Elgin Independent School District

Harvest Ridge Elementary School

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

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

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment 3

Demographics 4

Student Learning 7

School Processes & Programs 11

Perceptions 15

Priority Problem Statements 18

Goals 22

Goal 1 : LEVER 1:PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT THROUGH STRO... 23

Goal 2 : LEVER 2: TALENT Each lever is defined by a set of Essential Actions (EA) a... 27

Goal 3 : LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS The campus establi... 33

Goal 4 : LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MAT... 42

Goal 5 : LEVER 5: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CAPACITY BUILDING The ca... 59

Goal 6 : LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS The campus maintains stro... 63

Funding Summary 66

211 - Title I-Part A 67

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Harvest Ridge Elementary School opened as a new campus in August 2024. From the 2024–2025 school year to the 2025–2026 school year, we experienced significant enrollment growth of approximately 25%, increasing from 596 to 745 students. This growth can be attributed to two primary factors: the continued rapid growth of our district and the return of fifth-grade students to elementary campuses. Overall, the percentages across most student demographic groups remained relatively consistent from the previous school year. However, we observed a notable decrease of nearly 24 percentage points in the percentage of students identified as Economically Disadvantaged, declining from 83.2% to 59.3%. Emergent Bilingual students represent 44% of our current student population, highlighting the continued importance of prioritizing language development, implementing research-based instructional strategies, and ensuring communication with families is accessible, clear, and easily understood. Chronic absenteeism remains a key area of focus for our campus. During the 2025–2026 school year, 21% of students met the definition of chronic absenteeism, while 63.5% of students were identified as at risk in some capacity. These data emphasize the need to continue prioritizing student attendance, identifying barriers to regular school participation, and providing targeted academic and behavioral supports to promote student engagement and achievement.

Harvest Ridge Elementary is a Title I schoolwide campus. The campus earned a D (67) in 2026, its second D in a row, and is completing a Local Improvement Plan (LIP) for 2026-27. A third D in 2027 would count as an unacceptable rating, so this plan focuses on the two areas closest to 70: Academic Growth and Closing the Gaps. The campus is not identified for federal Comprehensive, Targeted, or Additional Targeted Support (CSI, TSI, or ATS).

The table below provides a summary of enrollment, student demographics, and other key indicators, comparing data from the 2024–2025 and 2025–2026 school years.

Enrollment, Ethnicity and Race	*2024 - 2025*	*2025 - 2026*
Total Enrollment	596	745
Economically Disadvantaged	83.2%	59.3%
Special Education	15.9%	17.7%
Emergent Bilingual	46.3%	44.0%
African American	11.7%	14.1%
Hispanic	72.1%	67.7%
White	10.1%	12.3%
American Indian	0.2%	0.4%

Enrollment, Ethnicity and Race	*2024 - 2025*	*2025 - 2026*
Asian	0.8 %	0.7 %
Pacific Islander	0.2 %	0.1 %
Two or More Races	4.9 %	4.7 %
Attendance Rate	-	93.5 %
Chronic Absenteeism	-	21 %
At-Risk		63.5 %

Our teacher population consists largely of educators who are early in their careers, with 67.5% of teachers having five or fewer years of experience last year. Of this group, 22.6% are first-year teachers, while 44.9% have between one and five years of experience. Although 32.5% of our teachers have six or more years of experience and bring valuable knowledge and expertise to our campus, the high percentage of novice teachers highlights the need for intentional, ongoing support and professional growth opportunities.

This year, 23 out of our 41 teachers (56%) have five or fewer years of experience, and 20 out of 41 teachers (49%) are working toward their teaching certification.

Strengths

- Our campus serves neighborhoods that continue to experience residential growth, creating opportunities for sustained increases in student enrollment in the coming years.
- Many of our teachers are early in their careers and demonstrate a willingness to learn, grow, and strengthen their instructional practices as they gain experience. This provides an opportunity to continue building upon a strong culture of continuous improvement through mentoring, coaching, and professional development, including support for teachers working toward certification.
- The process for identifying students coded Economically Disadvantaged has been strengthened for the current school year by completing required forms during registration, supporting more accurate student identification and access to available resources.
- Although overall student enrollment continues to increase, our campus serves a relatively consistent student population in terms of demographic composition from year to year, allowing us to build on established instructional practices and develop targeted supports to meet students' ongoing needs.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	During the 2025-2026 school year, 21% of students were chronically absent, and 63.5% were identified as at risk in some capacity. These results highlight the need to strengthen attendance monitoring, identify barriers to regular school participation, and increase student engagement to support academic achievement.	Campus processes for proactively monitoring attendance patterns, identifying barriers to regular school participation, and coordinating timely family outreach and interventions needed to be strengthened. As a result, opportunities to address attendance concerns before they became chronic were limited.
2 ★	Emergent bilingual students represent 44% of the campus population, highlighting the need for consistent, research-based instruction that supports English language development and fosters bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural learners while ensuring accessible communication with families.	Campus practices for implementing targeted English language development strategies and communicating with families were not consistently aligned to student needs. Opportunities to strengthen language supports, promote bilingualism and biliteracy, and provide clear, accessible family communication needed to be expanded.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Parent feedback gathered through the CNA process identified strengths in classroom engagement and teachers' efforts to encourage students to think critically. Families also noted strong school-to-home connections in some classrooms, particularly when teachers provide consistent weekly communication outlining grade-level learning objectives and the skills students are expected to develop. These aligned weekly messages help families understand what students are learning and provide opportunities to reinforce learning at home. However, parents identified opportunities to strengthen academic support outside the classroom by incorporating more homework, sending additional library books home, and expanding after-school tutoring opportunities to provide students with additional practice and support.

Teacher feedback and student performance data highlight the need for greater consistency in classroom management and behavioral supports across all classrooms. Ensuring that teachers have the training, resources, and guidance necessary to implement effective classroom management practices, regardless of years of experience or certification status, will help minimize disruptions and protect valuable instructional time. Teachers also identified a need for stronger alignment across assessments to support effective data triangulation and provide a more accurate picture of student progress and mastery. Continued professional development in data literacy is needed to help teachers analyze information from both formal and informal assessments and use those findings to adjust instruction, differentiate learning opportunities, and provide timely interventions based on student needs.

Academic achievement remains an area of concern, particularly in mathematics and reading. Student performance data indicate low mathematics achievement across grade levels, emphasizing the need for stronger Tier 1 instruction focused on foundational skills, conceptual understanding, and problem-solving strategies. Declining reading growth points throughout the year also indicate a need to strengthen reading instruction, monitor progress more frequently, and respond to gaps in foundational literacy skills. Additionally, low third-grade achievement highlights the importance of providing targeted support during the transition from second to third grade, with an increased focus on instructional rigor, grade-level expectations, and the skills students need to be successful as academic demands increase.

On 2026 STAAR, 37% of students in grades 3-5 reached Meets Grade Level or above in Reading and 27% in Math, up from 32% and 18% in 2025. Academic Growth held at 66, and Closing the Gaps rose from 65 to 69. Raising Academic Growth to 70 and Closing the Gaps to 70 would earn a C (70) if our other scores hold. Growth is where we lost the most ground: of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025, 25 dropped at least one performance level in 2026.

Fall 2026 MAP Growth projections show the campus at 51 in Student Achievement, 63 in Academic Growth, 49 in Relative Performance, and 38 in Closing the Gaps, for a projected overall score of 56, which is 11 points below our 2026 score. Our common formative assessments (CFAs) tell a more positive story: students are mastering the skills taught so far, and those results line up with our 2026 STAAR results and our 2027 targets. We will watch both measures at each checkpoint, because last year's gains are not locked in yet.

