretation; develop and distribute the campus parent and family engagement policy and the school-parent compact with parents; spend the 1% parent and family engagement set-aside on activities parents help choose; and evaluate parent and family engagement each spring with a survey.

Evidence is uploaded to CRATE within 10 school days. Paid from the campus Title I, Part A 1% parent and family engagement set-aside ($1,570).

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Annual meeting agendas, sign-ins, and slides; signed policy and compact distribution records; and spring survey results are in CRATE. The family survey rating for consistent school communication rises from 3.8 to at least 4.0.

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 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 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION:  3.2 School-wide Culture, Behavior, Safety
Establish strong school culture, behavior, and safety systems.
Target: By May 2027, Elgin Intermediate will review discipline data by student group each month and have fewer out-of-school suspensions than in 2025-26.

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

## Strategy 1

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Teams, and Counselors

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2

**Title I:** 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principals, Assistant Principals

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1

**Title I:** 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principals, Assistant Principals, Counselors

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1

**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 Perceptions

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | The 2025-2026 End-of-Year Staff Survey found concerns with campus procedures and collaboration: only 46% of respondents agreed discipline procedures were clear and consistently implemented, and 42% agreed PLCs were purposeful and used time well. These results show a need to strengthen consistency, accountability, and follow-through in campus procedures and PLCs. | The campus previously focused on establishing structures and procedures without consistently defining expectations for implementation, monitoring effectiveness, and ensuring follow-through. As a result, the quality and consistency of campus practices varied, affecting staff confidence in established systems. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | Although student perceptions improved in 2025-2026, students still report concerns with connectedness and relationships. Students rated comfort approaching a school adult with a problem at 2.4, respectful peer interactions at 2.5, and enjoyment of attending school at 2.3. These results indicate a continued need to strengthen student trust, belonging, and connection with adults on campus. | The campus needs to strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of relationship-building practices, student support systems, and opportunities for student voice. Although Capturing Kids' Hearts practices are established, implementation has not consistently resulted in students feeling connected, supported, and comfortable seeking assistance from adults. |

## Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 3.3: Interventions and Supports
Staff identify and respond to needs of all students and provide timely targeted responses to reduce barriers to learning and promote trust, belonging, safety, growth mindset, and self-regulation.
Target: By June 2027, 100% of homeless, migrant, foster care, and at-risk students will be identified, coded in PEIMS, and served.

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principal and Campus Leadership Team

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 2, 3

**Title I:** 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 2

**Title I:** 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** 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 Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |
| 3 | Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 15.3% of Elgin Intermediate students had missed 10% or more of school days through October 26, 2026 (15.5% at the same point in 2025-26). | The campus does not yet have a consistent early-warning system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families. |

### Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | Although student perceptions improved in 2025-2026, students still report concerns with connectedness and relationships. Students rated comfort approaching a school adult with a problem at 2.4, respectful peer interactions at 2.5, and enjoyment of attending school at 2.3. These results indicate a continued need to strengthen student trust, belonging, and connection with adults on campus. | The campus needs to strengthen the consistency and effectiveness of relationship-building practices, student support systems, and opportunities for student voice. Although Capturing Kids' Hearts practices are established, implementation has not consistently resulted in students feeling connected, supported, and comfortable seeking assistance from adults. |

## Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, 100% of Elgin Intermediate sixth-grade students will be scheduled for at least 30 minutes of daily, or 225 minutes per two-week period of, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity, as required by TEC 28.002(l-1). Chronic absenteeism will decrease from 15.3% (through October 26, 2026) to at most 12%.

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

## Strategy 1

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

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** PE schedules show every sixth-grade student meets the TEC 28.002(l-1) physical activity minutes, and the percentage of students in the FitnessGram Healthy Fitness Zone rises from the fall to the spring testing window.

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, PE Teachers, and School Nurse

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 3

**Title I:** 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

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

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Attendance logs show a family contact for every student who reaches 5% absences within one week. Chronic absenteeism falls each six weeks toward the 12% target, and average daily attendance stays at or above the campus goal of 95%.

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Counselor, and Attendance Clerk

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 3

**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 |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | Chronic absenteeism limits access to instruction: 15.3% of Elgin Intermediate students had missed 10% or more of school days through October 26, 2026 (15.5% at the same point in 2025-26). | The campus does not yet have a consistent early-warning system to identify students at the first signs of chronic absence and follow up with their families. |

# Goal 4

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

## Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 4.1: Multi-tiered Academic Experience
Implement a research-based strategy and approach for strong multi-tiered instruction and supports.

