Elgin Independent School District

Elgin Middle 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 13

Perceptions 15

Priority Problem Statements 18

Goals 22

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

Goal 2 : LEVER 2: ESSENTIAL ACTIONS AND KEY PRACTICES Each lever is defined... 32

Goal 3 : LEVER 3: INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORT SYSTEMS The campus establi... 38

Goal 4 : LEVER 4: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: HIGH QUALITY INSTRUCTIONAL MAT... 48

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

Goal 6 : LEVER 6: CAMPUS FINANCE and OPERATIONS The campus maintains stro... 66

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

Students: Enrollment and Demographics

Enrollment, Grade Level, Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Measure	2024-25	2025-26	Change
Total enrollment	**839**	**880**	**+41 (+4.9%)**
District enrollment	5,941	6,221	+4.7%
Grade 7	391	455	+64 (+16.4%)
Grade 8	448	425	−23 (−5.1%)
Hispanic	**654 (77.9%)**	**692 (78.6%)**	**+38**
African American	**77 (9.2%)**	**74 (8.4%)**	**−3**
White	**86 (10.3%)**	**86 (9.8%)**	**0**
Two or more races	18 (2.1%)	24 (2.7%)	+6
American Indian	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	+1
Pacific Islander	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	+1
Asian	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	−2
Female	**421 (50.2%)**	**451 (51.3%)**	**+30**
Male	**418 (49.8%)**	**429 (48.8%)**	**+11**

Students: Enrollment and Demographics

Elgin Middle School enrolled 880 students in grades 7-8 in 2025-26, up 41 students (4.9%) from 839 in 2024-25. That growth matches the district's, which rose 4.7% to 6,221 students. It was concentrated in 7th grade, which grew from 391 to 455 students (+16.4%), while 8th grade shrank from 448 to 425 (−5.1%). Because the incoming 7th-grade class is larger than the 8th-grade class it will replace, enrollment is likely to keep rising.

The racial and ethnic makeup of the campus is stable. Hispanic students are the large majority at 78.6% (692 students), up slightly from 77.9%, compared with 53.1% statewide. African American students make up 8.4% (74), White students 9.8% (86), and students of two or more races 2.7% (24, up from 18). Asian, American Indian and Pacific Islander students together total four students. The campus is 51.3% female and 48.8% male, a slightly higher female share than last year.

Special Populations and Programs

Measure	2024-25	2025-26	Change
Economically disadvantaged	677 (80.7%)	458 (52.0%)	−219 (−28.7 pts)
At-risk	667 (79.5%)	708 (80.5%)	+41
Emergent bilingual / EL	407 (48.5%)	435 (49.4%)	+1
Bilingual/ESL program	402 (47.9%)	198 (22.5%)	−204
Special education	**108 (12.9%)**	**137 (15.6%)**	**+29 (+26.9%)**
Gifted and talented	89 (10.6%)	101 (11.5%)	+12

Measure	2024-25	2025-26	Change
Section 504	71 (8.5%)	57 (6.5%)	−14
Dyslexia	76 (9.1%)	79 (9.0%)	+3
Homeless	8 (1.0%)	13 (1.5%)	+5
Immigrant	29 (3.5%)	22 (2.5%)	−7
Migrant	5 (0.6%)	7 (0.8%)	+2
Foster care / Military connected	0 / 0	0 / 0	No change
Career and Technical Education	57 (6.8%)	Not reported	n/a

Special Populations

The campus serves a high-need population. About 80.5% of students (708) are identified as at-risk, up from 79.5%, against 54.6% statewide. Emergent bilingual and English learner students make up 49.4% (435), up from 48.5% and more than twice the state rate of 23.6%.

Economic disadvantage fell from 80.7% to 52.0%, even though the at-risk rate held steady, which points to a change in how the count is determined rather than a change in family income.

Special education is the fastest-growing group. The count rose from 108 students (12.9%) to 137 (15.6%), an increase of 26.9%, which brings the campus in line with the district (16.0%) and the state (16.5%). Nearly all of the growth is in intellectual disabilities, which rose from 72 to 105 students and now account for 76.6% of the special education population, against 50.9% statewide. Behavioral disabilities declined from 19 students to 15, and autism and physical disabilities held steady at 10 and 7.

Other program populations are mostly stable. Gifted and talented identification rose from 89 students (10.6%) to 101 (11.5%), above both the district (10.4%) and the state (9.0%). Dyslexia held at about 9.0% (79 students), well above the district (5.7%) and the state (7.1%). Section 504 fell from 71 students (8.5%) to 57 (6.5%). The number of students experiencing homelessness grew from 8 to 13 (1.5%), migrant students from 5 to 7, and immigrant students fell from 29 to 22. There are no foster care or military-connected students, and CTE enrollment (57 students in 2024-25) was not reported for 2025-26.

Strengths

Strengths

- Attendance and chronic absenteeism are better than the district's and improving.
- Mobility, attrition, and dropout rates are low.
- Algebra I results are strong and improving.
- Math growth is high (70%).
- The principal has a longer tenure than the district average.
- Class size in math is at the district level.

Needs

- Chronic absenteeism is still 7 points above the state, especially for special education students (38.6%).
- Discipline placements are 4.6%, more than double the state rate.
- Teachers are inexperienced (57% with five or fewer years), have short tenure, and are paid less.
- Teacher diversity does not match student diversity.
- Large share of students in special populations: 80.5% at-risk, 49.4% EB/EL, 9.0% with dyslexia, and 6.5% with Section 504.
- Social studies and science class sizes are over 24.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	The campus economically disadvantaged population dropped 28.7 percentage points from 24-25 to 25-26 while at-risk stayed near 80%.	Elgin ISD shifted to universal free lunch for all students, causing a change in how family income and therefore economically disadvantaged status is determined.
2 ★	EMS chronic absenteeism is 25.3%, which is 7.3 points above the state rate of 18.0%. It is highest for special education students (38.6%, with 89.9% attendance) and rose for White students from 22.3% to 29.3%.	1a: The campus lacks a tiered attendance system that targets groups with the highest rates, especially special education students. 1b: Economic, health, and transportation barriers affect families (80.5% at-risk), and the school does not systematically identify them. 1c: Family communication about attendance is inconsistent and is not always in the family's home language.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

EMS STAAR Student Performance 1. Results by tested grade and subject

Test	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
Gr 7 Reading	55 → 59 (+4)	25 → 30 (+5)	10 → 12 (+2)
Gr 7 Math	No Tests → 13	No Tests → 5	Masked → 0
Gr 8 Reading	76 → 71 (−5)	44 → 37 (−7)	16 → 12 (−4)
Gr 8 Math	49 → 72 (+23)	23 → 38 (+15)	6 → 7 (+1)
Gr 8 Science	57 → 43 (−14)	27 → 19 (−8)	7 → 6 (−1)
Gr 8 Social Studies	40 → 28 (−12)	17 → 9 (−8)	6 → 2 (−4)
Algebra I EOC	80 → 81 (+1)	40 → 41 (+1)	16 → 16 (0)