In 2026, 35% of Hispanic students, 35% of African American students, and 32% of High Focus students reached Meets in Reading, and 28%, 16%, and 24% reached Meets in Math.

Moving forward, our campus must prioritize increasing the percentage of students who meet grade-level expectations. While supporting students who are significantly below grade level remains essential, greater emphasis must also be placed on helping students reach proficiency and demonstrate mastery of grade-level standards. Strengthening Tier 1 instruction, aligning curriculum and assessments, monitoring student progress, and implementing timely interventions will be critical to closing achievement gaps and ensuring students are adequately prepared for the next grade level. Attendance must also remain a priority, as consistent participation in instruction is essential for students to access learning opportunities and make sustained academic progress.

Although fifth-grade science performance improved relative to the district average during the previous school year, fewer than half of fifth-grade students achieved the Approaches Grade Level performance standard. This indicates a continued need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction across all content areas, ensuring that students receive rigorous, standards-aligned instruction and frequent opportunities to apply their learning. By improving instructional consistency, strengthening foundational skills, and using assessment data to guide instructional decisions, our campus can work toward more consistent student growth and improved academic outcomes across grade levels and subject areas.

Strengths

- Demonstrated improvement in Closing the Gaps, with the overall score increasing from 65 to 69. This growth reflects progress in addressing performance differences among student groups and improving outcomes for students who require additional academic support.
- Made progress in TELPAS, earning 2 out of 4 possible points based on student growth in English language proficiency. This progress highlights efforts to support Emergent Bilingual students in developing the language skills necessary to access grade-level content and demonstrate academic achievement.
- Improved the overall Student Achievement score from 55 to 58, indicating growth in student performance across assessed content areas. Continued emphasis on high-quality Tier 1 instruction, targeted interventions, and data-driven instructional decisions will be important to continue improving in this area.
- Increased the overall percentage of students achieving Approaches, Meets, and Masters Grade Level performance standards in mathematics from the 2024–2025 school year to the 2025–2026 school year. These gains indicate progress in mathematics achievement, while continued attention to foundational skills, problem-solving, and rigorous grade-level instruction will help move more students toward Meets and Masters performance levels.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Mathematics achievement and academic growth remain areas of concern in fourth and fifth grades, with only 56% of students in each grade achieving Approaches Grade Level or above. Meets Grade Level performance is also low, with 36% of fourth graders and 23% of fifth graders meeting grade-level expectations.	Campus systems for supporting novice and uncertified teachers, including coaching and lesson internalization, do not yet ensure consistent implementation of rigorous, aligned Tier 1 mathematics instruction, including curriculum alignment and effective instructional practices.
2	Third-grade mathematics achievement remains below expected levels, with only 52% of students achieving Approaches Grade Level or above, 24% meeting grade-level expectations, and 11% mastering grade-level expectations.	The campus lacks a systematic process for diagnosing students' gaps in prerequisite mathematics skills (Pre-K through 2nd) and delivering targeted intervention, so foundational gaps persist from grade to grade.
3 ★	On 2026 STAAR Reading, 62% of students across grades 3 - 5 scored a 0 on the extended constructed response, indicating a need to strengthen students' ability to develop, organize, and communicate complete written responses that meet grade-level expectations.	Insufficient professional development was provided to equip teachers with clear, effective strategies for implementing extended constructed response instruction. As a result, teachers taught the process as a single, whole-class strategy rather than differentiating instruction to address students' varying levels of readiness and writing needs.
4 ★	186 of 229 emergent bilingual students (81%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels in TELPAS Reading.	Targeted, rigorous instruction in foundational English language skills was not consistently implemented, and student progress was not systematically monitored throughout the school year. Consequently, gaps in English language development and reading proficiency were not consistently identified or addressed through timely, differentiated instruction and intervention.
5 ★	212 of 229 emergent bilingual students (93%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels on TELPAS writing, indicating that the majority of students have not yet developed the English writing proficiency needed to demonstrate grade-level expectations.	Instructional priorities focused primarily on listening and speaking, resulting in writing receiving less emphasis in instructional planning and delivery. Students had fewer opportunities to practice writing in English across content areas, hindering their ability to develop and apply the academic vocabulary, sentence structures, and written communication skills necessary for growth in this area.

6 ★

45% of students scored in the Low Approaches range on the science assessment, while only 22% achieved Meets Grade Level. These results indicate a need to improve overall science achievement and increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.

Instructional planning did not consistently prioritize intentional connections between hands-on labs, scientific investigations, and the ways scientific concepts and skills are assessed. As a result, students had limited opportunities to apply their learning from experiments to assessment-based questions requiring them to analyze data, interpret results, and demonstrate mastery.

7 ★

60% of all students demonstrated academic growth, while only 58% of Hispanic students met growth expectations. Both groups fell short of their targets on Reading STAAR, resulting in no points earned in this portion of Closing the Gaps for either group. This highlights the need to strengthen reading achievement and accelerate academic growth for all students, particularly Hispanic students.

After CUA 2, campus instructional priorities shifted toward mathematics, and intervention time focused on students below grade level. Reading instruction and extension were not planned for students already at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters, so 25 of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped a performance level in 2026.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Our campus provides several specialized programs to meet the diverse needs of our students. We house the Early Childhood Special Education program for qualifying three- and four-year-old students, as well as Solid Roots, the districtwide Tier 3 Behavior Support program serving qualifying elementary students across the district. Additionally, our one-way dual language program serves students in Pre-K through fifth grade. With 44% of our student population identified as Emergent Bilingual, this program plays an important role in supporting language development and academic achievement. Continuing to strengthen these programs and ensure students receive appropriate academic, behavioral, and language supports remains a priority.

Feedback from parents and community members during the CNA process highlighted opportunities to strengthen communication, family engagement, and the home-to-school connection. Although our campus is a National Showcase School for Capturing Kids' Hearts, families expressed a need for clearer communication about the program, its purpose, and its implementation across the campus. Parents also shared a desire for more family events, additional after-school programs, and timely communication regarding student progress, campus initiatives, and available supports. We welcome parent and community input, and we recognize the need to establish more consistent and structured opportunities for feedback, such as surveys and other methods of gathering stakeholder perspectives. Using this information to guide decisions will help ensure that family voices are heard and campus initiatives reflect the needs of our school community.

Teacher feedback during the CNA process indicated that our campus has a strong Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process for identifying and addressing student needs. Teachers identified the Literacy First program as a valuable resource for supporting literacy development in Kindergarten through second grade, but expressed a need for additional intervention options, particularly for students in the primary grades. Our current assessment process includes NWEA for first through fifth grades, CLI for Pre-K, and mCLASS for kindergarten. However, an additional tool to monitor ongoing academic growth in mathematics and better inform instructional decisions in Kindergarten is needed. Moving forward, we will continue evaluating intervention resources and assessment practices to ensure teachers have the tools necessary to monitor student progress, differentiate instruction, and provide timely, targeted support.

Our instructional leadership team meets regularly to review instructional practices, student progress, and campus priorities. However, there is an opportunity to increase the frequency of campus leadership team meetings to strengthen communication, collaboration, and alignment across campus initiatives. Establishing more consistent leadership meetings will allow teams to review progress toward campus goals, respond to emerging needs, and make informed decisions based on student data and stakeholder feedback. Strengthening these collaborative structures will also help ensure more consistent implementation of instructional and behavioral supports throughout the campus.

During the previous school year, extracurricular opportunities included UIL and Kindness Squad. Feedback from students, staff, and families indicated a desire for additional opportunities to increase student participation, leadership, and engagement. In response, we plan to expand the number and variety of extracurricular activities offered to students. Increasing these opportunities will help students explore their interests, build positive relationships, develop leadership skills, and strengthen their sense of belonging within the school community.