**Evaluation Data Source:** * Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention rosters, student progress-monitoring tracking sheets, and universal screener data reports will be evaluated by the campus administration to verify that 100% of multi-tiered academic instructional strategies and student supports are research-based and implemented with fidelity

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of teacher lesson plans and intervention schedules document the consistent delivery of strong Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 academic supports, with classroom walkthrough data verifying that differentiated instructional practices match individual student needs

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 2 - 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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of classroom walkthrough logs and lesson plans show consistent implementation of the district's research-based instructional framework and core content Tier 1 strategies across all classrooms

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

**Problem Statements:**  Student Learning 1, 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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE:4.1.3 Coherent Extended Time, Tutoring, Interventions Approach
Campus executes a coherent, research-based approach to extended time, tutoring, and interventions that align with the multi-tiered system of supports outlined by the district.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA:  100% of extended learning schedules, tutoring rosters, and intervention logs demonstrate a research-based, coordinated approach that aligns with the district's MTSS framework to ensure target student groups achieve documented growth.

Aligned student tutoring logs, HB 1416 accelerated instruction trackers, and 2027 Summer School (Bilingual and Jump Start) attendance rosters.

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

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

**Funding Sources:** Extended-day tutoring, teacher pay 211 - Title I-Part A, $4,974, Extended-day snacks 211 - Title I-Part A, $1,500, Instructional supplies for tutoring and intervention 211 - Title I-Part A, $3,500

**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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.1.4 Aligned Assessment System
Campus ensures that teachers understand the purpose of assessment and administer assessments aligned with high-quality instructional materials and the district's framework to support strong instruction.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: * 100% of assessment schedules, curriculum alignment documents, and data analysis rubrics demonstrate that administered assessments are fully aligned with the district's high-quality instructional materials and framework to directly inform instruction

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 1

**Title I:** 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 5

KEY PRACTICE: 4.1.4 -- Aligned Assessment System

EIS will strengthen weekly PLC processes to ensure teachers analyze standards-aligned formative and unit assessments, identify student misconceptions, and develop targeted reteaching plans. PLC teams will use student work and follow-up assessments to determine whether students mastered the identified TEKS and make necessary instructional adjustments.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of extended learning schedules, tutoring rosters, and intervention logs demonstrate a research-based, coordinated approach that aligns with the district's MTSS framework to ensure target student groups achieve documented growth.

Aligned student tutoring logs, HB 1416 accelerated instruction trackers, and 2027 Summer School (Bilingual and Jump Start) attendance rosters.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2, 4 - 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | On the 2026 STAAR mathematics assessment, only 11% of EIS students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, and 2% achieved Masters Grade Level. These results demonstrate that the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations in mathematics, making mathematics achievement a significant campus improvement priority. | Mathematics instructional planning and monitoring have not consistently ensured that teachers internalize the adopted HQIM, implement rigorous grade-level tasks, and use formative assessments to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction. This has limited the campus's ability to ensure consistent, high-quality mathematics instruction across classrooms. |
| 2 | On the 2026 STAAR RLA assessment, only 24% of students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, while 51% performed below Approaches Grade Level. This level of performance contributes to the campus's low Student Achievement score and creates a significant gap between current performance and the campuswide achievement goals. | The midyear adoption of HMH during the 2025-2026 school year limited the time available to establish consistent teacher training, lesson internalization routines, and instructional monitoring. The campus had not yet developed a fully established system to support consistent implementation of the new curriculum across RLA classrooms. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, 23% of Hispanic students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, 10% of Hispanic students achieved Meets, compared with 18% of White students. These gaps contribute to the campus's Closing the Gaps performance and must narrow to support the campus goal of a 70 scaled score in Domain 3. | Campus PLC and assessment review processes have not consistently required instructional teams to disaggregate performance by student group, identify the specific TEKS contributing to achievement gaps, and monitor whether reteaching improves student outcomes. Consequently, instructional responses have not consistently addressed the standards and misconceptions identified through student data. |

**Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs**

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |
| 2 | EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning. | The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning. |

## Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION: 4.2 Management of Curriculum Implementation
Monitors curriculum implementation and ensures access to curriculum materials.

**Evaluation Data Source:** Lesson plan submission logs, weekly walkthrough documentation, and instructional material inventory sheets will be evaluated by the campus administration to verify that 100% of teachers have full access to and are implementing the required curriculum materials with fidelity

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.2.1 Quality Tier 1 Materials Access and Use
Campus leaders ensure teachers have access to and use high-quality instructional materials that fully cover state standards, align to research-based instructional strategies, and meet the needs of all students, including special populations.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** * SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of teacher lesson plans and classroom observations confirm daily use of district-adopted high-quality instructional materials that fully cover state standards and include documented differentiation strategies for special populations (HB3)

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

**Problem Statements:** 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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.2.2 Implementation Monitoring
Campus follows a consistent routine to monitor the implementation of district-adopted instructional materials, uses internalization guides and instructional planning tools, and campus leaders track adherence to the required scope and sequence and aligned assessments.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** * SUCCESS CRITERIA: * 100% of lesson plans and observation logs verify that teachers consistently use internalization guides and instructional planning tools to track exact adherence to the required scope, sequence, and aligned assessments