2. All grades combined

Subject	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
All subjects	60 → 54 (−6)	30 → 26 (−4)	10 → 8 (−2)
ELA/Reading	66 → 65 (−1)	35 → 34 (−1)	13 → 12 (−1)
Mathematics	65 → 61 (−4)	32 → 31 (−1)	11 → 9 (−2)
Science	57 → 43 (−14)	27 → 19 (−8)	7 → 6 (−1)
Social Studies	40 → 28 (−12)	17 → 9 (−8)	6 → 2 (−4)

2026 Meets+ compared with district and state

Subject	Campus	District	State
ELA/Reading	34%	33%	56%
Mathematics	31%	23%	47%
Science	19%	27%	54%
Social Studies	9%	30%	52%

3. Student groups (all subjects, 2025 → 2026)

Group	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
African American	60 → 55 (−5)	27 → 23 (−4)	10 → 7 (−3)
Hispanic	57 → 52 (−5)	26 → 25 (−1)	8 → 7 (−1)
White	81 → 73 (−8)	57 → 45 (−12)	29 → 19 (−10)

Group	Approaches+	Meets+	Masters
Two or more races	53 → 57 (+4)	27 → 28 (+1)	4 → 4 (0)
Economically disadvantaged	56 → 50 (−6)	26 → 23 (−3)	8 → 7 (−1)
Emergent bilingual (current & monitored)	51 → 49 (−2)	21 → 23 (+2)	6 → 7 (+1)
Special ed (current)	43 → 35 (−8)	25 → 15 (−10)	8 → 4 (−4)
Continuously enrolled	64 → 55 (−9)	31 → 27 (−4)	11 → 9 (−2)
Non-continuously enrolled	52 → 52 (0)	27 → 25 (−2)	9 → 8 (−1)

EMS STAAR Cohort Comparison (6th to 7th grade; 7th to 8th grade, year to year)

Following cohorts gives a fairer picture of growth than comparing one year's 7th graders to the next year's. Both cohorts improved on most measures. The 7th to 8th grade cohort grew strongly and faster than the state. The 6th to 7th grade cohort grew in math but not in reading.

The two cohorts studied:

- **Cohort A:** 6th graders at Elgin Intermediate in 2024-25 → 7th graders at Elgin Middle in 2025-26.
- **Cohort B:** 7th graders at Elgin Middle in 2024-25 → 8th graders at Elgin Middle in 2025-26.

1. Cohort A: 6th (Intermediate) → 7th (Middle)

Measure	Campus (2024-25 → 2025-26)	State, same grades
Reading Approaches+	59 → 59 (0)	77 → 78 (+1)
Reading Meets+	33 → 30 (−3)	56 → 56 (0)
Reading Masters	9 → 12 (+3)	29 → 32 (+3)
Math Meets+ (incl. EOC)	10 → 22 (+12)	41 → 44 (+3)
Reading AND Math Meets+	9 → 17 (+8)	37 → 39 (+2)

2. Cohort B: 7th → 8th (both at Middle)

Measure	Campus (2024-25 → 2025-26)	State, same grades
Reading Approaches+	55 → 71 (+16)	76 → 84 (+8)
Reading Meets+	25 → 37 (+12)	54 → 61 (+7)
Reading Masters	10 → 12 (+2)	27 → 33 (+6)
Math Meets+ (incl. EOC)	20 → 42 (+22)	43 → 54 (+11)
Reading AND Math Meets+ (incl. EOC)	14 → 28 (+14)	38 → 47 (+9)

3. Student groups: Cohort A (6th → 7th)

Group	Reading Approaches+	Reading Meets+	Math Meets+ (incl. EOC)	Reading and Math Meets+
All students	59 → 59 (0)	33 → 30 (−3)	10 → 22 (+12)	9 → 17 (+8)
African American	55 → 60 (+5)	39 → 23 (−16)	6 → 15 (+9)	6 → 12 (+6)
Hispanic	57 → 55 (−2)	29 → 28 (−1)	10 → 20 (+10)	9 → 16 (+7)
White	77 → 83 (+6)	55 → 48 (−7)	13 → 35 (+22)	13 → 33 (+20)
Two or more races*	50 → 69 (+19)	33 → 23 (−10)	0 → 23 (+23)	0 → 8 (+8)
Economically disadvantaged	54 → 55 (+1)	28 → 26 (−2)	8 → 18 (+10)	7 → 13 (+6)
Emergent bilingual	52 → 50 (−2)	25 → 24 (−1)	10 → 21 (+11)	9 → 15 (+6)
Special ed (current)*	32 → 37 (+5)	12 → 14 (+2)	7 → 15 (+8)	6 → 11 (+5)

4. Student groups: Cohort B (7th → 8th)

Group	Reading Approaches+	Reading Meets+	Math Meets+ (incl. EOC)	Reading and Math Meets+
All students	55 → 71 (+16)	25 → 37 (+12)	20 → 42 (+22)	14 → 28 (+14)
African American	48 → 64 (+16)	24 → 39 (+15)	9 → 41 (+32)	6 → 31 (+25)
Hispanic	54 → 70 (+16)	22 → 35 (+13)	20 → 39 (+19)	13 → 25 (+12)
White	74 → 81 (+7)	53 → 57 (+4)	29 → 62 (+33)	29 → 51 (+22)
Two or more races*	55 → 92 (+37)	18 → 42 (+24)	27 → 58 (+31)	18 → 33 (+15)
Economically disadvantaged	51 → 65 (+14)	23 → 33 (+10)	19 → 37 (+18)	13 → 23 (+10)
Emergent bilingual	46 → 68 (+22)	17 → 32 (+15)	14 → 36 (+22)	9 → 23 (+14)
Special ed (current)*	17 → 35 (+18)	11 → 19 (+8)	9 → 21 (+12)	4 → 15 (+11)

Student performance on the 2025-26 STAAR was mixed. Across all subjects and grades, 54% of tests reached Approaches Grade Level or above (down from 60%), 26% reached Meets or above (down from 30%), and 8% reached Masters (down from 10%). Students performed above the district in ELA (34% Meets vs. 33%) and math (31% vs. 23%), but below the state in every subject (ELA 56%, math 47%).