We made significant gains in establishing a structured PLC process through training with Solution Tree. All teachers were assigned roles, teams met twice weekly for both informal and formal PLCs, TEKS were studied, and lesson plans were completed. However, the process became more focused on compliance and completing required tasks than on meaningful lesson internalization, analyzing student data, and making intentional instructional adjustments to meet student needs. Moving forward, the focus must shift from completing the PLC process to strengthening its impact on instructional quality, consistency across classrooms, and student achievement.

Core instruction uses HMH for reading and STEMscopes for math. Grade-level teams meet twice a week: Wednesdays for planning and Thursdays for formal PLCs in our PLC data room, using the four PLC questions and district-written common formative assessments (CFAs). Campus administrators observe every teacher at least once a week, give written feedback in Eduphoria Strive, and calibrate together weekly. Students take NWEA MAP Growth three times a year, two comprehensive unit assessments (CUAs), and unit assessments. This year the campus is partnering with engage2learn through the LIFT program for coaching on observation and feedback, HQIM implementation, and PLCs.

Overall, feedback gathered indicates a need to continue strengthening campus systems and processes through consistent

communication, collaboration, and structured opportunities for stakeholder input. Priorities include improving family engagement, expanding academic interventions, refining assessment practices, increasing leadership team collaboration, and providing additional extracurricular opportunities. By using student data and feedback from teachers, families, and community members to guide continuous improvement, we can build more effective systems that support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of all students.

Strengths

- Our campus offers a range of specialized programs that allow us to meet the diverse needs of students, including early childhood special education, intensive behavioral support, and dual language instruction.
- Multiple opportunities are available for families to engage with the campus and communicate directly with staff through Coffee with Counselors, CAC meetings, PTA meetings, and parent conferences.
- Our established MTSS process provides a framework for identifying student needs, setting measurable academic and behavioral goals, monitoring progress, and aligning interventions with efforts to close achievement gaps.
- Teachers recognize the value of Literacy First in supporting literacy development, providing a foundation for continued growth in evidence-based reading instruction and targeted interventions.
- Regular instructional leadership team meetings provide opportunities to collaborate, review student outcomes, and align instructional practices with campus improvement priorities.
- Existing extracurricular activities, including UIL and Kindness Squad, provide a foundation for expanding student involvement, leadership, and opportunities to build positive peer relationships.
- Our campus has established opportunities for family and community involvement, creating a foundation for strengthening partnerships and using stakeholder feedback to inform campus decisions.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Campus instructional processes did not consistently provide sufficient opportunities for collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and data-driven instructional adjustments. As a result, lesson delivery and instructional responses to student needs were not consistently strengthened through PLCs to support improved student achievement and academic growth.	PLC time and expectations emphasized completing required tasks and documentation rather than deeply internalizing lessons, analyzing student data, anticipating student misconceptions, and planning differentiated instructional responses. As a result, opportunities to strengthen instructional alignment and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms were limited.
2	Extracurricular offerings, previously including UIL and Kindness Squad, provided opportunities for student involvement; however, feedback from students, staff, and families indicated a need for a wider variety of activities to increase participation, leadership, and student engagement.	The campus offered a limited range of extracurricular opportunities to address the diverse interests, strengths, and needs of the student population. Without a broader selection of activities, opportunities for students to develop leadership skills, build positive relationships, explore interests, and strengthen their sense of belonging were limited.
3 ★	Campus leadership structures provided opportunities to review instructional practices, student progress, and campus priorities; however, the frequency of leadership team meetings limited opportunities for ongoing collaboration, monitoring, and alignment across campus initiatives.	Campus leadership meetings were not scheduled frequently enough to support systematic review of progress toward campus goals, timely responses to emerging student needs, and consistent monitoring of instructional and behavioral initiatives. This limited opportunities to make timely, data-informed decisions and ensure consistent implementation across the campus.
4 ★	Family and community feedback identified a need for more consistent communication about campus programs, student progress, available supports, and campus initiatives, as well as additional opportunities for family engagement and participation in campus decisions.	Campus processes for communicating with families and gathering stakeholder feedback were not sufficiently structured or consistently implemented to ensure families received timely information and had meaningful opportunities to share input and influence campus priorities.

5 ★	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

Our campus has a staff retention rate of 92%, reflecting a strong foundation of staff commitment and continuity. The school community is supportive, and families recognize the campus's presence within the community and its efforts to engage parents and caregivers. Feedback gathered during the CNA process highlighted the kindness and compassion of teachers, as well as the campus's commitment to inclusivity through school events and communication. Diverse celebrations throughout the year help foster a welcoming environment where students and families feel represented and valued. Parent feedback also identified school climate, safety, and family support as strengths, as reflected in the Spring 2026 family survey. Continued attention to staff well-being and positive staff-leadership relationships will be important in maintaining this supportive environment.

Although parent involvement is strong through the PTA and volunteer programs, opportunities remain to increase the frequency and consistency of family feedback. CNA feedback and the Spring 2026 family survey identified family engagement and barriers to participation as areas for continued growth. In particular, greater efforts are needed to engage families who speak languages other than English so their perspectives are more accurately represented in campus decision-making. Parents recommended additional ESL support, more frequent surveys with intentional review and follow-up, increased social media communication, and parent workshops to provide families with meaningful opportunities to connect with the school and support student learning.

Academic performance remains an area of concern and requires a focused, campuswide effort to improve student outcomes. While teacher experience and certification status may contribute to differences in instructional practice, it is essential to establish consistent expectations and ensure that all students have equitable access to high-quality instruction and the support they need to succeed. Strengthening instructional consistency, monitoring student progress, and aligning academic interventions with identified needs will help create a more level playing field across classrooms and grade levels.

In the Spring 2026 Survey, 55 staff members completed the Staff Survey. Teacher feedback from Spring 2026 indicates that staff value the coaching and support they receive but would benefit from more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities. Given the number of teachers who are new to the profession or working toward certification, targeted professional development, job-embedded coaching, and intentional mentoring will be important in building instructional capacity. Moving forward, the campus must balance its commitment to staff support and well-being with a focus on high expectations, continuous professional growth, and improved academic achievement for all students.

Student survey data from Capturing Kids' Hearts highlights strengths in the consistent use of hand signals, greeting students, and celebrating student successes, reflecting efforts to build positive relationships and create a welcoming classroom environment. However, the feedback also identifies opportunities to deepen these relationships by ensuring teachers know students beyond their academic performance and grades, including their interests, strengths, and individual needs. Additionally, students would benefit from more opportunities to take ownership of their learning environment, develop leadership skills, and positively reference and reinforce the classroom Social Contract. Strengthening these practices will help foster a greater sense of belonging, student voice, and shared responsibility for maintaining a positive school culture.

Strengths

- 77% of parents who completed the Spring 2026 family survey responded favorably regarding school climate and safety, indicating that families generally view the campus as a safe and supportive learning environment.
- Teacher survey results placed feedback and coaching in the 90th percentile, with 92% of teachers reporting that they frequently receive thorough feedback on their teaching. This reflects a strength in instructional coaching and opportunities for professional growth.
- Student feedback from the Capturing Kids' Hearts survey identified positive teacher-student relationships as a campus strength. Students reported that teachers greet them with a smile, treat them kindly, and encourage them to be the best students they can be.
- Parent involvement through PTA, volunteer programs, and campus events provides a foundation for strong family-school partnerships and continued community engagement.