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

**Problem Statements:** 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 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.2.3 Parent Access to Instructional Material

Campus leaders ensure parents have meaningful opportunities to access the curriculum and instructional materials used in classrooms.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA:  100% of campus curriculum night agendas, digital access logs, and parent communication records show that families are provided regular, meaningful opportunities to review and access the instructional materials used in classrooms;

Title I campus Principals will attend training and host 6 "Watch Parties" for family involvement, to meet requirement of Improvement Required for Meaningful Consultation in collaboration with ESC13.  Staff will be trained on October 14 at all elementary campuses  (Evidence in Crate)

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

**Problem Statements:**  School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 4

EIS will strengthen the implementation of HMH in RLA and STEMscopes in mathematics through consistent lesson internalization and collaborative planning. Teachers will identify the TEKS, daily learning objectives, instructional models, student tasks, anticipated misconceptions, and checks for understanding before delivering instruction. Campus leaders will monitor the quality of implementation through lesson plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, and student work.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of weekly collaborative lesson plans, HQIM internalization documents, and instructional monitoring records demonstrate that teachers are planning and delivering TEKS-aligned instruction using adopted high-quality instructional materials with integrity, including clear learning objectives, purposeful grade-level tasks, and formative assessments.

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

**Problem Statements:**  Student Learning 1, 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

## Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | On the 2026 STAAR mathematics assessment, only 11% of EIS students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, and 2% achieved Masters Grade Level. These results demonstrate that the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations in mathematics, making mathematics achievement a significant campus improvement priority. | Mathematics instructional planning and monitoring have not consistently ensured that teachers internalize the adopted HQIM, implement rigorous grade-level tasks, and use formative assessments to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction. This has limited the campus's ability to ensure consistent, high-quality mathematics instruction across classrooms. |
| 2 | On the 2026 STAAR RLA assessment, only 24% of students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, while 51% performed below Approaches Grade Level. This level of performance contributes to the campus's low Student Achievement score and creates a significant gap between current performance and the campuswide achievement goals. | The midyear adoption of HMH during the 2025-2026 school year limited the time available to establish consistent teacher training, lesson internalization routines, and instructional monitoring. The campus had not yet developed a fully established system to support consistent implementation of the new curriculum across RLA classrooms. |

## Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning. | The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning. |
| 3 | The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy. | Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district. |

## Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION: 4.3 CCMP Course Offerings and Graduation Programs of Study
All students are provided with individual career and academic planning and meaningful advising experiences leading to informed decision-making and successful navigation to and through their chosen pathway.

**Evaluation Data Source:** Personal graduation plans (PGPs), high school endorsement check sheets, student advising logs, and CCMP pathway enrollment reports will be evaluated by campus and district leadership to verify that 100% of students receive individual career and academic planning experiences

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.3.1 Graduation Pathways
Campuses ensure all students understand available graduation pathways through age-appropriate guidance and have sufficient counseling staff to support all students.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA:
Campus master schedules, course enrollment reports, and CCMR pathway tracking logs confirm a measurable increase in advanced and rigorous course completion rates across all secondary campuses from the 2025-2026 baselines, ensuring equitable student access to OnRamps Stats (29), OnRamps Pre-Calculus (59), P-TECH (47), ECHS (332), Associate's Degrees earned (30), non-ECHS Dual Credit (72), and AP courses (610)

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

**TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools

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

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.3.2 Career Readiness
Campuses identify and promote career pathways appropriate for each grade level, connecting students to high-growth, high-demand occupations, and actively pursuing opportunities for career exploration and work-based learning opportunities.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** * SUCCESS CRITERIA: * 100% of campus master calendars and event schedules document the execution of campus career fairs, 5th-to-6th grade transition programs, and 8th-to-9th grade transition activities that connect students to career exploration pathways and work-based learning opportunities

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

**TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 4.3.3 Advising
Campuses provide an aligned K-12 advising system within the counseling program to support students in navigating to and through their academic and career pathways to ensure students graduate prepared for postsecondary life.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of student counseling profiles document the execution of an aligned K-12 advising process, with individual graduation plans, career interest inventory results, and grade-level transition checklists (PK t0 Kinder, 5th grade to Intermediate/Middle School, and 8th grade to High School) confirming that every student receives systematic guidance to navigate their academic and career pathways toward postsecondary readiness.

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

**TEA Priorities:** Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, the percentage of Elgin Intermediate School sixth-grade students achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 11% in 2026 to 35% in 2027. Students receiving special education services will increase from 11% to at least 25% at Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics, and current emergent bilingual students will increase from 5% to at least 20%.