The strongest results came in math. Grade 8 math Meets rose from 23% to 38%, with large gains for emergent bilingual students (15% to 42%) and economically disadvantaged students (21% to 32%). Algebra I performance held steady at 81% Approaches, near the state rate of 83%. Following cohorts, last year's 7th graders grew faster than the state in both reading (Meets 25% to 37%) and math (20% to 42%).

Areas of greatest concern are science and social studies, where Meets fell to 19% and 9% and Approaches fell 14 and 12 points. Grade 7 math was also low, with 13% reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets. Last year's 6th graders grew in math but slipped in reading (Meets 33% to 30%) as they entered 7th grade. Special education students declined the most (Meets 25% to 15%), followed by White students (57% to 45%) and economically disadvantaged students (26% to 23%). Emergent bilingual students were the only major group to improve at Meets (21% to 23%).

Overall, students are growing in math and in reading by the time they reach 8th grade, but too few are reaching Meets in 7th grade math, science, and social studies. The campus needs stronger Tier 1 instruction in those areas and targeted support for students with disabilities.

Strengths

Strengths - Overall Student Performance

1. Grade 8 math is the strongest result on the campus.

- Approaches+ rose from 49% to 72%, and Meets+ from 23% to 38%.
- Emergent bilingual students went from 15% to 42% at Meets+, and from 43% to 72% at Approaches+.
- Economically disadvantaged students rose from 21% to 32% at Meets+, and special ed students from 46% to 67% at Approaches+.

2. The 7th to 8th grade cohort outgrew the state.

- Following those students, Reading Meets+ rose 12 points (state +7), and math Meets+ rose 22 points (state +11).
- The share meeting standard in both subjects doubled, from 14% to 28%.
- Every student group improved. African American students rose from 9% to 41% in math Meets+, and emergent bilingual students from 14% to 36%.

3. Algebra I is close to the state.

- Approaches+ is 81% against 83% statewide. It was 80% last year, so it held steady.
- Masters held at 16%.
- Meets+ is 41% against 51% statewide, so there is still room to grow at the higher levels.

4. The campus beats the district in ELA and math.

- Meets+ is 34% in ELA (district 33%) and 31% in math (district 23%).
- The 8-point math edge over the district is meaningful.

5. Seventh grade reading improved.

- Approaches+ rose from 55% to 59%, Meets+ from 25% to 30%, and Masters from 10% to 12%.
- Students meeting standard in both reading and math rose from 14% to 17%.
- Last year's 6th graders (Elgin Intermediate) also grew in math (10% to 22% at Meets+, state +3) as they moved into 7th grade.

6. Emergent bilingual students are a bright spot.

- They were the only major group to improve at Meets+ in all subjects combined (21% to 23%).
- Their results in grade 8 math and in the 7th to 8th grade cohort were among the campus's largest gains.

7. Reading gaps narrowed in the cohort data.

- The African American to White gap in reading Meets+ narrowed from 29 to 18 points because African American students rose while White students held steady (53% to 57%).
- This is a better kind of gap closing than the one in the year-over-year 8th grade reading comparison, where the gap narrowed only because White students dropped.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).
2 ★	Special education students declined the most of any group. Meets fell from 25% to 15% and Approaches from 43% to 35%. Only 14% of 7th graders and 19% of 8th graders in special education reached Meets in reading.	Specially designed instruction and accommodations are not consistently aligned to Tier 1 grade-level content. Co-planning between special education and content teachers is limited, and progress monitoring is not yet used routinely to adjust instruction when students stall or regress.
3 ★	Eighth grade social studies performance dropped year to year, with Approaches dropping from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9% with only 2% Masters.	Social Studies has not had curriculum resources of any kind to use for planning and internalization.
4 ★	Eighth grade science and social studies performance dropped sharply. Science Approaches fell from 57% to 43% and Meets from 27% to 19%. Social studies Approaches fell from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9%, with only 2% reaching Masters.	Planning and monitoring structures such as PLCs, common assessments, and intervention data have focused mainly on reading and math. Content-area teams have less support for standards-based planning, anticipating misconceptions, and building the vocabulary and reading skills students need to access science and social studies content.
5 ★	Reading Meets is below where it needs to be and is inconsistent across grades. Meets for students moving from 6th to 7th grade slipped from 33% to 30%, falling from 39% to 23% for African American students. Eighth grade reading Meets dropped from 44% to 37% year over year, and campus ELA Meets (34%) is well below the state (56%).	Tier 1 reading instruction does not consistently push students from Approaches to Meets. There is a 31-point gap between the two levels. Short-cycle data is not used systematically to respond when students begin to regress, and the practices that helped last year's 7th graders grow in 8th grade have not been studied and replicated at other grade levels.

6 ★

Continuously enrolled students, one of the campus's two TSI groups, declined in 2026. Across all subjects, Approaches fell from 64% to 55%, Meets from 31% to 27%, and Masters from 11% to 9%. Only 36% reached Meets in reading and 32% in math.

Students who have been at Elgin Middle all year are not tracked as a group in PLCs and intervention rosters, so their declines are not caught and addressed during the year.

7 ★

African American students are not reaching Meets and Masters in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, ELA Meets fell from 38% to 31% (state 56%) and math Masters fell from 10% to 4%. Only 12% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects, and the 6th-to-7th grade cohort's reading Meets fell from 39% to 23%. African American students trail White students by 21 points at Meets in both ELA and math.

Student group results are not routinely disaggregated in PLCs and common formative assessments, so declines such as the drop in reading Meets and math Masters are not identified and addressed during the school year.

8 ★

Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.

There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Elgin Middle School runs a seven-period day with 57-minute class periods and a 35-minute advisory period at the start of the day for tutoring and targeted support. Core content departments share a common conference period for PLCs. Programs include special education services (Functional Academics and Functional Communications life skills classes, inclusion in all four core subjects, math and reading resource, and the Solid Roots behavior support class), Emergent Bilingual ELDA and ELLA classes, and 7th and 8th grade math and reading intervention classes. Students can earn high school credit in Algebra I, Principles of Agriculture, Professional Communications, Art I, PE, Dance, and Spanish. Extracurriculars include athletics, band, mariachi, theater, dance, art, UIL Academics, cheer, National Junior Honor Society, and folklórico, plus the ACE after-school program. Support staff include an instructional coach, two counselors, a student support specialist, assistant principals, mentor teachers, and department chairs.