- Parent feedback during the CNA process highlighted teachers' kindness and compassion, the campus's inclusive approach to events and communication, and the school's visible presence and involvement within the community.
- The campus's 92% staff retention rate reflects a strong foundation of staff commitment and continuity, supporting relationship-building and consistency for students.
- Harvest Ridge Elementary School works collaboratively with the PTA to provide diverse celebrations and inclusive opportunities throughout the year that help students and families feel welcomed, valued, and represented.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Although families view the campus as welcoming, inclusive, and supportive, CNA feedback and the Spring 2026 family survey identified a need for more consistent communication, increased family engagement, and more frequent opportunities for families to provide feedback and contribute to campus decisions, particularly for families who speak languages other than English.	Campus processes for gathering and responding to family feedback were not sufficiently frequent, structured, or accessible to ensure diverse family perspectives informed campus decisions. Communication and engagement opportunities were not consistently differentiated to address language barriers and varying family needs.
2 ★	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	During the 2025-2026 school year, 21% of students were chronically absent, and 63.5% were identified as at risk in some capacity. These results highlight the need to strengthen attendance monitoring, identify barriers to regular school participation, and increase student engagement to support academic achievement.	Campus processes for proactively monitoring attendance patterns, identifying barriers to regular school participation, and coordinating timely family outreach and interventions needed to be strengthened. As a result, opportunities to address attendance concerns before they became chronic were limited.
2	60% of all students demonstrated academic growth, while only 58% of Hispanic students met growth expectations. Both groups fell short of their targets on Reading STAAR, resulting in no points earned in this portion of Closing the Gaps for either group. This highlights the need to strengthen reading achievement and accelerate academic growth for all students, particularly Hispanic students.	After CUA 2, campus instructional priorities shifted toward mathematics, and intervention time focused on students below grade level. Reading instruction and extension were not planned for students already at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters, so 25 of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped a performance level in 2026.
3	On 2026 STAAR Reading, 62% of students across grades 3 - 5 scored a 0 on the extended constructed response, indicating a need to strengthen students' ability to develop, organize, and communicate complete written responses that meet grade-level expectations.	Insufficient professional development was provided to equip teachers with clear, effective strategies for implementing extended constructed response instruction. As a result, teachers taught the process as a single, whole-class strategy rather than differentiating instruction to address students' varying levels of readiness and writing needs.
4	Mathematics achievement and academic growth remain areas of concern in fourth and fifth grades, with only 56% of students in each grade achieving Approaches Grade Level or above. Meets Grade Level performance is also low, with 36% of fourth graders and 23% of fifth graders meeting grade-level expectations.	Campus systems for supporting novice and uncertified teachers, including coaching and lesson internalization, do not yet ensure consistent implementation of rigorous, aligned Tier 1 mathematics instruction, including curriculum alignment and effective instructional practices.
5	212 of 229 emergent bilingual students (93%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels on TELPAS writing, indicating that the majority of students have not yet developed the English writing proficiency needed to demonstrate grade-level expectations.	Instructional priorities focused primarily on listening and speaking, resulting in writing receiving less emphasis in instructional planning and delivery. Students had fewer opportunities to practice writing in English across content areas, hindering their ability to develop and apply the academic vocabulary, sentence structures, and written communication skills necessary for growth in this area.

6 ★	Campus instructional processes did not consistently provide sufficient opportunities for collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and data-driven instructional adjustments. As a result, lesson delivery and instructional responses to student needs were not consistently strengthened through PLCs to support improved student achievement and academic growth.	PLC time and expectations emphasized completing required tasks and documentation rather than deeply internalizing lessons, analyzing student data, anticipating student misconceptions, and planning differentiated instructional responses. As a result, opportunities to strengthen instructional alignment and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms were limited.
7 ★	Family and community feedback identified a need for more consistent communication about campus programs, student progress, available supports, and campus initiatives, as well as additional opportunities for family engagement and participation in campus decisions.	Campus processes for communicating with families and gathering stakeholder feedback were not sufficiently structured or consistently implemented to ensure families received timely information and had meaningful opportunities to share input and influence campus priorities.
8 ★	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.
9 ★	186 of 229 emergent bilingual students (81%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels in TELPAS Reading.	Targeted, rigorous instruction in foundational English language skills was not consistently implemented, and student progress was not systematically monitored throughout the school year. Consequently, gaps in English language development and reading proficiency were not consistently identified or addressed through timely, differentiated instruction and intervention.
10 ★	Emergent bilingual students represent 44% of the campus population, highlighting the need for consistent, research-based instruction that supports English language development and fosters bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural learners while ensuring accessible communication with families.	Campus practices for implementing targeted English language development strategies and communicating with families were not consistently aligned to student needs. Opportunities to strengthen language supports, promote bilingualism and biliteracy, and provide clear, accessible family communication needed to be expanded.

11 ★

45% of students scored in the Low Approaches range on the science assessment, while only 22% achieved Meets Grade Level. These results indicate a need to improve overall science achievement and increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.

Instructional planning did not consistently prioritize intentional connections between hands-on labs, scientific investigations, and the ways scientific concepts and skills are assessed. As a result, students had limited opportunities to apply their learning from experiments to assessment-based questions requiring them to analyze data, interpret results, and demonstrate mastery.

12 ★

Although families view the campus as welcoming, inclusive, and supportive, CNA feedback and the Spring 2026 family survey identified a need for more consistent communication, increased family engagement, and more frequent opportunities for families to provide feedback and contribute to campus decisions, particularly for families who speak languages other than English.

Campus processes for gathering and responding to family feedback were not sufficiently frequent, structured, or accessible to ensure diverse family perspectives informed campus decisions. Communication and engagement opportunities were not consistently differentiated to address language barriers and varying family needs.

13 ★

Campus leadership structures provided opportunities to review instructional practices, student progress, and campus priorities; however, the frequency of leadership team meetings limited opportunities for ongoing collaboration, monitoring, and alignment across campus initiatives.

Campus leadership meetings were not scheduled frequently enough to support systematic review of progress toward campus goals, timely responses to emerging student needs, and consistent monitoring of instructional and behavioral initiatives. This limited opportunities to make timely, data-informed decisions and ensure consistent implementation across the campus.

14 ★

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

Goals

Goal 1

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 1.4: Performance Management of Campus Improvement Plan and Goals(LEVERS)
By June 2027, Harvest Ridge Elementary School will complete 100% of its Title I schoolwide planning requirements, with evidence for every meeting in CRATE within 10 school days.

Evaluation Data Source: agendas, signed sign-ins, minutes, slides; December, February, and April formative and June summative reviews; posted English and Spanish CIP

Strategy 1

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

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus improvement strategies will be aligned to identified student needs, resulting in more targeted interventions, equitable access to instructional support, and measurable academic growth for all student groups. Every Closing the Gaps student group improves its achievement and growth results on each district assessment.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Campus Advisory Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - 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

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Campus Advisory Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - 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 3

Enforce make-up rule: a second meeting that week when any stakeholder group has 2 or fewer attendees

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - 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 4

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

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 5

Campus plans will be reviewed at the December, February, and April formative checkpoints and the June summative review.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, and Campus Advisory Committee

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 6

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals, Campus Advisory Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Campus leadership structures provided opportunities to review instructional practices, student progress, and campus priorities; however, the frequency of leadership team meetings limited opportunities for ongoing collaboration, monitoring, and alignment across campus initiatives.	Campus leadership meetings were not scheduled frequently enough to support systematic review of progress toward campus goals, timely responses to emerging student needs, and consistent monitoring of instructional and behavioral initiatives. This limited opportunities to make timely, data-informed decisions and ensure consistent implementation across the campus.

