

Coppell Independent School District



Austin Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

Working together, we are committed to creating profound learning experiences for each child, while nurturing meaningful relationships, to positively impact our world.

Core Values

Relationships: We value authentic relationships. When we invest in each other we learn and flourish.

Engagement: We value collective engagement that positively impacts the lives of our children and our world.

Great Teaching: We value great teaching because we believe it is the key to deep learning.

Redefining Success: We value each individual's contribution because the measure of success can be different for everyone.

Value Statement

At Austin Elementary, we are driven to unlock the passion and cultivate the uniqueness inherent in every learner. We believe:

- Our school community works together to develop unique learning opportunities while providing support and encouragement needed for lifelong success.
- An effective school provides the skills necessary to become productive contributors to a global society.
- An effective classroom allows learners and educators to take risks in a physically and emotionally safe and supportive environment.
- Quality instructional programs are chosen for their potential to unlock passions, provide real world experiences, and nurture every learner.
- Our educators embrace professional learning and collaboration as critical components in preparing our learners as they pursue their passions in the 21st century.
- A successful learner pursues their passion while becoming an independent thinker, problem solver, and risk taker.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	5
Student Learning	8
School Processes & Programs	23
Perceptions	27
Priority Problem Statements	29
Data Documentation for CNA	34
Improvement Planning Data	35
Accountability Data	35
Student Data: Assessments	35
Student Data: Student Groups	36
Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators	36
Employee Data	36
Parent/Community Data	37
Support Systems and Other Data	37
Goals	38
Goal 1 : Accountability for Learning: At Austin, we will achieve our full potential by I...	39
Goal 2 : Organization that Cultivates Excellence: At Austin, we will maintain high st...	49
Goal 3 : Safety, Wellness and Belonging: At Austin, we will create physically secure...	53
State Compensatory Education	56
Budget for Austin Elementary	57
Funding Summary	58
199 - State Comp Ed	59
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements	60



Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

DEMOGRAPHICS

Austin Elementary is in Coppell ISD, a suburban district with 10 elementary schools, 3 middle schools, 2 high schools, a freshman campus and an alternative education campus. In the 2025-26 school year, total enrollment was 519 which represents a decrease of 6.6% from the prior year (-37 total learners).

In 2025-26, the student population was 47.2% Asian, 29.1% White, 14.1% Hispanic, 3.9% African American and 5.8% multi-racial. Females made up 46.1% of the learners and males represented 53.9%. Our economically disadvantaged percentage was 9.8%.

Our Emergent Bilingual (EB) population consisted of 109 learners that made up 21% of our campus. The top 5 foreign languages spoken by this student group were: Telugu (35.8%), Tamil (10.1%), Hindi (8.3%), Arabic (6.4%), and Spanish (5.5%). Additionally, 8.3% of our EBs were also economically disadvantaged.

Our 38 gifted and talented learners constituted 7.3% of our population. Our gender split in the GT group was 31.6% female and 68.4% male. Of the four major ethnic groups, our GT learners were 60.5% Asian, 26.3% White, 2.6% Hispanic and 0% African American.

We had 119 learners that qualified for special education services, which represented 22.9% of our population. There were 23 learners with 504 accommodations, which was 4.4% of the total enrollment.

The average daily attendance for our campus in 2025-26 was 96.9%, which increased by 1% from the prior year.

STAFFING

Austin employed 37 educators and 13 instructional aides in the 2025-26 school year. The number of teachers decreased by 2 from the prior year while the number of aides remained the same. The ethnic breakdown for the teaching staff was 89.2% White, 5.4% Hispanic, 2.7% African American and 2.7% multi-racial. Females made up 97.3% of the educators and males represented 2.7%.

Overall, our educators had a varied level of professional experience: 37.8% (14) had 2-5 years, 10.8% (4) had 6-10 years, 24.3% (9) had 11-15 years, 10.8% (4) had 16-20 years, and 16.2% (6) had more than 20 years.

Looking at longevity within the district, 24.3% of our teachers had 0-1 years in district, 32.4% had 2-5 years, 8.1% had 6-10 years, 24.3% had 11-15 years, 2.7% had 16-20 years and 8.1% had more than 20 years. The average years of professional experience was 12.1 with 7.8 years in the district.

Advanced degrees were held by 21.6% of our teachers: 8 with master's degrees. Our campus principal had 28 years of career experience in a professional position (not necessarily as a principal) and 12 years in Coppell. Our assistant principal had 26 years of professional experience and 5 years in the district.

Our educator retention rate from 2024-25 to 2025-26 was 68.3%. For educational aides it was 69.2%. We hired 10 new teachers in 2025-26. The characteristics of our new teachers were as follows: 90% White, 10% African American, 100% female, 40% with 2-5 years of professional experience, 30% with 6-10 years, 10% with 11-15 years, 20% with more than 20 years and 27% new to the campus. The average years of professional experience was 9.7 with 1.8 years in the district. 30% of our new teachers had advanced degrees.