Strengths

- Grade 8 math, Algebra I, and the 7th to 8th grade cohort show that instruction can drive growth. The Root Cause Analysis names 8th grade RLA and Algebra as internal models to study and replicate.
- Vertically aligned PLCs with weekly content planning and weekly common formative assessments (CFAs) are planned for 2026-27 in all core content areas, beginning August 31, 2026.
- The campus has an instructional coach and PLC structure with defined responsible parties
- Approximately 80% of 8th Graders have received HS Credit for Algebra I
- Students at EMS have a number of opportunities to receive HS Credit, including in 7th Grade

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Advisory period is misused time. The intention is for targeted students support and tutoring.	Students are late arriving due, in large part, to bus transportation, with some buses arriving into 1st period.
2 ★	55% of EMS core content teachers are uncertified and currently working through an alternative certification program.	EISD has faced a staffing and teacher shortage for a number of years and have relied on the previous District of Innovation Plan to hire uncertified teachers.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Staff perceptions. The Spring 2026 staff survey shows a staff that finds its work meaningful (92% to 100% favorable) and has a generally positive relationship with campus leaders (73% favorable, around the 60th percentile nationally). Staff-leadership relationships have declined since Spring 2025 (84% to 73%), however. The largest drops since Fall 2025 were in how fairly leadership treats staff (65%, down 16 points) and how motivating staff find the leadership team (62%, down 11). Well-being held steady at 68% (around the 40th percentile), but only 27% of staff reported not feeling overwhelmed and 15% reported not feeling exhausted. Feedback and Coaching is the lowest-rated area at 48% (down 4 points), with only 38% favorable on how often staff receive feedback and 42% on how thorough it is. Professional Learning held at 55%. Staff rated PD as more relevant (58%, up 14 points) and say they learn from leaders (69%, up 9), but only 35% feel they have input into their own professional development and 42% say PD helps them explore new ideas.

Family perceptions. Families rated the school lowest in areas tied to involvement and belonging. Family Engagement scored 7% (below the 10th percentile nationally), with 58% of families almost never meeting with teachers in person and 65% almost never helping at the school. Barriers to engagement scored 74%, and the most common barriers were limited information about involvement opportunities (60% favorable), uncertainty about how to communicate with the school (64%), and busy schedules (63%). Strengths include communication with families from their culture (86% favorable), transportation (86%), and students' ability to get help with bullying (70%, up 13 points). School Safety (58%) shows concern, with 28% of families almost always worrying about violence. School Fit (49%) fell, particularly for sense of belonging (49%, down 22 points) and cultural fit (47%). School Climate (46%) shows low ratings for motivating lessons (35%) and the school's valuing of diversity (44%, down 13 points). Family Support also dropped to 53%, including how often families help their child with content (30%) and educational activities outside the home (28%).

Strengths

Staff survey (Spring 2026)

1. Staff find their work meaningful. 100% say their work matters to them and 92% find it meaningful (up 4 points each). Job satisfaction rose 8 points to 73%, and 72% feel effective at their jobs (up 4).

2. Staff have positive personal relationships with campus leaders.

- Staff-Leadership Relationships scored 73%, around the 60th percentile nationally.
- 85% say leaders are understanding when personal challenges arise, and 77% say leaders are friendly, respectful, and care about them as individuals.
- Confidence that leaders have the school's best interests in mind and perception that leaders are supportive both rose 4 points (73% each).

3. Staff are learning from leaders and PD is becoming more relevant.

- Professional Learning is around the 60th percentile nationally.
- 69% say they learn from school leaders (up 9 points), and 62% have learned new strategies (up 6).
- Relevance of PD to their work rose 14 points to 58%.

4. Staff report engagement and fewer feelings of frustration.

- 85% were favorable on feeling excited and 81% on feeling engaged at work.
- The share not feeling frustrated rose 9 points to 85%.
- Feeling safe at work rose 6 points to 58%, with 58% saying they almost always feel safe.

5. Staff value the feedback they get when they receive it.

- 60% find feedback useful, and 60% say they learn from evaluation processes.
- The amount of feedback staff receive rose 10 points, though it is still low at 38%.

Family survey (Spring 2026)

1. Families face few practical barriers.

- Communication with families from their culture (86% favorable), transportation (86%), safe travel to school (84%), and childcare (83%) are all low barriers.
- Feeling a sense of belonging in the school community as a barrier improved 5 points (71%), and worry about retaliation for raising concerns improved 4 points (70%).
- Scheduling as a barrier improved 14 points to 63%.

2. Perceptions of school safety are improving.

- School Safety rose from 54% to 57% to 58% across three survey periods.
- 70% say students can get help from an adult if bullied (up 13 points), and perceptions of online bullying risk improved 6 points (65%).

3. Many families are involved in their child's learning at home.

- 79% talk with their child often about what the class is learning.
- 72% talk with their child when the child is having a problem with others.
- 67% put effort into helping their child become more independent.

4. Families see growing respect at the school.

- 58% say teachers show respect for students (up 9 points).
- 49% say students show respect for staff (up 12 points).
- Satisfaction with the school's approach to discipline rose 5 points to 51%.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Staff report receiving too little feedback and having too little say in their professional learning.	Observation and feedback cycles are not yet scheduled and calibrated consistently across all teachers, so the amount and quality of feedback vary. Professional development is planned mostly at the campus level with limited teacher input, and it is not consistently differentiated by teacher need or tied to coaching follow-up.
2	Staff trust and fairness ratings for campus leadership declined, and staff report high workload strain. Fairness of leadership treatment fell 16 points to 65% and how motivating the leadership team is fell 11 points to 62%. Only 27% did not feel overwhelmed and 15% did not feel exhausted at work in the past week.	Expectations, decisions, and priorities are not always communicated transparently or consistently, so staff may not see how decisions are made. Several initiatives are starting at once (weekly PLCs, weekly CFAs, intervention platforms), and without clear prioritization and protected time, workload rises.
3 ★	Few families are involved in the school. Family Engagement scored 7% (below the 10th percentile nationally), and 58% of families almost never meet in person with teachers. About 40% say limited information about involvement opportunities is a problem, and 36% feel unsure how to communicate with the school.	Information about involvement opportunities is not shared consistently through channels families use, and there are few structured, low-barrier ways to take part.
4	Families report a weaker sense of belonging and less support for learning at home. Families rated their child's sense of belonging at 49% favorable (down 22 points), and the school's valuing of diversity at 44% (down 13). Family Support fell 20 points to 53%, with only 28% favorable on educational activities at home (down 41 points).	The campus does not yet have a consistent system for building belonging and culturally responsive practices, such as advisory, student voice, and family input. Families also receive limited guidance on how to support reading and math at home, which connects to the campus's reading and math results for African American and Hispanic students.