4	Family and community feedback identified a need for more consistent communication about campus programs, student progress, available supports, and campus initiatives, as well as additional opportunities for family engagement and participation in campus decisions.	Campus processes for communicating with families and gathering stakeholder feedback were not sufficiently structured or consistently implemented to ensure families received timely information and had meaningful opportunities to share input and influence campus priorities.
5	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Although families view the campus as welcoming, inclusive, and supportive, CNA feedback and the Spring 2026 family survey identified a need for more consistent communication, increased family engagement, and more frequent opportunities for families to provide feedback and contribute to campus decisions, particularly for families who speak languages other than English.	Campus processes for gathering and responding to family feedback were not sufficiently frequent, structured, or accessible to ensure diverse family perspectives informed campus decisions. Communication and engagement opportunities were not consistently differentiated to address language barriers and varying family needs.

Goal 2

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 2.1: Intentional Roles and Staffing
By June 2027, Harvest Ridge Elementary will meet 100% of Right to Know requirements, and every uncertified teacher will have a written certification plan.

Evaluation Data Source: dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Strategy 1

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

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

Check certification in September and January; send 4-week letters

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

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

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals, Uncertified Teachers

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

ESL Academy - training and pay for successful certification attainment

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

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

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 2.3: Growth and Retention Strategies
By May 2027, at least 90% of staff targeted for Title II training will complete it, and classroom use of the practice will rise from 75% to 90%.

Evaluation Data Source: dated notices and request log; 4-week letters; certification plans; Title II sign-ins; walkthrough data

Strategy 1

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

Spring Title II consultation survey and EOY CAC discussion

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

4-day accountability calibration training

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.3

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Campus leadership structures provided opportunities to review instructional practices, student progress, and campus priorities; however, the frequency of leadership team meetings limited opportunities for ongoing collaboration, monitoring, and alignment across campus initiatives.	Campus leadership meetings were not scheduled frequently enough to support systematic review of progress toward campus goals, timely responses to emerging student needs, and consistent monitoring of instructional and behavioral initiatives. This limited opportunities to make timely, data-informed decisions and ensure consistent implementation across the campus.
5	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 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

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
By May 2027, Harvest Ridge Elementary School will meet 100% of its ESSA SS1116 PFE requirements, and family attendance at PFE events will grow from 46% of families to at least 66% of families.

Evaluation Data Source: annual meeting evidence; policy and compact sign-ins; Watch Party QR attendance; staff training sign-ins; spring survey

Strategy 1

Hold the annual Title I meeting at least twice at flexible times, with Spanish interpretation

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principals; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

Train all staff on working with families at the October 14 staff meeting, with a make-up opportunity for teachers during the week of October 19th. All paraprofessionals will be trained during the Professional Development Day on November 6.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 6

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 7

Evaluate PFE each spring with a survey and parent focus group

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Campus Advisory Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	Family and community feedback identified a need for more consistent communication about campus programs, student progress, available supports, and campus initiatives, as well as additional opportunities for family engagement and participation in campus decisions.	Campus processes for communicating with families and gathering stakeholder feedback were not sufficiently structured or consistently implemented to ensure families received timely information and had meaningful opportunities to share input and influence campus priorities.
5	The campus does not yet keep complete, organized evidence that its Title I schoolwide program meets federal requirements, including stakeholder involvement in the needs assessment and plan, Right to Know notices, parent and family engagement, time and effort, and a clear tie between each Title I and State Compensatory Education expense and a campus plan strategy.	Federal program tasks have not been assigned to named campus staff with a yearly calendar of deadlines, and the October 2025 ESSA validations found missing evidence for Title I campus stakeholder involvement across the district.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Although families view the campus as welcoming, inclusive, and supportive, CNA feedback and the Spring 2026 family survey identified a need for more consistent communication, increased family engagement, and more frequent opportunities for families to provide feedback and contribute to campus decisions, particularly for families who speak languages other than English.	Campus processes for gathering and responding to family feedback were not sufficiently frequent, structured, or accessible to ensure diverse family perspectives informed campus decisions. Communication and engagement opportunities were not consistently differentiated to address language barriers and varying family needs.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 3.2: School-wide Culture, Behavior, Safety
By May 2027, instructional days lost to removals will not exceed 15%, with no group more than 10% above the campus rate.

Evaluation Data Source: referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

Strategy 1

Capturing Kids' Hearts with Tier 2 supports before any removal

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 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 2

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 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

Monthly discipline review by student group

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Instructional Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Demographics 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 Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	During the 2025-2026 school year, 21% of students were chronically absent, and 63.5% were identified as at risk in some capacity. These results highlight the need to strengthen attendance monitoring, identify barriers to regular school participation, and increase student engagement to support academic achievement.	Campus processes for proactively monitoring attendance patterns, identifying barriers to regular school participation, and coordinating timely family outreach and interventions needed to be strengthened. As a result, opportunities to address attendance concerns before they became chronic were limited.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 3.3: Interventions and Supports
By June 2027, 100% of homeless, migrant, foster care, and at-risk students will be identified, coded in PEIMS, and served, and their attendance will rise by 1.5 points.

Evaluation Data Source: referrals and surveys; at-risk roster checked against PEIMS; attendance by group; monthly discipline data

Strategy 1

Residency questionnaire and occupational survey for every enrolling family

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Demographics 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 2

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Student Support Specialist; Principal, Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Demographics 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

State Compensatory Education (SCE) supplements the regular program for students who meet the state at-risk criteria (TEC 29.081). Harvest Ridge Elementary's 2026-27 SCE budget (fund 199, PIC 30) totals $165,371.11: Communities In Schools case management $36,430; teacher salary $73,180; paraprofessional salary $31,834.88; benefits $23,926.23. SCE-funded positions: Teacher (1.0 FTE) and Paraprofessional (1.0 FTE). Each SCE-funded staff member serves identified at-risk students in reading and math intervention, and their time and effort is documented in CRATE. Also identify students who meet the 17 state at-risk criteria each six weeks and code them in PEIMS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Demographics 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 3 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	During the 2025-2026 school year, 21% of students were chronically absent, and 63.5% were identified as at risk in some capacity. These results highlight the need to strengthen attendance monitoring, identify barriers to regular school participation, and increase student engagement to support academic achievement.	Campus processes for proactively monitoring attendance patterns, identifying barriers to regular school participation, and coordinating timely family outreach and interventions needed to be strengthened. As a result, opportunities to address attendance concerns before they became chronic were limited.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 3.2: School-wide Culture, Behavior, Safety
By May 2027, 100% of PK-5 students at Harvest Ridge Elementary will receive at least 135 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity each week through PE and recess, as required by TEC 28.002(l-1), and chronic absenteeism will decrease from 21% in 2025-26 to at most 15%.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 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 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 2027 target.

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 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 4 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	During the 2025-2026 school year, 21% of students were chronically absent, and 63.5% were identified as at risk in some capacity. These results highlight the need to strengthen attendance monitoring, identify barriers to regular school participation, and increase student engagement to support academic achievement.	Campus processes for proactively monitoring attendance patterns, identifying barriers to regular school participation, and coordinating timely family outreach and interventions needed to be strengthened. As a result, opportunities to address attendance concerns before they became chronic were limited.

Goal 4

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

Performance Objective 1

☑ **High Priority** ☑ **HB3 Goal**

Essential Action 4.1: By May 2027, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Math will increase from 27% to at least 42%, and the percentage of African American students scoring Meets will increase from 16% to at least 31%, through targeted instruction, data-driven instructional adjustments, and differentiated academic support. Students receiving special education services will increase from 10% to at least 20% at Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Mathematics will increase from 23% to at least 30%, supporting the district HB 3 early mathematics goal.

Evaluation Data Source: Math CFAs, unit assessments, CUA 1 and CUA 2, MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY, and 2027 STAAR Math.