Strengths

- Austin maintains a strong average daily attendance rate of 96.9%, reflecting a 1% increase from the prior year.
- The campus serves a culturally and linguistically diverse student population, with learners representing multiple racial, ethnic, and language backgrounds.
- Austin's multilingual community is strengthened by a significant Emergent Bilingual population representing a wide range of home languages.
- The teaching staff includes a balanced range of professional experience, with over half of educators having 11 or more years in education.
- Austin educators average 12.1 years of professional experience, providing a strong foundation of instructional knowledge and expertise.
- Eight educators hold master's degrees, contributing advanced knowledge and leadership capacity to the campus.
- Instructional aide staffing remained consistent, allowing the campus to continue providing additional learner support.
- The addition of new educators brings a blend of fresh perspectives and prior professional experience to the campus.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★	There is a need to consistently embed ELPS-aligned strategies, academic vocabulary, and language supports across content areas to ensure Emergent Bilingual learners have equitable access to grade-level instruction.	Emergent Bilingual learners represent 21% of the campus population and bring varied levels of English proficiency and diverse linguistic backgrounds, requiring intentional and consistent language support across classrooms and content areas.
2★	There is a need to consistently analyze and respond to data across student groups to address achievement gaps while ensuring learners who are meeting or mastering grade-level standards continue to experience growth and extension.	With 22.9% of learners receiving special education services and additional learners identified as Emergent Bilingual, economically disadvantaged, or gifted and talented, campus-wide data can mask differences in performance and growth among student groups.
3★	Although Austin hired only one new educator for the current school year, staffing changes in previous years have created an ongoing need to ensure all educators have a consistent understanding of campus and district expectations, including working effectively as a Professional Learning Community.	Varying levels of experience with campus and district systems have resulted in a need for continued onboarding, professional learning, and support around PLC practices and instructional expectations.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

Austin had many strengths during our previous year in how we were facilitating instruction, intervening, connecting with families and learners for feedback and engagement purposes. We continued to offer numerous opportunities for tutoring or learners, summer learning opportunities and will continue looking at how we can provide support moving forward into this school year. Educators at Austin Elementary worked diligently to meet the needs of all learners and, as a Professional Learning Community, shared students across grade levels to ensure both academic and social emotional needs were being met. Students are demonstrating progress in Reading, with growth scores indicating that instructional practices are having an impact. EB students are progressing in Reading and language proficiency, which provides a foundation to build upon as we continue strengthening supports across content areas. Many students are meeting grade-level expectations overall, and building on these strengths will be important as we address gaps in Math and among sub populations.

mCLASS K-5:

Click [HERE](#) for Kindergarten-5th grade mCLASS composite score differentials between 25-26 BOY, MOY, EOY

NWEA MAP:

Click [HERE](#) for the Student Growth Summary Report which shows aggregate growth from Fall 25 to Spring 26. Click [HERE](#) for an explanation if needed.

	0326 TELPAS Kindergarten	0326 TELPAS Grade 1	0326 TELPAS Grade 2	0326 TELPAS Grade 3	0326 TELPAS Grade 4	0326 TELPAS Grade 5
Austin Elementary						
Total Students	31	27	13	14	12	11
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	30.43%	83.33%	81.82%	63.64%	57.14%
1 Level Higher	-	69.57%	16.67%	18.18%	36.36%	42.86%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.52	3.22	2.42	3.06	2.98	3.12
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	16.13%	7.41%	7.69%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	29.03%	3.70%	53.85%	7.14%	25%	18.18%
Advanced	35.48%	37.04%	30.77%	85.71%	58.33%	72.73%
Advanced High	19.35%	51.85%	7.69%	7.14%	16.67%	9.09%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	19.85	22.21	19.08	20.82
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1599.77	1650.79	1553	1576.82
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	21.77	27.14	27.5	27.82
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1471.92	1555.64	1567.42	1579.91

Writing Raw Score	0	0	10.85	18	27	28.82
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1468.62	1504.71	1529.25	1544
Reading Raw Score	0	0	15.85	22.5	23.08	27
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1505.69	1586.36	1585.25	1634.82
Economic Disadvantage						
Total Students	-	2	2	1	4	-
Date Taken	-	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	-
Lower/Same Level	-	0%	100%	100%	75%	-
1 Level Higher	-	100%	0%	0%	25%	-
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
TELPAS Composite Score	-	2.9	2.05	2.8	2.73	-
No Rating	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Beginning	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Intermediate	-	0%	100%	0%	50%	-
Advanced	-	100%	0%	100%	50%	-
Advanced High	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Listening Raw Score	-	0	18.5	21	18.75	-
Listening Scale Score	-	0	1573	1611	1549.75	-
Speaking Raw Score	-	0	16.5	24	27.5	-
Speaking Scale Score	-	0	1393	1497	1567	-
Writing Raw Score	-	0	9.5	15	24.75	-
Writing Scale Score	-	0	1455	1454	1512.75	-
Reading Raw Score	-	0	13	24	18.25	-
Reading Scale Score	-	0	1475.5	1592	1522.75	-
Asian						
Total Students	29	20	12	13	7	8
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	33.33%	81.82%	80%	66.67%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	66.67%	18.18%	20%	33.33%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.51	3.23	2.48	3.08	3	3.06
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	17.24%	10%	8.33%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	31.03%	0%	50%	7.69%	28.57%	25%