★ = Priority

Priority Problem Statements

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).
2 ★	Eighth grade social studies performance dropped year to year, with Approaches dropping from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9% with only 2% Masters.	Social Studies has not had curriculum resources of any kind to use for planning and internalization.
3 ★	Special education students declined the most of any group. Meets fell from 25% to 15% and Approaches from 43% to 35%. Only 14% of 7th graders and 19% of 8th graders in special education reached Meets in reading.	Specially designed instruction and accommodations are not consistently aligned to Tier 1 grade-level content. Co-planning between special education and content teachers is limited, and progress monitoring is not yet used routinely to adjust instruction when students stall or regress.
4 ★	African American students are not reaching Meets and Masters in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, ELA Meets fell from 38% to 31% (state 56%) and math Masters fell from 10% to 4%. Only 12% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects, and the 6th-to-7th grade cohort's reading Meets fell from 39% to 23%. African American students trail White students by 21 points at Meets in both ELA and math.	Student group results are not routinely disaggregated in PLCs and common formative assessments, so declines such as the drop in reading Meets and math Masters are not identified and addressed during the school year.
5 ★	Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.	There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

6

EMS chronic absenteeism is 25.3%, which is 7.3 points above the state rate of 18.0%. It is highest for special education students (38.6%, with 89.9% attendance) and rose for White students from 22.3% to 29.3%.

1a: The campus lacks a tiered attendance system that targets groups with the highest rates, especially special education students. 1b: Economic, health, and transportation barriers affect families (80.5% at-risk), and the school does not systematically identify them. 1c: Family communication about attendance is inconsistent and is not always in the family's home language.

7

Eighth grade science and social studies performance dropped sharply. Science Approaches fell from 57% to 43% and Meets from 27% to 19%. Social studies Approaches fell from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9%, with only 2% reaching Masters.

Planning and monitoring structures such as PLCs, common assessments, and intervention data have focused mainly on reading and math. Content-area teams have less support for standards-based planning, anticipating misconceptions, and building the vocabulary and reading skills students need to access science and social studies content.

8

Reading Meets is below where it needs to be and is inconsistent across grades. Meets for students moving from 6th to 7th grade slipped from 33% to 30%, falling from 39% to 23% for African American students. Eighth grade reading Meets dropped from 44% to 37% year over year, and campus ELA Meets (34%) is well below the state (56%).

Tier 1 reading instruction does not consistently push students from Approaches to Meets. There is a 31-point gap between the two levels. Short-cycle data is not used systematically to respond when students begin to regress, and the practices that helped last year's 7th graders grow in 8th grade have not been studied and replicated at other grade levels.

9

Continuously enrolled students, one of the campus's two TSI groups, declined in 2026. Across all subjects, Approaches fell from 64% to 55%, Meets from 31% to 27%, and Masters from 11% to 9%. Only 36% reached Meets in reading and 32% in math.

Students who have been at Elgin Middle all year are not tracked as a group in PLCs and intervention rosters, so their declines are not caught and addressed during the year.

10

Advisory period is misused time. The intention is for targeted students support and tutoring.

Students are late arriving due, in large part, to bus transportation, with some buses arriving into 1st period.

11 ★

55% of EMS core content teachers are uncertified and currently working through an alternative certification program.

EISD has faced a staffing and teacher shortage for a number of years and have relied on the previous District of Innovation Plan to hire uncertified teachers.

12 ★

Staff report receiving too little feedback and having too little say in their professional learning.

Observation and feedback cycles are not yet scheduled and calibrated consistently across all teachers, so the amount and quality of feedback vary. Professional development is planned mostly at the campus level with limited teacher input, and it is not consistently differentiated by teacher need or tied to coaching follow-up.

13 ★

Few families are involved in the school. Family Engagement scored 7% (below the 10th percentile nationally), and 58% of families almost never meet in person with teachers. About 40% say limited information about involvement opportunities is a problem, and 36% feel unsure how to communicate with the school.

Information about involvement opportunities is not shared consistently through channels families use, and there are few structured, low-barrier ways to take part.

★ = 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 1:1 : VISION AND MISSION
Understand the district's vision for student success.
Target: By May 2027, Elgin Middle will share its LIP goals (STAAR Meets in reading from 35% to 40% and in math from 32% to 37%) with staff and families at the BOY, MOY, and EOY Campus Advisory meetings.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Staff report receiving too little feedback and having too little say in their professional learning.	Observation and feedback cycles are not yet scheduled and calibrated consistently across all teachers, so the amount and quality of feedback vary. Professional development is planned mostly at the campus level with limited teacher input, and it is not consistently differentiated by teacher need or tied to coaching follow-up.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

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

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

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

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

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 8

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 1.2.2: Goals
Campus goals are specific to the campus, focused on improving student outcomes, and directly aligned to the district's multi-year student outcomes.

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 8

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 8

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).

8	Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.	There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 1.4: Performance Management of Campus Improvement Plan and Goals(LEVERS) Establish clear expectations for evaluating the effectiveness of district programs and initiatives to drive continuous improvement
Target: By May 2027, campus leaders will review data for the two TSI groups (Hispanic and continuously enrolled students) after each BOY, MOY, and EOY MAP window and record changes for any group below target.

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy ☑ Results Driven Accountability

The principal and instructional coach will review implementation and student progress for the two TSI groups (Hispanic and Continuously Enrolled) weekly. Reviews will include strategy delivery, reassessment results, and progress toward RLA, math, and growth targets

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student groups (Hispanic and Continuously Enrolled) will increase performance and achievement on 2027 STAAR Reading and Math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Instructional Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 6, 8

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7, 8

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7, 8

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7, 8

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
6	Continuously enrolled students, one of the campus's two TSI groups, declined in 2026. Across all subjects, Approaches fell from 64% to 55%, Meets from 31% to 27%, and Masters from 11% to 9%. Only 36% reached Meets in reading and 32% in math.	Students who have been at Elgin Middle all year are not tracked as a group in PLCs and intervention rosters, so their declines are not caught and addressed during the year.
7	African American students are not reaching Meets and Masters in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, ELA Meets fell from 38% to 31% (state 56%) and math Masters fell from 10% to 4%. Only 12% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects, and the 6th-to-7th grade cohort's reading Meets fell from 39% to 23%. African American students trail White students by 21 points at Meets in both ELA and math.	Student group results are not routinely disaggregated in PLCs and common formative assessments, so declines such as the drop in reading Meets and math Masters are not identified and addressed during the school year.