Strategy 1

Teachers meet twice a week during PLCs with the instructional coach and campus administrators to internalize upcoming lessons, unpack the TEKS, complete lesson tasks, anticipate misconceptions, and plan checks for understanding and differentiated responses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers consistently deliver rigorous, TEKS-aligned lessons and proactively address anticipated student misconceptions. Students receive stronger Tier 1 instruction and more consistent opportunities to master grade-level mathematics standards.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Teachers analyze weekly exit tickets, formative assessments, and unit assessment results during PLCs to identify standards where students demonstrate gaps in mastery. Teams document reteach plans, instructional adjustments, and students requiring additional support, then reassess targeted skills within one to two weeks.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers use current evidence of student learning to adjust instruction, respond promptly to misconceptions, and close gaps in student learning. Students receive timely, standards-specific instruction that strengthens mastery and increases readiness for Meets Grade Level performance.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Instructional Coach, and Team Leaders

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

Teachers use aggressive monitoring during daily math practice by circulating with a planned monitoring pathway, reviewing every student's work, using a consistent error-correction process, and providing immediate, actionable feedback. Teachers record common errors and student misconceptions, then use this evidence to adjust instruction, form small groups, and plan reteaching.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers identify misunderstandings in real time, provide immediate corrections, and ensure students accurately apply mathematical strategies before misconceptions become habits.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Instructional Coach, and Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

Funding Sources: Instructional supplies 211 - Title I-Part A, $10,000

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

Campus administrators and the instructional coach conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs and provide targeted, job-embedded coaching based on teacher experience, certification status, and identified instructional needs. Coaching cycles include modeling, co-planning, observation, and feedback focused on HQIM implementation, lesson internalization, differentiation, and rigorous math instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students have equitable access to high-quality instruction across classrooms, creating a more level playing field and increasing the percentage of students achieving Meets Grade Level or Above on Math STAAR.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

The principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach will use observation and student performance data to place teachers into appropriate support tiers. Every teacher will receive at least one observation per week, followed by written feedback within 24 hours that includes one specific, manageable action step for growth. All observations, including those conducted by the instructional coach, will be documented in Eduphoria Strive. Administrators will also participate in weekly calibration sessions using tools and resources provided by our LIFT coach to ensure consistency in observation practices and feedback.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Eduphoria Strive will be updated, showing that each teacher is observed at least weekly, with action steps and coaching conversation notes shared in a timely manner. Walkthrough Look-Fors, focused on specific T-TESS Dimensions and Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) will increase each month.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 - Perceptions 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

No Progress

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Mathematics achievement and academic growth remain areas of concern in fourth and fifth grades, with only 56% of students in each grade achieving Approaches Grade Level or above. Meets Grade Level performance is also low, with 36% of fourth graders and 23% of fifth graders meeting grade-level expectations.	Campus systems for supporting novice and uncertified teachers, including coaching and lesson internalization, do not yet ensure consistent implementation of rigorous, aligned Tier 1 mathematics instruction, including curriculum alignment and effective instructional practices.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus instructional processes did not consistently provide sufficient opportunities for collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and data-driven instructional adjustments. As a result, lesson delivery and instructional responses to student needs were not consistently strengthened through PLCs to support improved student achievement and academic growth.	PLC time and expectations emphasized completing required tasks and documentation rather than deeply internalizing lessons, analyzing student data, anticipating student misconceptions, and planning differentiated instructional responses. As a result, opportunities to strengthen instructional alignment and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms were limited.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By May 2027, at least 60% of students in grades 3-5 will earn a score of 1 or above on the STAAR Reading extended constructed response, up from 38% in 2026, through differentiated writing instruction, targeted professional development, and explicit strategies for developing, organizing, and communicating complete written responses.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR, ongoing data sources (CFAs, UAs, CUAs, NWEA), ECR rubric scores on CUA 1 and CUA 2

Strategy 1

Teachers use writing samples, formative assessments, and extended constructed response rubrics to identify students' specific needs in comprehension, planning, evidence selection, organization, and written communication. Teachers provide targeted small-group instruction at least twice weekly and adjust groups every two weeks based on student mastery and progress-monitoring data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students receive writing instruction aligned to their individual skill gaps and demonstrate measurable improvement in the components of a complete written response. More students independently produce responses that meet scoring criteria and earn a score of 1 or above.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Campus administrators and instructional leaders provide monthly, targeted professional development and job-embedded coaching on explicit extended constructed response instruction. Training includes modeling the response process, analyzing scored exemplars, unpacking rubrics, teaching evidence-based responses, and differentiating instruction. Follow-up walkthroughs and student work reviews are used to monitor implementation and identify additional coaching needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instructional practices become more consistent across classrooms, improving students' access to effective writing instruction and increasing extended constructed response performance.

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

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

Teachers incorporate at least one extended or short constructed response opportunity per week in reading and/or other content areas, requiring students to explain their thinking, cite evidence when appropriate, and communicate complete ideas. Teachers provide timely feedback using rubrics and maintain student work samples to monitor progress.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased opportunities to write strengthen students' fluency, organization, and ability to transfer response-writing skills to STAAR assessments and TELPAS.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 5

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
3	On 2026 STAAR Reading, 62% of students across grades 3 - 5 scored a 0 on the extended constructed response, indicating a need to strengthen students' ability to develop, organize, and communicate complete written responses that meet grade-level expectations.	Insufficient professional development was provided to equip teachers with clear, effective strategies for implementing extended constructed response instruction. As a result, teachers taught the process as a single, whole-class strategy rather than differentiating instruction to address students' varying levels of readiness and writing needs.

5	212 of 229 emergent bilingual students (93%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels on TELPAS writing, indicating that the majority of students have not yet developed the English writing proficiency needed to demonstrate grade-level expectations.	Instructional priorities focused primarily on listening and speaking, resulting in writing receiving less emphasis in instructional planning and delivery. Students had fewer opportunities to practice writing in English across content areas, hindering their ability to develop and apply the academic vocabulary, sentence structures, and written communication skills necessary for growth in this area.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus instructional processes did not consistently provide sufficient opportunities for collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and data-driven instructional adjustments. As a result, lesson delivery and instructional responses to student needs were not consistently strengthened through PLCs to support improved student achievement and academic growth.	PLC time and expectations emphasized completing required tasks and documentation rather than deeply internalizing lessons, analyzing student data, anticipating student misconceptions, and planning differentiated instructional responses. As a result, opportunities to strengthen instructional alignment and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms were limited.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By May 2027, the percentage of emergent bilingual students in grades K-4 (incoming grades 1-5) achieving Advanced or Advanced High on TELPAS Reading will increase from 19% to 30% through targeted English language development, differentiated reading instruction, and ongoing progress monitoring.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 TELPAS Reading, MAP Growth Reading, and classroom reading and language progress checks

Strategy 1

Teachers plan weekly opportunities for students to apply listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills together during content-area instruction. Teachers explicitly model how to use context clues, analyze vocabulary, interpret text structures, and support comprehension through discussion and written responses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students strengthen their ability to use multiple language domains to interpret academic texts and demonstrate understanding of increasingly complex English. Students develop transferable English language skills that support stronger reading comprehension and TELPAS performance.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 4

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Grade-level teams and campus instructional leaders review TELPAS results, reading data, and formative assessment evidence. Teams disaggregate data by grade level, English proficiency level, and student groups to identify trends, monitor growth, and plan targeted instructional adjustments.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instructional decisions become more responsive to student needs, accelerating English language development and increasing the percentage of students achieving Advanced or Advanced High.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 4, 7

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	186 of 229 emergent bilingual students (81%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels in TELPAS Reading.	Targeted, rigorous instruction in foundational English language skills was not consistently implemented, and student progress was not systematically monitored throughout the school year. Consequently, gaps in English language development and reading proficiency were not consistently identified or addressed through timely, differentiated instruction and intervention.
7	60% of all students demonstrated academic growth, while only 58% of Hispanic students met growth expectations. Both groups fell short of their targets on Reading STAAR, resulting in no points earned in this portion of Closing the Gaps for either group. This highlights the need to strengthen reading achievement and accelerate academic growth for all students, particularly Hispanic students.	After CUA 2, campus instructional priorities shifted toward mathematics, and intervention time focused on students below grade level. Reading instruction and extension were not planned for students already at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters, so 25 of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped a performance level in 2026.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By May 2027, the percentage of all students demonstrating academic growth in Reading will increase from 60% to 75%, and the percentage of Hispanic students demonstrating academic growth will increase from 59% to at least 72%, through targeted reading instruction, data-driven instructional adjustments, and differentiated interventions to accelerate academic growth and meet Closing the Gaps targets.