Advanced	31.03%	35%	33.33%	84.62%	42.86%	75%
Advanced High	20.69%	55%	8.33%	7.69%	28.57%	0%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	20	22.31	18.57	20.63
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1602.58	1653.85	1547.57	1575.88
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	22.42	27.38	27.57	27.75
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1481.25	1560.15	1569.86	1579
Writing Raw Score	0	0	11.08	18.23	26.43	26.88
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1471.75	1508.62	1522.57	1527
Reading Raw Score	0	0	16.17	22.38	22.71	26.38
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1509	1585.92	1581.14	1627.38
Black/African American						
Total Students	-	-	-	-	2	-
Date Taken	-	-	-	-	03/01/26	-
Lower/Same Level	-	-	-	-	50%	-
1 Level Higher	-	-	-	-	50%	-
2 Levels Higher	-	-	-	-	0%	-
3 Levels Higher	-	-	-	-	0%	-
TELPAS Composite Score	-	-	-	-	3.15	-
No Rating	-	-	-	-	0%	-
Beginning	-	-	-	-	0%	-
Intermediate	-	-	-	-	0%	-
Advanced	-	-	-	-	100%	-
Advanced High	-	-	-	-	0%	-
Listening Raw Score	-	-	-	-	20	-
Listening Scale Score	-	-	-	-	1565.5	-
Speaking Raw Score	-	-	-	-	27.5	-
Speaking Scale Score	-	-	-	-	1565	-
Writing Raw Score	-	-	-	-	31	-
Writing Scale Score	-	-	-	-	1565	-
Reading Raw Score	-	-	-	-	26.5	-
Reading Scale Score	-	-	-	-	1624.5	-
Hispanic						
Total Students	2	3	1	1	1	-
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	-

Lower/Same Level	-	0%	100%	100%	0%	-
1 Level Higher	-	100%	0%	0%	100%	-
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
TELPAS Composite Score	2.65	3.53	1.8	2.8	2.8	-
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Beginning	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Intermediate	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	-
Advanced	100%	33.33%	0%	100%	100%	-
Advanced High	0%	66.67%	0%	0%	0%	-
Listening Raw Score	0	0	18	21	22	-
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1566	1611	1590	-
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	14	24	28	-
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1360	1497	1579	-
Writing Raw Score	0	0	8	15	25	-
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1431	1454	1516	-
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12	24	20	-
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1466	1592	1542	-
Two or More Races						
Total Students	-	2	-	-	-	-
Date Taken	-	03/01/26	-	-	-	-
Lower/Same Level	-	100%	-	-	-	-
1 Level Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
TELPAS Composite Score	-	3	-	-	-	-
No Rating	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Beginning	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Intermediate	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Advanced	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Advanced High	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Listening Raw Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
Listening Scale Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
Speaking Raw Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
Speaking Scale Score	-	0	-	-	-	-

Writing Raw Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
Writing Scale Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
Reading Raw Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
Reading Scale Score	-	0	-	-	-	-
White						
Total Students	-	2	-	-	2	3
Date Taken	-	03/01/26	-	-	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	0%	-	-	100%	66.67%
1 Level Higher	-	100%	-	-	0%	33.33%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	-	2.9	-	-	2.8	3.27
No Rating	-	0%	-	-	0%	0%
Beginning	-	0%	-	-	0%	0%
Intermediate	-	50%	-	-	50%	0%
Advanced	-	0%	-	-	50%	66.67%
Advanced High	-	50%	-	-	0%	33.33%
Listening Raw Score	-	0	-	-	18.5	21.33
Listening Scale Score	-	0	-	-	1541	1579.33
Speaking Raw Score	-	0	-	-	27	28
Speaking Scale Score	-	0	-	-	1555.5	1582.33
Writing Raw Score	-	0	-	-	26	34
Writing Scale Score	-	0	-	-	1523.5	1589.33
Reading Raw Score	-	0	-	-	22.5	28.67
Reading Scale Score	-	0	-	-	1582	1654.67
Currently Emergent Bilingual						
Total Students	31	27	13	14	12	11
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	30.43%	83.33%	81.82%	63.64%	57.14%
1 Level Higher	-	69.57%	16.67%	18.18%	36.36%	42.86%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.52	3.22	2.42	3.06	2.98	3.12
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	16.13%	7.41%	7.69%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	29.03%	3.70%	53.85%	7.14%	25%	18.18%

Advanced	35.48%	37.04%	30.77%	85.71%	58.33%	72.73%
Advanced High	19.35%	51.85%	7.69%	7.14%	16.67%	9.09%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	19.85	22.21	19.08	20.82
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1599.77	1650.79	1553	1576.82
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	21.77	27.14	27.5	27.82
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1471.92	1555.64	1567.42	1579.91
Writing Raw Score	0	0	10.85	18	27	28.82
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1468.62	1504.71	1529.25	1544
Reading Raw Score	0	0	15.85	22.5	23.08	27
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1505.69	1586.36	1585.25	1634.82
Special Ed Indicator						
Total Students	6	5	2	1	2	3
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	33.33%	100%	100%	50%	66.67%
1 Level Higher	-	66.67%	0%	0%	50%	33.33%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1.3	2.3	1.65	1.8	3.05	3.37
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	66.67%	40%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	33.33%	0%	50%	100%	0%	0%
Advanced	0%	40%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Advanced High	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	17.5	18	21	22.33
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1559.5	1566	1575	1598.33
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	14.5	23	28	30
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1367	1482	1579	1617
Writing Raw Score	0	0	8	9	26.5	28.33
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1431	1372	1528	1541.33
Reading Raw Score	0	0	10.5	10	25	28.33
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1450.5	1418	1610	1651