8	Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.	There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

Goal 2

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.1: Intentional Roles and Staffing
Staff are strategically hired and placed to deliver on the envisioned student experience.
Target: By August 2027, Elgin Middle will place teachers so that its strongest teachers serve the grades and subjects with the greatest need, starting with 7th grade RLA and math.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

KEY PRACTICE: 2.1.2 Hiring and Evaluation
Campus leadership follows district defined selection criteria and evaluation processes to identify and hire candidates best suited for specific roles

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

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
2	55% of EMS core content teachers are uncertified and currently working through an alternative certification program.	EISD has faced a staffing and teacher shortage for a number of years and have relied on the previous District of Innovation Plan to hire uncertified teachers.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.2: Staff Selection
Intentionally selects educators well-prepared to provide high-quality instruction and services to each student.
Target: By August 2027, Elgin Middle will fill every open teaching position using the district's screening process and selection criteria.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

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

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

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
2	55% of EMS core content teachers are uncertified and currently working through an alternative certification program.	EISD has faced a staffing and teacher shortage for a number of years and have relied on the previous District of Innovation Plan to hire uncertified teachers.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 2.3: Growth and Retention Strategies
Systems in place to support teacher professional growth, advancement opportunities, and retention.
Target: By May 2027, every teacher will receive walkthrough feedback in Eduphoria at least once a month, and teachers new to the profession will meet regularly with a mentor teacher.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2 - Perceptions 1

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

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

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

ESF Levers: Lever 2: Talent Retention and Strategic Staffing

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	55% of EMS core content teachers are uncertified and currently working through an alternative certification program.	EISD has faced a staffing and teacher shortage for a number of years and have relied on the previous District of Innovation Plan to hire uncertified teachers.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Staff report receiving too little feedback and having too little say in their professional learning.	Observation and feedback cycles are not yet scheduled and calibrated consistently across all teachers, so the amount and quality of feedback vary. Professional development is planned mostly at the campus level with limited teacher input, and it is not consistently differentiated by teacher need or tied to coaching follow-up.

Goal 3

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 2

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

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.2: Professional Learning Supports
ELGIN ISD provides resources and training to enable staff to implement the comprehensive MTSS framework to address academic support, behavioral health and mental health services and

support.

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

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

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ✅ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

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

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4 ✅ Results Driven Accountability

KEY PRACTICE: 3.1.4: Family Engagement
ELGIN ISD sets expectations and provides staff training and time to meaningfully engage parents/caregivers, promote parent/caregiver understanding of student progress and campus expectations, and facilitate a parent/caregiver partnership to support overall student development and success.

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	EMS chronic absenteeism is 25.3%, which is 7.3 points above the state rate of 18.0%. It is highest for special education students (38.6%, with 89.9% attendance) and rose for White students from 22.3% to 29.3%.	1a: The campus lacks a tiered attendance system that targets groups with the highest rates, especially special education students. 1b: Economic, health, and transportation barriers affect families (80.5% at-risk), and the school does not systematically identify them. 1c: Family communication about attendance is inconsistent and is not always in the family's home language.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).

2	Special education students declined the most of any group. Meets fell from 25% to 15% and Approaches from 43% to 35%. Only 14% of 7th graders and 19% of 8th graders in special education reached Meets in reading.	Specially designed instruction and accommodations are not consistently aligned to Tier 1 grade-level content. Co-planning between special education and content teachers is limited, and progress monitoring is not yet used routinely to adjust instruction when students stall or regress.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Few families are involved in the school. Family Engagement scored 7% (below the 10th percentile nationally), and 58% of families almost never meet in person with teachers. About 40% say limited information about involvement opportunities is a problem, and 36% feel unsure how to communicate with the school.	Information about involvement opportunities is not shared consistently through channels families use, and there are few structured, low-barrier ways to take part.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principals, Assistant Principals

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	EMS chronic absenteeism is 25.3%, which is 7.3 points above the state rate of 18.0%. It is highest for special education students (38.6%, with 89.9% attendance) and rose for White students from 22.3% to 29.3%.	1a: The campus lacks a tiered attendance system that targets groups with the highest rates, especially special education students. 1b: Economic, health, and transportation barriers affect families (80.5% at-risk), and the school does not systematically identify them. 1c: Family communication about attendance is inconsistent and is not always in the family's home language.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal and Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 2

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

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	EMS chronic absenteeism is 25.3%, which is 7.3 points above the state rate of 18.0%. It is highest for special education students (38.6%, with 89.9% attendance) and rose for White students from 22.3% to 29.3%.	1a: The campus lacks a tiered attendance system that targets groups with the highest rates, especially special education students. 1b: Economic, health, and transportation barriers affect families (80.5% at-risk), and the school does not systematically identify them. 1c: Family communication about attendance is inconsistent and is not always in the family's home language.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Special education students declined the most of any group. Meets fell from 25% to 15% and Approaches from 43% to 35%. Only 14% of 7th graders and 19% of 8th graders in special education reached Meets in reading.	Specially designed instruction and accommodations are not consistently aligned to Tier 1 grade-level content. Co-planning between special education and content teachers is limited, and progress monitoring is not yet used routinely to adjust instruction when students stall or regress.

Performance Objective 4 ☑ High Priority

By May 2027, 100% of Elgin Middle School students will be scheduled for the physical activity required by TEC 28.002(l-1) (30 minutes daily or 225 minutes every two weeks, for at least four semesters in grades 6-8). Average daily attendance will rise from 93.87% (first 53 days of 2026-27) to at least 95%, and chronic absenteeism will fall from 20.9% (through October 26, 2026) to at most 18%.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

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 by student group every two weeks, starting with special education students. Staff will 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%, and connect families with the counselor, nurse, or Communities In Schools to remove health and transportation barriers.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Attendance logs show a family contact within one week for every student who reaches 5% absences. Chronic absenteeism falls each six weeks toward the 18% target, including for special education students (38.6% in 2025-26), and average daily attendance reaches the campus goal of 95%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Counselors, and Attendance Clerk

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 3: Integrated Student Support Systems

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	EMS chronic absenteeism is 25.3%, which is 7.3 points above the state rate of 18.0%. It is highest for special education students (38.6%, with 89.9% attendance) and rose for White students from 22.3% to 29.3%.	1a: The campus lacks a tiered attendance system that targets groups with the highest rates, especially special education students. 1b: Economic, health, and transportation barriers affect families (80.5% at-risk), and the school does not systematically identify them. 1c: Family communication about attendance is inconsistent and is not always in the family's home language.

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

By May 2027, the percentage of students taking the seventh-grade Math STAAR who achieve Approaches or above will increase from 13% to 30% and who achieve Meets or above will increase from 5% to 15%.