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

Strategy 1

Grade-level teams and campus instructional leaders conduct in-depth data analysis during PLCs at least every six weeks, disaggregating reading performance by student group, grade level, TEKS, and assessment type. Teams compare formative assessment results to identify trends, evaluate growth across assessments, identify disparities, and determine targeted instructional responses. Teachers document findings and action steps in PLC data protocols.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers develop stronger data literacy and consistently use disaggregated assessment evidence to identify achievement gaps, monitor growth across student groups, and make informed instructional decisions. Instructional adjustments more accurately address student needs, strengthen outcomes for Hispanic students, and accelerate reading growth toward the campus targets.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7 - 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

Teachers conduct individual student data meetings to review progress toward reading goals, celebrate growth, identify skill gaps, and establish specific next steps. Students maintain progress-tracking tools and revisit their goals during subsequent conferences.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students understand their current performance, recognize areas of growth and need, and take greater ownership of their reading goals. Teachers use conference discussions and assessment evidence to adjust instruction and support.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7 - 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

Teachers consistently use aggressive monitoring during daily reading instruction by reviewing student responses and providing immediate, actionable feedback. Teachers document common misconceptions and use observed student needs to adjust instruction, form small groups, and reteach quickly.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students develop stronger reading skills and apply strategies more accurately, supporting continued progress toward academic growth targets.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7

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

Following BOY MAP assessments and each CUA, teachers will establish individualized growth targets for every student in grades 3-5, using the previous year's STAAR performance level to guide goal setting. During intervention time, students performing at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters will receive intentional, targeted extension lessons to support continued academic growth. The GT teacher, interventionist, instructional coach, and special education staff will collaborate with grade-level teams to align instructional groups and ensure targeted support meets students' individual learning needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A student growth tracker will be maintained and updated following BOY, CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2 assessments to monitor and document individual student progress. Assessment data will be used to measure growth from 2026 STAAR performance to current achievement levels and guide instructional decisions and targeted interventions. On CUA 2, students will earn their growth points by maintaining or raising their performance level from 2026 at Meets or Masters.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7

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

No Progress

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
7	60% of all students demonstrated academic growth, while only 58% of Hispanic students met growth expectations. Both groups fell short of their targets on Reading STAAR, resulting in no points earned in this portion of Closing the Gaps for either group. This highlights the need to strengthen reading achievement and accelerate academic growth for all students, particularly Hispanic students.	After CUA 2, campus instructional priorities shifted toward mathematics, and intervention time focused on students below grade level. Reading instruction and extension were not planned for students already at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters, so 25 of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped a performance level in 2026.

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus instructional processes did not consistently provide sufficient opportunities for collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and data-driven instructional adjustments. As a result, lesson delivery and instructional responses to student needs were not consistently strengthened through PLCs to support improved student achievement and academic growth.	PLC time and expectations emphasized completing required tasks and documentation rather than deeply internalizing lessons, analyzing student data, anticipating student misconceptions, and planning differentiated instructional responses. As a result, opportunities to strengthen instructional alignment and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms were limited.

Performance Objective 5 ☑ High Priority ☑ HB3 Goal

Essential Action 4.1: By May 2027, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 37% to at least 49%, and Masters Grade Level will stay at or above 17%. Students receiving special education services will increase from 11% to at least 21% at Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading. Grade 3 students scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 31% to at least 37%, supporting the district HB 3 early literacy goal.

Evaluation Data Source: Reading CFAs, unit assessments, CUA 1 and CUA 2, MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY, and 2027 STAAR Reading

Strategy 1

The principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach will use observation and student performance data to place teachers into appropriate support tiers. Every teacher will receive at least one observation per week, followed by written feedback within 24 hours that includes one specific, manageable action step for growth. All observations, including those conducted by the instructional coach, will be documented in Eduphoria Strive. Administrators will also participate in weekly calibration sessions using tools and resources provided by our LIFT coach to ensure consistency in observation practices and feedback.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Eduphoria Strive will be updated, showing that each teacher is observed at least weekly, with action steps and coaching conversation notes shared in a timely manner. Walkthrough Look-Fors, focused on specific T-TESS Dimensions and Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) will increase each month.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7 - Perceptions 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

No Progress

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Following BOY MAP assessments and each CUA, teachers will establish individualized growth targets for every student in grades 3-5, using the previous year's STAAR performance level to guide goal setting. During intervention time, students performing at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters will receive intentional, targeted extension lessons to support continued academic growth. The GT teacher, interventionist, instructional coach, and special education staff will collaborate with grade-level teams to align instructional groups and ensure targeted support meets students' individual learning needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A student growth tracker will be maintained and updated following BOY, CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2 assessments to monitor and document individual student progress. Assessment data will be used to measure growth from 2026 STAAR performance to current achievement levels and guide instructional decisions and targeted interventions. On CUA 2, students will earn their growth points by maintaining or raising their performance level from 2026 at Meets or Masters.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7

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

No Progress

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
7	60% of all students demonstrated academic growth, while only 58% of Hispanic students met growth expectations. Both groups fell short of their targets on Reading STAAR, resulting in no points earned in this portion of Closing the Gaps for either group. This highlights the need to strengthen reading achievement and accelerate academic growth for all students, particularly Hispanic students.	After CUA 2, campus instructional priorities shifted toward mathematics, and intervention time focused on students below grade level. Reading instruction and extension were not planned for students already at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters, so 25 of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped a performance level in 2026.

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

Performance Objective 6 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By June 2027, Harvest Ridge Elementary's Academic Growth score will increase from 66 to at least 70, and its Closing the Gaps score will increase from 69 to at least 70, as measured in the 2027 state accountability system.