	May 2026 STAAR Mathematics, Grade 3	May 2026 STAAR Mathematics, Grade 4	May 2026 STAAR Mathematics, Grade 5	May 2026 STAAR Reading Language Arts, Grade 3	May 2026 STAAR Reading Language Arts, Grade 4	May 2026 STAAR Reading Language Arts, Grade 5	May 2026 STAAR Science, Grade 5
Austin Elementary							
Total Students	85	72	91	85	72	91	91
Raw Score	25	25	31	31	31	37	20
Scale Score	1557	1598	1781	1522	1611	1717	0
Percent Score	66.26%	62.12%	73.52%	59.16%	59.13%	71.47%	65.13%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	87.06%	75%	94.51%	94.12%	88.89%	90.11%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	64.71%	58.33%	76.92%	70.59%	68.06%	78.02%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	38.82%	30.56%	47.25%	27.06%	37.50%	61.54%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	2.35%	6.94%	2.20%	3.53%	5.56%	7.69%	-
Did Not Meet High	10.59%	18.06%	3.30%	2.35%	5.56%	2.20%	-
Approaches Low	9.41%	6.94%	7.69%	10.59%	11.11%	8.79%	-
Approaches High	12.94%	9.72%	9.89%	12.94%	9.72%	3.30%	-
Meets	25.88%	27.78%	29.67%	43.53%	30.56%	16.48%	-
Masters	38.82%	30.56%	47.25%	27.06%	37.50%	61.54%	-
Economic Disadvantage							
Total Students	10	9	10	10	9	10	10
Raw Score	18	15	21	25	18	24	13
Scale Score	1426	1429	1591	1441	1437	1519	0
Percent Score	49.73%	38.06%	49.52%	47.88%	34.83%	46.54%	42%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	60%	33.33%	80%	80%	44.44%	60%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	20%	0%	20%	40%	22.22%	30%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	10%	0%	20%	20%	0%	10%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	11.11%	10%	20%	44.44%	30%	-

Did Not Meet High	40%	55.56%	10%	0%	11.11%	10%	-
Approaches Low	20%	22.22%	40%	20%	0%	30%	-
Approaches High	20%	11.11%	20%	20%	22.22%	0%	-
Meets	10%	0%	0%	20%	22.22%	20%	-
Masters	10%	0%	20%	20%	0%	10%	-
Asian							
Total Students	42	28	45	42	28	45	45
Raw Score	27	30	35	32	35	41	22
Scale Score	1609	1704	1859	1536	1669	1782	0
Percent Score	72.52%	75.71%	82.33%	60.71%	66.62%	78.89%	73.26%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	95.24%	92.86%	97.78%	95.24%	92.86%	95.56%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	78.57%	89.29%	88.89%	73.81%	85.71%	91.11%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	50%	57.14%	68.89%	26.19%	53.57%	77.78%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	4.76%	0%	0%	2.38%	3.57%	2.22%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	7.14%	2.22%	2.38%	3.57%	2.22%	-
Approaches Low	4.76%	0%	2.22%	4.76%	7.14%	2.22%	-
Approaches High	11.90%	3.57%	6.67%	16.67%	0%	2.22%	-
Meets	28.57%	32.14%	20%	47.62%	32.14%	13.33%	-
Masters	50%	57.14%	68.89%	26.19%	53.57%	77.78%	-
Black/African American							
Total Students	3	8	2	3	8	2	2
Raw Score	22	18	18	32	26	24	13
Scale Score	1514	1477	1543	1541	1546	1518	0
Percent Score	60.36%	45.31%	42.86%	61.54%	49.28%	46.15%	43.33%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	50%	100%	66.67%	87.50%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	33.33%	12.50%	0%	66.67%	37.50%	0%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	33.33%	12.50%	0%	66.67%	12.50%	0%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-

Did Not Meet Low	0%	25%	0%	33.33%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	33.33%	25%	0%	0%	12.50%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	12.50%	100%	0%	25%	100%	-
Approaches High	33.33%	25%	0%	0%	25%	0%	-
Meets	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	-
Masters	33.33%	12.50%	0%	66.67%	12.50%	0%	-
Hispanic							
Total Students	13	9	11	13	9	11	11
Raw Score	18	18	23	25	22	27	14
Scale Score	1422	1466	1654	1445	1487	1568	0
Percent Score	49.90%	43.89%	54.55%	48.96%	41.88%	51.92%	46.36%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	53.85%	44.44%	72.73%	84.62%	77.78%	54.55%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	38.46%	11.11%	45.45%	53.85%	44.44%	36.36%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	7.69%	0%	18.18%	7.69%	0%	36.36%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	9.09%	7.69%	22.22%	36.36%	-
Did Not Meet High	46.15%	55.56%	18.18%	7.69%	0%	9.09%	-
Approaches Low	15.38%	22.22%	18.18%	30.77%	22.22%	18.18%	-
Approaches High	0%	11.11%	9.09%	0%	11.11%	0%	-
Meets	30.77%	11.11%	27.27%	46.15%	44.44%	0%	-
Masters	7.69%	0%	18.18%	7.69%	0%	36.36%	-
Two or More Races							
Total Students	3	5	2	3	5	2	2
Raw Score	24	24	32	28	34	37	17
Scale Score	1524	1566	1746	1485	1646	1787	0
Percent Score	64.86%	59%	76.19%	53.85%	64.62%	71.15%	56.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	60%	100%	33.33%	60%	50%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	33.33%	20%	50%	33.33%	60%	50%	0%

Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	33.33%	20%	0%	0%	20%	50%	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	0%	66.67%	20%	0%	-
Meets	33.33%	40%	50%	0%	0%	0%	-
Masters	33.33%	20%	50%	33.33%	60%	50%	-

White

Total Students	24	22	31	24	22	31	31
Raw Score	24	24	29	32	31	36	19
Scale Score	1550	1569	1730	1542	1602	1683	0
Percent Score	65.09%	59.09%	69.28%	62.34%	59%	69.29%	61.94%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	91.67%	72.73%	96.77%	100%	86.36%	93.55%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	58.33%	54.55%	74.19%	79.17%	68.18%	80.65%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	37.50%	18.18%	29.03%	33.33%	36.36%	51.61%	0%

Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	9.09%	3.23%	0%	4.55%	6.45%	-
Did Not Meet High	8.33%	18.18%	0%	0%	9.09%	0%	-
Approaches Low	12.50%	4.55%	6.45%	12.50%	4.55%	6.45%	-
Approaches High	20.83%	13.64%	16.13%	8.33%	13.64%	6.45%	-
Meets	20.83%	36.36%	45.16%	45.83%	31.82%	29.03%	-
Masters	37.50%	18.18%	29.03%	33.33%	36.36%	51.61%	-

Currently Emergent Bilingual

Total Students	14	12	11	14	12	11	11
Raw Score	26	24	25	26	26	30	17
Scale Score	1589	1589	1652	1456	1539	1591	0
Percent Score	71.04%	60.83%	60.17%	50%	50%	57.69%	57.58%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	85.71%	66.67%	90.91%	92.86%	75%	81.82%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	78.57%	50%	54.55%	57.14%	50%	54.55%	0%
Masters							

Grade Level (TX)	50%	41.67%	9.09%	0%	25%	9.09%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	7.14%	0%	0%	7.14%	25%	9.09%	-
Did Not Meet High	7.14%	33.33%	9.09%	0%	0%	9.09%	-
Approaches Low	0%	8.33%	9.09%	7.14%	16.67%	9.09%	-
Approaches High	7.14%	8.33%	27.27%	28.57%	8.33%	18.18%	-
Meets	28.57%	8.33%	45.45%	57.14%	25%	45.45%	-
Masters	50%	41.67%	9.09%	0%	25%	9.09%	-

First Year of Monitoring

Total Students	1	1	6	1	1	6	6
Raw Score	34	33	33	42	47	40	20
Scale Score	1798	1737	1817	1679	1870	1730	0
Percent Score	91.89%	82.50%	79.37%	80.77%	90.38%	77.56%	65.56%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	33.33%	100%	100%	83.33%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Meets	0%	0%	66.67%	0%	0%	16.67%	-
Masters	100%	100%	33.33%	100%	100%	83.33%	-

Second Year of Monitoring

Total Students	13	8	3	13	8	3	3
Raw Score	26	33	37	34	39	42	24
Scale Score	1570	1768	1865	1556	1742	1784	0
Percent Score	69.65%	82.50%	87.30%	64.64%	75.72%	81.41%	80%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%

Meets Grade Level (TX)	76.92%	100%	100%	92.31%	100%	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	38.46%	75%	100%	23.08%	87.50%	66.67%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	7.69%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches High	15.38%	0%	0%	7.69%	0%	0%	-
Meets	38.46%	25%	0%	69.23%	12.50%	33.33%	-
Masters	38.46%	75%	100%	23.08%	87.50%	66.67%	-

Third Year of Monitoring

Total Students	-	-	8	-	-	8	8
Raw Score	-	-	37	-	-	43	21
Scale Score	-	-	1919	-	-	1800	0
Percent Score	-	-	88.69%	-	-	83.41%	70.83%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	-	-	87.50%	-	-	100%	0%
Date Taken	-	-	05/01/26	-	-	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Approaches Low	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Approaches High	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Meets	-	-	12.50%	-	-	0%	-
Masters	-	-	87.50%	-	-	100%	-

Special Ed Indicator

Total Students	13	18	21	13	18	21	21
Raw Score	20	17	24	27	22	27	14
Scale Score	1470	1459	1637	1471	1486	1554	0
Percent Score	52.81%	42.64%	56.12%	52.66%	41.67%	51.83%	45.87%
Approaches							

Grade Level (TX)	69.23%	33.33%	80.95%	76.92%	72.22%	71.43%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	23.08%	22.22%	47.62%	61.54%	33.33%	42.86%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	15.38%	0%	14.29%	23.08%	5.56%	23.81%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	7.69%	22.22%	9.52%	15.38%	11.11%	28.57%	-
Did Not Meet High	23.08%	44.44%	9.52%	7.69%	16.67%	0%	-
Approaches Low	23.08%	11.11%	14.29%	7.69%	22.22%	28.57%	-
Approaches High	23.08%	0%	19.05%	7.69%	16.67%	0%	-
Meets	7.69%	22.22%	33.33%	38.46%	27.78%	19.05%	-
Masters	15.38%	0%	14.29%	23.08%	5.56%	23.81%	-

As we go into 2026-2027, we will continue to use various data collection tools that help support and track learner growth and specific areas of need:

- NWEA MAP
- mCLASS
- Dreambox
- Tools such as Reflex Math, Raz Kids Plus, Peardeck
- Panorama Data
- LAS - Language Testing
- TELPAS
- Grades
- Assignments and Engagement Levels of Learners
- Observations from Educators
- Progress Monitoring Tools
- Referral and Progress Data for Specialized Services of Support - Special Education/Dyslexia/ GTi/504/English Learner
- Data Collection for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Including Accelerated Instruction - Tutoring/ Documentation of Learner Growth

Strengths

mClass Strengths:

- Overall Growth Across the Year: By EOY, 48% of students scored at/above benchmark on the composite score, an increase from 40% at BOY.
- Reading Accuracy is a Major Strength: Accuracy rose from 79% at BOY to 95% at EOY, showing strong foundational decoding and accuracy skills.
- Reading Fluency Gains: Students at/above benchmark in Oral Reading Fluency rose from 34% at BOY to 47% at EOY.
- Comprehension (Maze) Growth: At EOY, 71% of students were at/above benchmark in comprehension, up from 62% at BOY

MAP Strengths:

- Reading is a campus-wide strength, especially in early grades (K–2) where growth and achievement are both very high.
- Science shows standout achievement, particularly in 5th grade.
- Math achievement percentiles are high across all grades, even if growth projections were not met by as many students.
- Across content areas, students are performing above national norms.

STAAR Strengths:

- Strong 5th grade math performance, with nearly all students meeting or exceeding expectations.
- Reading achievement is solid across grades, with steady growth shown from year to year.
- Emergent Bilingual (EB) monitored students are thriving, with many reaching *Meets* and *Masters*.
- Asian student subgroup demonstrates consistently high achievement in both math and reading.
- Many grade levels show high percentages at Approaches (80%+), indicating broad foundational learning.
- Evidence of growth in Meets and Masters levels, particularly in 4th and 5th grade.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ There are significant achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged learners and the overall campus population in both reading and math	Economically disadvantaged learners may require more consistent access to targeted small-group instruction, timely intervention, and ongoing progress monitoring based on individual skill needs.
2★ Learners receiving special education services are performing below the overall campus population at the Meets and Masters Grade Level standards in reading and math	There is a need for stronger collaboration between general education and special education staff to ensure consistent implementation of accommodations, specially designed instruction, grade-level TEKS, and targeted intervention.
3★ Math performance varies across grade levels and student groups, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 math instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.	Educators need continued support in unpacking math standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and STEMscopes resources with fidelity, strengthening conceptual instruction, analyzing common formative assessments, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT.
4★ There is a need to ensure learners who have not yet met grade-level standards receive targeted intervention while learners performing at the Meets and Masters levels continue to experience growth and extension.	Instructional planning and data analysis have not always consistently examined the needs of learners at every performance level or provided a systematic balance of intervention and extension.
5★ ELAR performance varies across grade levels, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 reading and writing instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.	Educators need continued support in unpacking ELAR standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and HMH resources with fidelity, strengthening instruction in Extended Constructed Responses, analyzing common formative assessments and student work, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Austin Elementary follows the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and utilizes CISD curriculum documents, pacing guides, and instructional resources, including HMH and STEMscopes, to provide a guaranteed and viable curriculum for all learners. Educators use the workshop model, whole-group instruction, targeted small-group instruction, and flexible learning experiences to respond to individual learner needs. Campus learning spaces include the Literacy Lab, a dedicated Collaborative Team Time space, the outdoor learning garden, the library, the STEAM lab, and the motor lab.

As a Professional Learning Community, educators collaborate around four essential questions: What do we want learners to know and be able to do? How will we know if they have learned it? How will we respond when they have not learned it? How will we extend learning when they have? The master schedule provides biweekly Collaborative Team Time (CTT), during which educators unpack standards, develop and analyze common formative assessments, review district assessment data, and plan targeted instruction. Administrators, learning coach, and specialized support staff collaborate with teams throughout this process.

The master schedule also includes a daily school-wide intervention and extension block known as Mustang Time. Educators use multiple data sources, including MAP, mCLASS, STAAR, common formative assessments, and progress-monitoring data, to provide targeted support and extension. Classroom teachers collaborate with special education, GT, language acquisition, and other support staff to address individual learner needs, monitor progress across student groups, and adjust instruction to close achievement gaps.

Austin's grade-level-banded vertical teams support TEKS and curriculum alignment in literacy, math, and science across PK–5. Educators collaborate to strengthen instructional practices, analyze student work and assessment data, and ensure learners are prepared for the next grade level. Language Acquisition Specialists support teams in intentionally embedding academic vocabulary, ELPS-aligned strategies, and language supports for Emergent Bilingual learners.

Campus professional learning is aligned with learner data, instructional priorities, and campus goals. Educators will participate in learning focused on Building Thinking Classrooms, Kagan strategies, data analysis, curriculum implementation, and targeted instruction. Members of the CISD Curriculum and Instruction team will collaborate with campus educators to strengthen instructional practices and address identified learner needs.

Austin will continue to strengthen its Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) processes. Educators use qualitative and quantitative data to identify academic and behavioral needs, establish targeted goals, implement evidence-based interventions, monitor progress, and adjust support. Panorama is used to document and monitor MTSS plans. The administrative team also conducts regular “kid talk” discussions to review MTSS data,

attendance, office referrals, threat assessments, 504 supports, and special education referrals to ensure learner needs are addressed through coordinated campus systems.