**Evaluation Data Source:** 2026 and 2027 STAAR Mathematics performance reports, NWEA MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY results, district unit assessment data, and common formative assessment results will be reviewed by campus administration and instructional teams to monitor progress toward increasing mathematics achievement from 11% to 35% at Meets Grade Level or Above.

## Strategy 1

Mathematics HQIM Internalization and Instructional Delivery

Sixth-grade mathematics teachers will use weekly collaborative planning to internalize STEMscopes lessons, identify grade-level TEKS and learning objectives, anticipate student

misconceptions, and plan explicit modeling, rigorous student tasks, and checks for understanding. Campus leadership will monitor alignment between planned lessons and classroom implementation.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of reviewed mathematics collaborative lesson plans and HQIM internalization documents demonstrate alignment between STEMscopes, grade-level TEKS, daily learning objectives, instructional tasks, and formative assessments.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1 - 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

Following each mathematics reteaching cycle, teachers will review aligned reassessment results during the next PLC data meeting, document the number and percentage of targeted students demonstrating mastery, and adjust support for students who have not yet mastered the identified TEKS.

Mathematics PLCs will meet twice weekly for 45 minutes per session. Meetings will focus on HQIM lesson and unit internalization, instructional rehearsal, analysis of student work and assessment data, identification of misconceptions, and planning targeted reteaching. Special education and emergent bilingual support staff will actively participate in PLCs to support co-planning, appropriate accommodations, specially designed instruction, ELPS integration, and instructional responses to identified student needs.

Initially, PLC meetings will be facilitated by the Instructional Coach, Campus Principal, or an Assistant Principal to establish consistent protocols and expectations for instructional planning and data-driven instruction. As teachers demonstrate proficiency with these routines, facilitation responsibilities will gradually transition to content team leaders and other designated PLC members. Campus administrators and the Instructional Coach will continue providing guidance, monitoring PLC effectiveness, reviewing instructional artifacts, and ensuring follow-through on agreed-upon instructional actions.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of completed mathematics PLC assessment-analysis cycles document the TEKS assessed, student misconceptions, targeted reteaching plans, and follow-up assessment results used to evaluate instructional effectiveness.

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

**Problem Statements:** 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

Sixth-grade mathematics and special education teachers will collaborate during weekly planning to internalize Bluebonnet lessons, identify essential TEKS, anticipate student misconceptions, and plan specially designed instruction aligned with students' IEPs and individual learning needs. Teachers will implement explicit modeling, visual and concrete representations, scaffolded problem-solving tasks, and appropriate accommodations while maintaining access to grade-level mathematics instruction. Student progress will be reviewed every three instructional weeks using curriculum-aligned assessments, student work, and IEP progress-monitoring data to determine necessary instructional adjustments.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of reviewed mathematics co-planning documents and special education instructional records demonstrate alignment among Bluebonnet grade-level TEKS, specially designed instruction, required IEP accommodations, and formative assessments. Classroom walkthroughs, student work, and progress-monitoring results will verify implementation and identify areas requiring reteaching or additional instructional support. By May 2027, the percentage of students receiving special education services achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 11% in 2026 to 25% in 2027.

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

**Problem Statements:** 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

Sixth-grade mathematics teachers and emergent bilingual support staff will collaborate during weekly planning to internalize STEMscopes lessons, identify essential TEKS and mathematical language demands, and plan linguistic supports appropriate to students' English proficiency levels. Teachers will implement explicit mathematical vocabulary instruction, visual representations, structured academic discussion, and opportunities for students to explain and justify mathematical reasoning. Instruction will maintain grade-level rigor while providing language supports that allow students to demonstrate mathematical understanding. Student progress will be reviewed every three instructional weeks using curriculum-aligned assessments, student work, and formative assessment results to guide instructional adjustments.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of reviewed mathematics collaborative planning documents and EB instructional support records demonstrate alignment among STEMscopes, grade-level TEKS, ELPS, appropriate linguistic supports, and formative assessments. Classroom walkthroughs and student work will verify opportunities for students to communicate mathematical reasoning and demonstrate mastery of grade-level standards. By May 2027, the percentage of current emergent bilingual students achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 5% in 2026 to 20% in 2027.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 3, 5 - 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | On the 2026 STAAR mathematics assessment, only 11% of EIS students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, and 2% achieved Masters Grade Level. These results demonstrate that the majority of students are not meeting grade-level expectations in mathematics, making mathematics achievement a significant campus improvement priority. | Mathematics instructional planning and monitoring have not consistently ensured that teachers internalize the adopted HQIM, implement rigorous grade-level tasks, and use formative assessments to identify misconceptions and adjust instruction. This has limited the campus's ability to ensure consistent, high-quality mathematics instruction across classrooms. |
| 3 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, only 13% of current emergent bilingual students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, while 5% achieved Meets in mathematics. These results represent significant gaps in grade-level achievement and create an additional challenge in meeting the campus's Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps goals. | Campus instructional planning and PLC processes have not consistently included a structured review of emergent bilingual students' academic language needs or the integration of ELPS-aligned instructional supports into daily lessons. As a result, opportunities for intentional vocabulary development, academic discussion, and language development have varied across classrooms. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Although TELPAS progress increased from 18% in 2025 to 21% in 2026, the campus remained 9 percentage points below the 30% accountability target. Of the 210 students evaluated, only 45 demonstrated English language proficiency progress. Continued improvement is necessary to sustain progress on the English Language Proficiency indicator within Domain 3. | he campus has not consistently established expectations or monitoring processes for integrating the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) into daily content instruction. Without a consistent process for planning, observing, and providing feedback on academic language development, students' opportunities to practice listening, speaking, reading, and writing have varied across classrooms. |

**Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs**

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |
| 2 | EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning. | The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning. |

## Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, the percentage of Elgin Intermediate School sixth-grade students achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR Reading/Language Arts will increase from 24% in 2026 to 41% in 2027. Students receiving special education services will increase from 16% to at least 30% at Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading/Language Arts, and current emergent bilingual students will increase from 13% to at least 25%.

**Evaluation Data Source:** 2026 and 2027 STAAR RLA performance reports, NWEA MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY results, district unit assessment data, common formative assessments, and student writing samples will be reviewed by campus administration and instructional teams to monitor progress toward increasing RLA

achievement from 24% to 41% at Meets Grade Level or Above.

## Strategy 1

HMH Internalization and Grade-Level Reading Instruction

Sixth-grade RLA teachers will use weekly collaborative planning to internalize HMH lessons, identify grade-level TEKS, analyze complex texts and instructional tasks, and plan explicit instruction, student discussion, written responses, and formative assessments. Campus leaders will monitor implementation through lesson plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, and student work.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of reviewed RLA collaborative lesson plans and HQIM internalization documents demonstrate alignment between HMH, grade-level TEKS, daily learning objectives, rigorous reading and writing tasks, and formative assessments.

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

**Problem Statements:** 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

Sixth-grade RLA teachers will use weekly PLC meetings to analyze HQIM-aligned formative assessments, unit assessments, and student work to identify learning gaps and misconceptions. Teachers will plan targeted reteaching within the grade-level curriculum and use follow-up assessments to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction.

RLA PLCs will meet twice weekly for 45 minutes per session. Meetings will focus on HQIM lesson and unit internalization, instructional rehearsal, analysis of student work and assessment data, identification of misconceptions, and planning targeted reteaching. Special education and emergent bilingual support staff will actively participate in PLCs to support co-planning, appropriate accommodations, specially designed instruction, ELPS integration, and instructional responses to identified student needs.

Facilitation and Leadership Development: Initially, PLC meetings will be facilitated by the Instructional Coach, Campus Principal, or an Assistant Principal to establish consistent protocols and expectations for instructional planning and data-driven instruction. As teachers demonstrate proficiency with these routines, facilitation responsibilities will gradually transition to content team leaders and other designated PLC members. Campus administrators and the Instructional Coach will continue providing guidance, monitoring PLC effectiveness, reviewing instructional artifacts, and ensuring follow-through on agreed-upon instructional actions.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of completed RLA PLC assessment-analysis cycles include standards-based student performance analysis, identified misconceptions, targeted instructional adjustments, and follow-up assessment results demonstrating whether students mastered the targeted TEKS.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 - 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

Sixth-grade RLA teachers will use incoming STAAR results, NWEA MAP Growth data, universal screeners, and classroom assessments to identify students requiring additional reading support. Classroom teachers will provide research-based targeted instruction aligned with identified skill gaps while maintaining student access to grade-level HQIM. Student progress will be reviewed regularly to adjust instructional supports.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention rosters, and student progress-monitoring records demonstrate that identified students received targeted, research-based reading interventions aligned with their individual academic needs. Documentation will reflect Intervention teachers will deliver targeted, research-based small-group reading instruction for 30 minutes, five days per week, based on diagnostic reading needs and identified skill gaps. Progress will be reviewed every three instructional weeks using curriculum-aligned skill assessments, student work, and intervention progress-monitoring data. Students who do not meet their established growth goals across two consecutive progress-monitoring checks will receive adjusted intervention support, including changes to instructional strategies, group placement, or intervention intensity.