Evaluation Data Source: Common Formative Assessments, Cumulative Unit Assessments, NWEA Map Data, 2027 STAAR

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Offer a math camp during July 2026 to all incoming 7th grade on-level math students to EMS with a focus on operational math and math fluency.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Achievement on 7th Math Approaches Grade Level at 30% or higher; weekly progress checks through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); review of data and progress using Unit Assessments (UAs), Cumulative Unit Assessments (CUAs)

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Implementation of HQIM for Tier I instruction (STEMscopes) and warm-ups (Lowman Education).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Achievement on 7th Math Approaches Grade Level at 30% or higher; weekly progress checks through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); review of data and progress using Unit Assessments (UAs), Cumulative Unit Assessments (CUAs)

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Weekly Professional Learning Communities to discuss data, target student learning, and respond to student needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Achievement on 7th Math Approaches Grade Level at 30% or higher; weekly progress checks through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); review of data and progress using Unit Assessments (UAs), Cumulative Unit Assessments (CUAs). Teams will review CFA data during and after each period - independently by teacher. Collective data will be reviewed weekly on Mondays to determine if reteach is required. UA, CUA, NWEA Map data will be reviewed in the subsequent PLC after the assessment has been administered. Teams will participate in a data dig to determine patterns, next steps, and how to address misconceptions and skills still needed through targeted support and/or reteach.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Instructional Coach, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

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 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Weekly after school tutoring sessions offered to all 7th grade on-level math students.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Achievement on 7th Math Approaches Grade Level at 30% or higher; weekly progress checks through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs); review of data and progress using Unit Assessments (UAs), Cumulative Unit Assessments (CUAs). Teachers will measure learning and understanding through exits used in at the end of the tutorial session that are independent from the exits in class.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).

Performance Objective 2

By May 2027, the percentage of Hispanic students achieving Meets on the 2027 Reading STAAR will increase from 32% to 40%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Reading/ELA

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

During weekly RLA PLCs, teachers will review student work and assessment results separately for Hispanic students, identify priority misconceptions, plan targeted instructional responses, and review reassessment results at the next scheduled data meeting. Team/campus leaders will monitor follow-through

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 STAAR Reading.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 8

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Weekly Professional Learning Communities to discuss data, target student learning, and respond to student needs, with a specific focus on subgroup data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 Reading STAAR.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 8

TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Students will receive Read 180 based on 2026 STAAR Reading data, for at least 15 minutes/day. Teachers will monitor student usage and progress every week and adjust support after each CFA and/or UA. Intervention will support access to grade-level skills.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 Reading STAAR.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team, RLA Teachers

Problem Statements: Student Learning 8

TEA Priorities: 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
8	Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.	There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

Performance Objective 3

By May 2027, the percentage of African American students achieving Meets on the 2027 Reading STAAR will increase from 31% (2026 STAAR) to 40%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Reading results for African American students, NWEA MAP Growth reading reports, and PLC common assessment data.

Strategy 1

During weekly RLA and Math PLCs, teachers will review student work and assessment results separately for African American students, identify priority misconceptions, plan targeted instructional responses, and review reassessment results at the next scheduled data meeting. Team/campus leaders will monitor follow-through

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 Reading STAAR.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7

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

Weekly Professional Learning Communities to discuss data, target student learning, and respond to student needs, with a specific focus on subgroup data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 Reading STAAR. Progress monitoring of the strategy conducted through weekly CFA data, CUAs, NWEA Map, exit tickets, and teacher common assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7

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
7	African American students are not reaching Meets and Masters in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, ELA Meets fell from 38% to 31% (state 56%) and math Masters fell from 10% to 4%. Only 12% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects, and the 6th-to-7th grade cohort's reading Meets fell from 39% to 23%. African American students trail White students by 21 points at Meets in both ELA and math.	Student group results are not routinely disaggregated in PLCs and common formative assessments, so declines such as the drop in reading Meets and math Masters are not identified and addressed during the school year.

Performance Objective 4

By May 2027, the percentage of Hispanic students achieving Meets on the 2027 Math STAAR will increase from 30% (2026 STAAR) to 40%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Math & Algebra I EOC

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

During weekly Math PLCs, teachers will review student work and assessment results separately for Hispanic students, identify priority misconceptions, plan targeted instructional responses, and review reassessment results at the next scheduled data meeting. Team/campus leaders will monitor follow-through

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 STAAR Math & Algebra I EOC. Progress monitoring of the strategy conducted through weekly CFA data, CUAs, NWEA Map, exit tickets, and teacher common assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Instructional Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 8

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
8	Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.	There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

Performance Objective 5

By May 2027, the percentage of African American students achieving Meets on the 2027 Math STAAR will increase from 26% (2026 STAAR) to 36%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Math & Algebra I EOC

Strategy 1

During weekly RLA and Math PLCs, teachers will review student work and assessment results separately for African American students, identify priority misconceptions, plan targeted instructional responses, and review reassessment results at the next scheduled data meeting. Team/campus leaders will monitor follow-through

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student achievement on the May 2027 STAAR Math. Progress monitoring of the strategy conducted through weekly CFA data, CUAs, NWEA Map, exit tickets, and teacher common assessments.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Instructional Leadership Team

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

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 6

By May 2027, students enrolled in 8th Grade Social Studies will increase their Approaches and above on the Social Studies STAAR from 28% to 40% and Meets and above from 9% to 25%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Social Studies results, district benchmark data, and bi-weekly collaborative planning records.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Eighth-grade social studies teachers will use bi-weekly collaborative planning to internalize Savvas lessons, anticipate misconceptions, plan grade-level tasks, and analyze student work. Teams will reteach essential standards and reassess within one week.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement on the 2027 SS STAAR. Hispanic students should increase Meets standard on 2027 STAAR from 8% to 20%; Continuously Enrolled students should increase Meets standard on 2027 STAAR from 8% to 20%.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, Campus Leadership Team

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 4

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

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

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Eighth grade social studies performance dropped year to year, with Approaches dropping from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9% with only 2% Masters.	Social Studies has not had curriculum resources of any kind to use for planning and internalization.

4	Eighth grade science and social studies performance dropped sharply. Science Approaches fell from 57% to 43% and Meets from 27% to 19%. Social studies Approaches fell from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9%, with only 2% reaching Masters.	Planning and monitoring structures such as PLCs, common assessments, and intervention data have focused mainly on reading and math. Content-area teams have less support for standards-based planning, anticipating misconceptions, and building the vocabulary and reading skills students need to access science and social studies content.

Performance Objective 7

By May 2027, students enrolled in 8th Grade Science will increase their Approaches and above on the Social Studies STAAR from 43% to 60% and Meets and above from 19% to 40%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Science results, district benchmark data, and bi-weekly collaborative planning records.

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

Eighth-grade Science teachers will use bi-weekly collaborative planning to internalize Savvas lessons, anticipate misconceptions, plan grade-level tasks, and analyze student work. Teams will reteach essential standards and reassess within one week.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student achievement on the 2027 Science STAAR. Hispanic students should increase Meets standard on 2027 STAAR from 17% to 35%; Continuously Enrolled students should increase Meets standard on 2027 STAAR from 19% to 40%.