Technology will be used with intentionality to enhance learning while maintaining a balance between screen time and hands-on experiences. Educators will implement the CISD Technology Framework, teach responsible technology use, align instruction with the Technology Applications TEKS, and consider when technology best supports the learning objective.

Austin supports social-emotional learning and character development through intentional morning meetings and weekly Second Step lessons. The Austin House System builds relationships, belonging, positive character, and community through spirit assemblies, House meetings, and Mustang of the Week recognitions. Learners also have opportunities to participate in leadership, service, and extracurricular experiences such as Student Council, Mustang Live Broadcasting, Principal Advisory Committee, Morning Greeters, Library Helpers, Recycling Club, Yearbook Committee, Marimba Club, and Running Club.

The physical and emotional safety of learners and staff remains a campus priority. Austin follows district and state safety requirements, conducts required drills, provides safety training, and reviews procedures to identify additional needs. Following drills, campus leaders debrief implementation and make adjustments to strengthen staff and learner preparedness.

Strengths

- Job-embedded professional learning as part of Collaborative Team Time
- Coaching opportunities with campus Learning Coach
- Common protocols and agendas for collaborative teams and planning
- Differentiated professional learning sessions
- Student Culture Committee
- Austin Student Council
- Austin House System
- STEAM Class
- School garden
- Flexible learning environment
- School-wide enrichment opportunities
- Learner led broadcasting team
- Library Interns
- Principal Advisory Committee (learners in grades 3-5)
- Austin Morning Greeters (learners in 4th-5th)
- Marimba Band (5th grade)

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★ There is a need to continue strengthening Collaborative Team Time as a Professional Learning Community focused on the four essential PLC questions.	Varying levels of experience with campus and district systems have resulted in a need for continued support with unpacking standards, developing and analyzing common formative assessments, reviewing learner data, and planning targeted intervention and extension.
2 ★ There is a need to strengthen the consistency of MTSS documentation, progress monitoring, and instructional response for learners receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.	Educators are continuing to build capacity in using Panorama and multiple sources of data to establish targeted goals, document interventions, monitor progress, and adjust academic and behavioral supports.
3 ★ There is a need to strengthen vertical alignment in literacy, math, and science across PK-5.	Educators need dedicated opportunities to deepen their understanding of standards across grade levels and align curriculum, academic vocabulary, instructional practices, and expectations for learner mastery.
4 ★ There is a need to consistently implement the CISD Technology Framework to ensure technology is used with intentionality while maintaining an appropriate balance between screen time and hands-on learning experiences.	Panorama family survey data reflects concerns about learner screen time, and educators need continued support in determining when technology enhances learning and when hands-on or pencil-and-paper experiences are more appropriate.
5 ★ There is a continued need to maintain consistent safety practices and preparedness across the campus.	.Ongoing changes to district and state safety requirements require continued staff and learner training, regular drills, clear communication, and consistent review of campus procedures.

6



There is a need for intentional, campus-aligned professional learning that strengthens instructional practices, data analysis, and learner engagement.

Educators have varying levels of experience and need continued, job-embedded support in using data to make instructional decisions and implementing research-based practices, including Building Thinking Classrooms and Kagan strategies, to increase engagement and respond to learner needs.

 = **Priority**

Perceptions

Summary

Austin Elementary is dedicated to meeting the academic, physical, and social emotional needs of its staff and students. Safety is a top priority for our learners and staff. We continue to follow all district protocols in order to keep all learners and staff safe. We conduct regular safety drills, exterior door audits, and have a trained MAT team for medical emergencies. We continue to utilize the Raptor Alert program to conduct secure, lock down, shelter, evacuation, and hold drills. Safety is also our number one goal for learners during arrival, dismissal and recess. Staff are “all hands on deck” when guarding and enforcing student safety.

Recent data points indicate that our learners continue to have strong relationships with each other as well as with their educators. Our spring Panorama data showed an increase in supportive relationships, sense of belonging, and school safety. The implementation of the “House System” provides a positive climate for staff and students. This cross-age system allows learners to build relationships across the campus. All students from PreK to 5th grade take part in the House System at Austin. Learners also have the opportunity to participate in student council, campus internships, learner-led announcements, and principal advisory committee. In addition, staff members will be paired with individual students to serve as a “champion.” These champion relationships provide students with a trusted adult who consistently supports their social-emotional and academic growth, strengthens their sense of belonging, and helps them reach their full potential.

At Austin Elementary we believe in cultivating deep roots with our families. Our Panorama data from the spring indicates that the majority of families feel Austin Elementary has a good school climate and that there is a mutual respect between staff and students. We are proud of our strong Parent Teacher Organization and value the partnership we have with our families. We continue to focus on ways to engage our families and provide ways for our families to take part in school-wide events and learning at Austin. We will honor National Grandparents' Day by hosting a Grandparent/Special Friends lunch in September. We will continue to host our Austin Multicultural Night in October in conjunction with our campus book fair. This was an incredible success in 2023 and brought many families together to share about their cultures. We continue to honor our Austin Veterans by holding a campus-wide Veterans' Day Assembly in November. We celebrate our school-wide fundraising by hosting a Color Run and Family Picnic in the fall. Beginning in October, we hold Friday Family Lunches. We continue to hold a variety of volunteer opportunities for our families within the school.