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

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

**Title I:** 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 4

Sixth-grade RLA and special education teachers will collaborate during weekly planning to internalize HMH lessons, identify priority TEKS, and plan specially designed instruction aligned with students' IEPs and individual academic needs. Teachers will use explicit instruction, appropriate accommodations, scaffolded grade-level reading and writing tasks, and formative assessments to support access to rigorous instruction. Student progress will be reviewed every three instructional weeks using curriculum-aligned assessments, student work, and IEP progress-monitoring data. Instructional teams will adjust supports and reteaching when students are not demonstrating sufficient progress.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of reviewed RLA co-planning documents and special education instructional records demonstrate alignment among adopted HQIM, grade-level TEKS, specially designed instruction, required IEP accommodations, and formative assessments. Student work, classroom observations, and progress-monitoring records will verify implementation and instructional adjustments. By May 2027, the percentage of students receiving special education services achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR RLA will increase from 16% in 2026 to 30% in 2027.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2 - 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

Strategy: Sixth-grade RLA teachers and emergent bilingual support staff will collaborate during weekly PLCs to internalize HMH lessons, identify grade-level TEKS and associated language demands, and plan ELPS-aligned linguistic supports based on students' English proficiency levels. Teachers will implement explicit academic vocabulary instruction, structured student discussion, reading comprehension supports, and evidence-based written responses while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level content. Student progress will be reviewed every three instructional weeks using curriculum-aligned assessments, student work, and language-development evidence. Instructional teams will adjust linguistic supports and targeted reteaching when students are not demonstrating sufficient progress.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 100% of reviewed RLA collaborative planning documents and EB instructional support records demonstrate alignment among HMH, grade-level TEKS, ELPS, appropriate linguistic supports, and formative assessments. Classroom walkthroughs, student work, and progress-monitoring data will verify implementation and instructional adjustments. By May 2027, the percentage of current emergent bilingual students achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR RLA will increase from 13% in 2026 to 25% in 2027.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 2, 3, 5 - 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 |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |

### Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | On the 2026 STAAR RLA assessment, only 24% of students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above, while 51% performed below Approaches Grade Level. This level of performance contributes to the campus's low Student Achievement score and creates a significant gap between current performance and the campuswide achievement goals. | The midyear adoption of HMH during the 2025-2026 school year limited the time available to establish consistent teacher training, lesson internalization routines, and instructional monitoring. The campus had not yet developed a fully established system to support consistent implementation of the new curriculum across RLA classrooms. |
| 3 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, only 13% of current emergent bilingual students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, while 5% achieved Meets in mathematics. These results represent significant gaps in grade-level achievement and create an additional challenge in meeting the campus's Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps goals. | Campus instructional planning and PLC processes have not consistently included a structured review of emergent bilingual students' academic language needs or the integration of ELPS-aligned instructional supports into daily lessons. As a result, opportunities for intentional vocabulary development, academic discussion, and language development have varied across classrooms. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | Although TELPAS progress increased from 18% in 2025 to 21% in 2026, the campus remained 9 percentage points below the 30% accountability target. Of the 210 students evaluated, only 45 demonstrated English language proficiency progress. Continued improvement is necessary to sustain progress on the English Language Proficiency indicator within Domain 3. | he campus has not consistently established expectations or monitoring processes for integrating the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) into daily content instruction. Without a consistent process for planning, observing, and providing feedback on academic language development, students' opportunities to practice listening, speaking, reading, and writing have varied across classrooms. |

**Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs**

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |
| 2 | EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning. | The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning. |

## Performance Objective 6 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, the percentage of Hispanic sixth-grade students at Elgin Intermediate School achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on STAAR will increase from 23% to 41% in Reading/Language Arts and from 10% to 35% in Mathematics, through consistent implementation of high-quality instructional materials, aligned assessments, and targeted instructional responses.

**Evaluation Data Source:** 2026 and 2027 STAAR RLA and Mathematics student-group performance reports, NWEA MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY results, disaggregated common formative and unit assessment data, and PLC instructional response documentation will be evaluated by campus administration and instructional teams to monitor progress toward the established Hispanic student achievement targets and determine the

effectiveness of instructional adjustments.

## Strategy 1

During weekly RLA and mathematics PLCs, teachers will analyze Hispanic students' assessment results and student work by TEKS, identify misconceptions, plan targeted reteaching, and review reassessment results at the next scheduled data meeting. The instructional coach and team leaders will monitor implementation.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of completed RLA and mathematics PLC assessment-analysis cycles include disaggregated Hispanic student performance data, identified TEKS and misconceptions, documented reteaching decisions, and follow-up assessment evidence to determine whether instructional adjustments improved student mastery. Following each instructional response, teachers will track the number and percentage of targeted students demonstrating mastery on an aligned assessment. PLC teams will compare the results with the established mastery target, document the instructional response, and determine next steps

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - 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

RLA and mathematics teachers will strengthen weekly lesson internalization and classroom implementation of adopted HQIM to ensure Hispanic students have consistent access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. Teachers will plan explicit modeling, academic vocabulary, structured student discussion, purposeful grade-level tasks, and checks for understanding. Appropriate ELPS-aligned linguistic supports will be integrated for emergent bilingual students based on identified language needs. Campus leaders will monitor implementation through walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and student work.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of reviewed RLA and mathematics lesson internalization documents demonstrate alignment between adopted HQIM, grade-level TEKS, daily learning objectives, rigorous instructional tasks, formative assessments, and appropriate linguistic supports based on identified student needs.