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

Strategy 1

Following BOY MAP assessments and each CUA, teachers will establish individualized growth targets for every student in grades 3-5, using the previous year's STAAR performance level to guide goal setting. During intervention time, students performing at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters will receive intentional, targeted extension lessons to support continued academic growth. The GT teacher, interventionist, instructional coach, and special education staff will collaborate with grade-level teams to align instructional groups and ensure targeted support meets students' individual learning needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: A student growth tracker will be maintained and updated following BOY, CUA 1, MOY, and CUA 2 assessments to monitor and document individual student progress. Assessment data will be used to measure growth from 2026 STAAR performance to current achievement levels and guide instructional decisions and targeted interventions. On CUA 2, students will earn their growth points by maintaining or raising their performance level from 2026 at Meets or Masters.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7

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

No Progress

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

From February through April, grade-level teams will use CUA 2 and MOY MAP assessment data to identify students nearing the next performance level and provide targeted small-group acceleration in reading and math. The master schedule will prioritize and protect dedicated reading intervention time to ensure it is consistently maintained and not reallocated for math instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students in targeted acceleration groups raise their scores from CUA 1 to CUA 2, meeting their growth target.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 7

Funding Sources: Extended-day snacks 211 - Title I-Part A, $5,000, Extended-day tutoring (teacher pay) 211 - Title I-Part A, $14,946

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

No Progress

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Mathematics achievement and academic growth remain areas of concern in fourth and fifth grades, with only 56% of students in each grade achieving Approaches Grade Level or above. Meets Grade Level performance is also low, with 36% of fourth graders and 23% of fifth graders meeting grade-level expectations.	Campus systems for supporting novice and uncertified teachers, including coaching and lesson internalization, do not yet ensure consistent implementation of rigorous, aligned Tier 1 mathematics instruction, including curriculum alignment and effective instructional practices.
7	60% of all students demonstrated academic growth, while only 58% of Hispanic students met growth expectations. Both groups fell short of their targets on Reading STAAR, resulting in no points earned in this portion of Closing the Gaps for either group. This highlights the need to strengthen reading achievement and accelerate academic growth for all students, particularly Hispanic students.	After CUA 2, campus instructional priorities shifted toward mathematics, and intervention time focused on students below grade level. Reading instruction and extension were not planned for students already at High Approaches, Meets, and Masters, so 25 of the 106 reading and math scores at Meets or Masters in 2025 dropped a performance level in 2026.

Performance Objective 7 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 4.1: By May 2027, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring Meets Grade Level or above on STAAR Science will increase from 22% to at least 40%, and Masters Grade Level will stay at or above 10%.

Evaluation Data Source: Science CFAs, unit assessments, CUA 1 and CUA 2, MAP Growth BOY, MOY, and EOY, and 2027 STAAR Science

Strategy 1

Grade 3-5 teachers will teach the district science curriculum with at least one hands-on investigation each week and follow each investigation with a short written task that asks students to analyze the data, interpret the results, and explain them with evidence. PLCs will review one science common formative assessment each unit.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Lesson plans and walkthroughs show a weekly investigation and data-analysis task in every grade 3-5 classroom. The percentage of 5th graders at Meets Grade Level on science unit assessments rises from CUA 1 to CUA 2.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Instructional Coach, and 5th Grade Science Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 6

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

From January through April, 5th grade students who score below Meets Grade Level on science CUA 1 will receive small-group science reteaching twice a week during the intervention block, focused on the readiness standards they missed.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Science reteach rosters and lesson plans are in place by January 22, 2027. Students in reteach groups raise their CUA 2 science scores compared with CUA 1.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Instructional Coach, and 5th Grade Science Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 6

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 7 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
6	45% of students scored in the Low Approaches range on the science assessment, while only 22% achieved Meets Grade Level. These results indicate a need to improve overall science achievement and increase the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations.	Instructional planning did not consistently prioritize intentional connections between hands-on labs, scientific investigations, and the ways scientific concepts and skills are assessed. As a result, students had limited opportunities to apply their learning from experiments to assessment-based questions requiring them to analyze data, interpret results, and demonstrate mastery.

Goal 5

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

Performance Objective 1

☑ **High Priority**

Essential Action 5.2: Instructional Planning for Effective Classroom Instruction
By May 2027, 100% of core teachers will get observation and feedback every two weeks, at least 80% of action steps will be re-observed within two weeks, and ELPS language objectives will appear in 85% of bilingual and ESL walkthroughs.

Evaluation Data Source: Strive observation records; coaching caseloads; LIFT PLC tool; bilingual and ESL walkthroughs; coach time and effort

Strategy 1

Title I coaches run observation and feedback cycles every two weeks, with priority to new and uncertified teachers

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

Twice-weekly PLCs (Wednesday planning and Thursday data PLC): review CFA and MAP growth data, reteach within 48 hours, and internalize HQIM lessons.

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 4, 5

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

District calibration walks align instructional coaching and walkthrough metrics to ensure evaluation ratings are consistent across all campuses.

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Title I: 2.5.2, 2.5.3

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

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
2	Emergent bilingual students represent 44% of the campus population, highlighting the need for consistent, research-based instruction that supports English language development and fosters bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural learners while ensuring accessible communication with families.	Campus practices for implementing targeted English language development strategies and communicating with families were not consistently aligned to student needs. Opportunities to strengthen language supports, promote bilingualism and biliteracy, and provide clear, accessible family communication needed to be expanded.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	186 of 229 emergent bilingual students (81%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels in TELPAS Reading.	Targeted, rigorous instruction in foundational English language skills was not consistently implemented, and student progress was not systematically monitored throughout the school year. Consequently, gaps in English language development and reading proficiency were not consistently identified or addressed through timely, differentiated instruction and intervention.
5	212 of 229 emergent bilingual students (93%) in kindergarten through fourth grade (incoming first through fifth grade) scored at the Beginning or Intermediate levels on TELPAS writing, indicating that the majority of students have not yet developed the English writing proficiency needed to demonstrate grade-level expectations.	Instructional priorities focused primarily on listening and speaking, resulting in writing receiving less emphasis in instructional planning and delivery. Students had fewer opportunities to practice writing in English across content areas, hindering their ability to develop and apply the academic vocabulary, sentence structures, and written communication skills necessary for growth in this area.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Campus instructional processes did not consistently provide sufficient opportunities for collaborative planning, lesson internalization, and data-driven instructional adjustments. As a result, lesson delivery and instructional responses to student needs were not consistently strengthened through PLCs to support improved student achievement and academic growth.	PLC time and expectations emphasized completing required tasks and documentation rather than deeply internalizing lessons, analyzing student data, anticipating student misconceptions, and planning differentiated instructional responses. As a result, opportunities to strengthen instructional alignment and ensure consistent implementation across classrooms were limited.
3	Campus leadership structures provided opportunities to review instructional practices, student progress, and campus priorities; however, the frequency of leadership team meetings limited opportunities for ongoing collaboration, monitoring, and alignment across campus initiatives.	Campus leadership meetings were not scheduled frequently enough to support systematic review of progress toward campus goals, timely responses to emerging student needs, and consistent monitoring of instructional and behavioral initiatives. This limited opportunities to make timely, data-informed decisions and ensure consistent implementation across the campus.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Spring 2026 teacher feedback indicated that staff value the coaching and support provided by campus leadership but need more effective, differentiated professional learning opportunities to strengthen instructional practice. This need is particularly important for novice teachers and teachers working toward certification.	Professional learning, coaching, and mentoring are not yet differentiated by teachers' experience, certification status, and instructional needs, so novice and uncertified teachers do not consistently get the job-embedded support they need to deliver rigorous instruction.

Goal 6

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

Essential Action 6.2: Campus Budget
By June 2027, 100% of federal and SCE spending will tie to a CIP strategy, at least 75% of the allocation will be spent or obligated by March 31, and 100% of time and effort will be in CRATE.

Evaluation Data Source: campus budget; quarterly reviews; time and effort in CRATE; SCE FTE list; inventory

Strategy 1

Build the Title I and SCE budget from the CNA and name the fund source on every strategy with a cost Title I, Part A also funds the campus instructional coach ($81,411, salary and benefits), an intervention aide ($29,103), Age of Learning reading and math intervention licenses ($16,000), and the 1% parent and family engagement set-aside ($1,570).

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal; Assistant Principals, Campus Advisory Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principals; Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

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

Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I-Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
4	1	3	Instructional supplies	--	$10,000.00
4	6	2	Extended-day snacks	--	$5,000.00
4	6	2	Extended-day tutoring (teacher pay)	--	$14,946.00
				Sub-Total	$29,946.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$29,946.00
				+/- Difference	$0.00