Problem Statements: Student Learning 4

TEA Priorities: 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
4	Eighth grade science and social studies performance dropped sharply. Science Approaches fell from 57% to 43% and Meets from 27% to 19%. Social studies Approaches fell from 40% to 28% and Meets from 17% to 9%, with only 2% reaching Masters.	Planning and monitoring structures such as PLCs, common assessments, and intervention data have focused mainly on reading and math. Content-area teams have less support for standards-based planning, anticipating misconceptions, and building the vocabulary and reading skills students need to access science and social studies content.

Performance Objective 8

By May 2027, continuously enrolled students will increase RLA Meets-or-above performance from 36% to 45% and mathematics Meets-or-above from 32% to 45%.

Evaluation Data Source: 2027 STAAR Reading, STAAR Math, Algebra I EOC

Strategy 1 ☑ Targeted Support Strategy

During weekly RLA and Math PLCs, teachers will review student work and assessment results separately for Continuously Enrolled students, identify priority misconceptions, plan targeted instructional responses, and review reassessment results at the next scheduled data meeting. Team/campus leaders will monitor follow-through

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve Meets and above performance on 2027 STAAR in both Reading (36% to 45%) and Math (32% to 45%)

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2, 5, 6

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 8 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Special education students declined the most of any group. Meets fell from 25% to 15% and Approaches from 43% to 35%. Only 14% of 7th graders and 19% of 8th graders in special education reached Meets in reading.	Specially designed instruction and accommodations are not consistently aligned to Tier 1 grade-level content. Co-planning between special education and content teachers is limited, and progress monitoring is not yet used routinely to adjust instruction when students stall or regress.
5	Reading Meets is below where it needs to be and is inconsistent across grades. Meets for students moving from 6th to 7th grade slipped from 33% to 30%, falling from 39% to 23% for African American students. Eighth grade reading Meets dropped from 44% to 37% year over year, and campus ELA Meets (34%) is well below the state (56%).	Tier 1 reading instruction does not consistently push students from Approaches to Meets. There is a 31-point gap between the two levels. Short-cycle data is not used systematically to respond when students begin to regress, and the practices that helped last year's 7th graders grow in 8th grade have not been studied and replicated at other grade levels.
6	Continuously enrolled students, one of the campus's two TSI groups, declined in 2026. Across all subjects, Approaches fell from 64% to 55%, Meets from 31% to 27%, and Masters from 11% to 9%. Only 36% reached Meets in reading and 32% in math.	Students who have been at Elgin Middle all year are not tracked as a group in PLCs and intervention rosters, so their declines are not caught and addressed during the year.

Goal 5

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.1:Instructional Leadership
Establish expectations and campus systems for instructional leaders and teachers' coaching and development.
Target: By May 2027, the principal, assistant principals, and instructional coach will each keep a weekly coaching schedule, and walkthrough feedback will be logged in Eduphoria.

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Staff report receiving too little feedback and having too little say in their professional learning.	Observation and feedback cycles are not yet scheduled and calibrated consistently across all teachers, so the amount and quality of feedback vary. Professional development is planned mostly at the campus level with limited teacher input, and it is not consistently differentiated by teacher need or tied to coaching follow-up.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 3 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 4 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 5 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Staff report receiving too little feedback and having too little say in their professional learning.	Observation and feedback cycles are not yet scheduled and calibrated consistently across all teachers, so the amount and quality of feedback vary. Professional development is planned mostly at the campus level with limited teacher input, and it is not consistently differentiated by teacher need or tied to coaching follow-up.

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 5.3: Data-Driven Instruction, Assessment Reflection, and Targeted Supports
Campus utilizes data to support all learners.
Target: By May 2027, STAAR Meets will rise from 35% to 40% in reading and from 32% to 37% in math (the LIP goals), with PLC data reviews after each common assessment.

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

Campus instructional leaders implement systems for teachers to analyze exit ticket data, review student work, and use formative assessments to identify learning gaps, plan targeted supports, and adjust instruction in alignment with high-quality instructional materials.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus will administer weekly Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) to measure learning targets for the skills taught that specific week; reteach and targeted instruction will be determined based on the data from the CFAs; Daily implementation of HQIM exits from Lowman Education. This will also support targeted professional learning for classroom teachers.

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7, 8

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

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 7, 8

TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools

ESF Levers: Lever 5: Instructional Leadership and Capacity Building

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
7	African American students are not reaching Meets and Masters in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, ELA Meets fell from 38% to 31% (state 56%) and math Masters fell from 10% to 4%. Only 12% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects, and the 6th-to-7th grade cohort's reading Meets fell from 39% to 23%. African American students trail White students by 21 points at Meets in both ELA and math.	Student group results are not routinely disaggregated in PLCs and common formative assessments, so declines such as the drop in reading Meets and math Masters are not identified and addressed during the school year.
8	Hispanic students are not making progress in reading and math. From 2025 to 2026, Meets stayed flat at 32% in ELA and 30% in math (state 56% and 47%), while Approaches fell 2 to 3 points. Only 16% of 7th graders met standard in both subjects (state 38%), and Hispanic students trail White students by 20 points in ELA and 17 in math.	There is a 30-point gap between students reaching Approaches and Meets in both subjects (62% vs. 32% in ELA, 60% vs. 30% in math). Short-cycle data is not yet used systematically to move students past the Approaches level when growth plateaus.

Goal 6

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

Performance Objective 1 ☑ High Priority

ESSENTIAL ACTION 6.1: Teacher and Student Time
Campus ensures there is sufficient time in the school day for impactful student experiences, as well as staff preparation and development.
Target: By May 2027, the master schedule will keep the daily 35-minute advisory period for tutoring and a common conference period for every core content PLC.

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Advisory period is misused time. The intention is for targeted students support and tutoring.	Students are late arriving due, in large part, to bus transportation, with some buses arriving into 1st period.

Performance Objective 2 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Seventh grade math performance is low, with only 13% of students reaching Approaches and 5% reaching Meets on the Grade 7 test, and no students at Masters.	Tier 1 math instruction is not yet consistent in 7th grade, and students arrive with foundational gaps from earlier grades (only 10% of last year's 6th graders met standard in math).

Performance Objective 3 ☑ High Priority

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

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Strategy 2 ☑ Results Driven Accountability

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

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

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	Few families are involved in the school. Family Engagement scored 7% (below the 10th percentile nationally), and 58% of families almost never meet in person with teachers. About 40% say limited information about involvement opportunities is a problem, and 36% feel unsure how to communicate with the school.	Information about involvement opportunities is not shared consistently through channels families use, and there are few structured, low-barrier ways to take part.

Performance Objective 4

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

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

Strategy 1

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

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

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

ESF Levers: Lever 6: Campus Finance and Operations

Formative Reviews

December	February	April	June