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 3, 4

**Title I:** 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

## Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, only 13% of current emergent bilingual students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, while 5% achieved Meets in mathematics. These results represent significant gaps in grade-level achievement and create an additional challenge in meeting the campus's Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps goals. | Campus instructional planning and PLC processes have not consistently included a structured review of emergent bilingual students' academic language needs or the integration of ELPS-aligned instructional supports into daily lessons. As a result, opportunities for intentional vocabulary development, academic discussion, and language development have varied across classrooms. |
| 4 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, 23% of Hispanic students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, 10% of Hispanic students achieved Meets, compared with 18% of White students. These gaps contribute to the campus's Closing the Gaps performance and must narrow to support the campus goal of a 70 scaled score in Domain 3. | Campus PLC and assessment review processes have not consistently required instructional teams to disaggregate performance by student group, identify the specific TEKS contributing to achievement gaps, and monitor whether reteaching improves student outcomes. Consequently, instructional responses have not consistently addressed the standards and misconceptions identified through student data. |

### Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |

# Goal 5

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

## Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.1:Instructional Leadership
Establish expectations and campus systems for instructional leaders and teachers' coaching and development.
Target: By May 2027, the principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach will each keep a weekly coaching schedule, and the TAP's two-week observation cycle will be logged in Strive.

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.1.2:Staff Development and Coaching Plan
Campus leaders will differentiate coaching by teacher experience and instructional need. Teachers requiring greater support will receive weekly observation and feedback; others will receive it at least biweekly. Follow-up observations will assess the agreed action step and inform the next coaching

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction. | Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices. |

## Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |

## Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.2: Instructional Planning for Effective Classroom Instruction
Provide job-embedded supports for teachers to effectively internalize, prepare for, and deliver instruction in a strong classroom environment.
Target: By May 2027, PLCs will meet twice a week by grade and content to internalize HMH and STEMscopes lessons, as set in the TAP.

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE:5.2.1: Culture and Routine Systems Training
Campus leadership ensures all teachers and instructional staff receive role aligned training on campus specific culture routines and behavior supports, aligned with district expectations.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: * 100% of campus professional development agendas and training rosters verify that teachers and instructional staff complete role-aligned training on campus-specific culture routines and behavior supports that align with district expectations

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

**Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.2.2: Curriculum-based Professional Learning
Campus leaders provide additional resources and support for teachers to effectively implement adopted instructional materials

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: 100% of campus professional learning calendars and resource allocation logs verify that teachers--including Career and Technical Education (CTE) and specialized program staff--receive curriculum-specific training, safety compliance materials, and industry-aligned coaching supports to effectively implement adopted instructional materials with fidelity

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 2

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.2.3: Instructional Delivery Training
Campus instructional leaders ensure teachers receive role-specific training focused on strong instruction, classroom management, intervention strategies, and support for special populations.

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA:* 100% of campus training logs and sign-in sheets verify that teachers receive role-specific training sessions focused on delivering strong instruction, establishing effective classroom management, executing intervention strategies, and providing targeted support for special populations

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.2.4:  Instructional Planning Supports
Campus leadership supports teachers in internalizing curriculum through structured individual planning time and PLCs.

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

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

**Problem Statements:**  School Processes & Programs 2

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 5 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 5.2.5: Observation and Feedback
Campus instructional leaders implement observation and feedback cycles with calibration aligned to high-quality instructional material delivery and strong instructional delivery practices, leveraging action step trackers to provide clarity and track progress over time.

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

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

**Problem Statements:**  School Processes & Programs 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

## Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Elgin Intermediate School has a relatively inexperienced teaching staff, with 57.6% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience. Combined with an average class size of 24.6 students, this creates a need for additional instructional support to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, differentiated instruction. | Campus professional development and instructional coaching have not been consistently differentiated based on teacher experience, instructional performance, and identified areas of need. As a result, teachers have received support, but the campus has not consistently monitored whether that support leads to improved instructional practices. |

### Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |
| 2 | EIS has adopted high-quality instructional materials in RLA and mathematics, but consistent lesson internalization and effective implementation remain areas for improvement. Teachers are still developing the instructional practices needed to ensure that HQIM is implemented with integrity and that students consistently engage in rigorous, grade-level learning. | The transition to new instructional materials occurred before the campus had fully established consistent systems for lesson internalization, instructional rehearsal, implementation monitoring, and teacher feedback. Campus leadership and teachers were still developing the knowledge and practices needed to effectively implement the adopted curriculum, resulting in variation in planning. |

### Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | The 2025-2026 End-of-Year Staff Survey found concerns with campus procedures and collaboration: only 46% of respondents agreed discipline procedures were clear and consistently implemented, and 42% agreed PLCs were purposeful and used time well. These results show a need to strengthen consistency, accountability, and follow-through in campus procedures and PLCs. | The campus previously focused on establishing structures and procedures without consistently defining expectations for implementation, monitoring effectiveness, and ensuring follow-through. As a result, the quality and consistency of campus practices varied, affecting staff confidence in established systems. |

## Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.3: Data-Driven Instruction, Assessment Reflection, and Targeted Supports
Campus utilizes data to support all learners.
Target: By May 2027, 90% of PLCs will run the full data-driven instruction cycle with reteaching within 48 hours (75% by December and 80% by March), as set in the TAP.

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

**Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** SUCCESS CRITERIA: PLC assessment-analysis cycles will document sixth-grade RLA and mathematics misconceptions, instructional responses, and reassessment results. Campus leaders will review student-group progress toward the academic objectives and adjust support when students are off track

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1

**Title I:** 2.5.2, 2.5.3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | On the 2026 STAAR assessments, 23% of Hispanic students achieved Meets Grade Level or Above in RLA, compared with 35% of White students. In mathematics, 10% of Hispanic students achieved Meets, compared with 18% of White students. These gaps contribute to the campus's Closing the Gaps performance and must narrow to support the campus goal of a 70 scaled score in Domain 3. | Campus PLC and assessment review processes have not consistently required instructional teams to disaggregate performance by student group, identify the specific TEKS contributing to achievement gaps, and monitor whether reteaching improves student outcomes. Consequently, instructional responses have not consistently addressed the standards and misconceptions identified through student data. |

## Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | EIS has established weekly PLC meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and teacher feedback processes, the quality of implementation and follow-through has been inconsistent. The campus has identified strengthening collaborative planning, instructional feedback, and monitoring systems as a priority to ensure these practices consistently lead to improved classroom instruction and student achievement. | The campus previously focused on establishing PLC and walkthrough structures without developing clear expectations for the quality of instructional practices, actionable feedback, and follow-up monitoring. As a result, meetings and observations occurred, but there was limited accountability for implementing instructional adjustments and evaluating their effectiveness. |

# Goal 6

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

## Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 6.1: Teacher and Student Time
Campus ensures there is sufficient time in the school day for impactful student experiences, as well as staff preparation and development.
Target: By May 2027, the master schedule will keep a protected daily intervention block and twice-weekly PLC time for every grade and content team.

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

### Strategy 1

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** Demographics 2

**Title I:** 2.5.2

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | During the 2025-2026 school year, 71.9% of EIS students (327) were identified as at-risk of academic failure. This creates a significant demand for academic interventions and student support services while maintaining access to rigorous, grade-level instruction. | The campus has not consistently implemented a coordinated process that connects incoming student performance data, diagnostic assessments, targeted interventions, and regular progress monitoring. As a result, instructional teams have not consistently used evidence of individual student needs to evaluate and adjust academic interventions. |

## Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

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

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

### Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

#### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2

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

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

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

**Problem Statements:** School Processes & Programs 3

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

### Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

| | Problem Statement | Root Cause |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy. | Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district. |

## Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 6.3: Enrollment and Access
A clearly defined process for enrollment and access that aligns with district expectations and established procedures.
Target: By June 2027, 100% of new enrollments will follow the district's registration process, with residency and occupational surveys completed for every enrolling family.

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

## Strategy 1

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

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

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

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

**Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Principal

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

## Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 6.4: Campus Operations
Strategically plans and allocates resources in alignment with the envisioned student experience.
Target: By May 2027, Elgin Intermediate will complete all required safety drills and monthly facility safety checks, with every finding fixed or reported within 10 school days.

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

## Strategy 1

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

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

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

**TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools

**ESF Levers:** Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

### Formative Reviews

| December | February | April | June |
|---|---|---|---|

# Funding Summary

# Funding Summary

## 211 - Title I-Part A

| Goal | Performance Objective | Strategy | Resources Needed | Account Code | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 1 | 3 | Extended-day tutoring, teacher pay | -- | $4,974.00 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | Extended-day snacks | -- | $1,500.00 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | Instructional supplies for tutoring and intervention | -- | $3,500.00 |
| | | | | **Sub-Total** | $9,974.00 |
| | | | | **Budgeted Fund Source Amount** | $9,974.00 |
| | | | | **+/- Difference** | $0.00 |