As part of the CISD Strategic Design work, Austin will continue to focus on the four core values: Relationships, Engagement, Great Teaching, and Redefining Success. We will continue to use our Advocacy Deck cards and will highlight educators and learners who exemplify these core values. Our teachers take part in highlighting one another each month as they witness their colleagues demonstrating the core values. In addition, we will work to highlight our efforts throughout the year that align with the seven pillars of the CISD Community-Based Accountability System (CBAS).

Strengths

- Multicultural Night celebrates the cultures and traditions represented throughout our school community.
- The Austin House System, including spirit assemblies and House meetings, contributes to a positive school climate and a strong sense of belonging.
- Mustang of the Week recognitions celebrate positive character traits and learner contributions.
- Buddy classes and cross-grade-level activities provide opportunities for peer connections and relationship-building.
- Intentional morning meetings, weekly Second Step lessons, class check-ins, and restorative practices support learners' social-emotional needs.
- Families describe Austin as a welcoming, caring, and inclusive school where learners feel known and valued.
- Strong relationships among learners, staff, and families contribute to a sense of family and community.
- Family events, academic showcases, volunteer opportunities, and school traditions strengthen family engagement.
- Consistent communication through team newsletters helps families remain informed and connected.
- Families view Austin as a positive and supportive learning environment where learners can take risks, grow, and develop independence.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★ There is a continued need to intentionally support learners' social-emotional needs, character development, relationships, and sense of belonging.	Learners need consistent opportunities to build relationships, develop positive coping and problem-solving skills, and connect with trusted adults and peers through morning meetings, Second Step lessons, the House System, and cross-grade-level experiences.
2 ★ There is a continued need to provide meaningful and accessible opportunities for parent and family engagement.	Families have diverse schedules, needs, and interests and require multiple ways to participate in campus events, academic experiences, volunteer opportunities, and school decision-making.
3 ★ There is a need to strengthen communication with families regarding learner progress, classroom learning, and ways to support learning at home.	Panorama family feedback indicates that parents would benefit from more individualized information about their child's strengths and areas of need, along with clearer resources and strategies for supporting learning at home.
4 ★ There is a need to ensure learning experiences provide appropriate levels of challenge, support, and differentiation for all learners.	Panorama family feedback indicates a desire for greater academic challenge for learners already performing at or above grade level, while other learners require additional small-group support and individualized feedback.

★ = Priority



Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1
★

There are significant achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged learners and the overall campus population in both reading and math

Economically disadvantaged learners may require more consistent access to targeted small-group instruction, timely intervention, and ongoing progress monitoring based on individual skill needs.

2
★

There is a need to strengthen the consistency of MTSS documentation, progress monitoring, and instructional response for learners receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.

Educators are continuing to build capacity in using Panorama and multiple sources of data to establish targeted goals, document interventions, monitor progress, and adjust academic and behavioral supports.

3
★

There is a need to continue strengthening Collaborative Team Time as a Professional Learning Community focused on the four essential PLC questions.

Varying levels of experience with campus and district systems have resulted in a need for continued support with unpacking standards, developing and analyzing common formative assessments, reviewing learner data, and planning targeted intervention and extension.

4
★

Although Austin hired only one new educator for the current school year, staffing changes in previous years have created an ongoing need to ensure all educators have a consistent understanding of campus and district expectations, including working effectively as a Professional Learning Community.

Varying levels of experience with campus and district systems have resulted in a need for continued onboarding, professional learning, and support around PLC practices and instructional expectations.

5
★

There is a need to ensure learners who have not yet met grade-level standards receive targeted intervention while learners performing at the Meets and Masters levels continue to experience growth and extension.

Instructional planning and data analysis have not always consistently examined the needs of learners at every performance level or provided a systematic balance of intervention and extension.

6
★

Math performance varies across grade levels and student groups, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 math instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.

Educators need continued support in unpacking math standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and STEMscopes resources with fidelity, strengthening conceptual instruction, analyzing common formative assessments, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT.

7★

Learners receiving special education services are performing below the overall campus population at the Meets and Masters Grade Level standards in reading and math

There is a need for stronger collaboration between general education and special education staff to ensure consistent implementation of accommodations, specially designed instruction, grade-level TEKS, and targeted intervention.

8★

There is a need to consistently analyze and respond to data across student groups to address achievement gaps while ensuring learners who are meeting or mastering grade-level standards continue to experience growth and extension.

With 22.9% of learners receiving special education services and additional learners identified as Emergent Bilingual, economically disadvantaged, or gifted and talented, campus-wide data can mask differences in performance and growth among student groups.

9★

There is a need to consistently embed ELPS-aligned strategies, academic vocabulary, and language supports across content areas to ensure Emergent Bilingual learners have equitable access to grade-level instruction.

Emergent Bilingual learners represent 21% of the campus population and bring varied levels of English proficiency and diverse linguistic backgrounds, requiring intentional and consistent language support across classrooms and content areas.

10★

There is a continued need to provide meaningful and accessible opportunities for parent and family engagement.

Families have diverse schedules, needs, and interests and require multiple ways to participate in campus events, academic experiences, volunteer opportunities, and school decision-making.

11★

There is a need to strengthen vertical alignment in literacy, math, and science across PK-5.

Educators need dedicated opportunities to deepen their understanding of standards across grade levels and align curriculum, academic vocabulary, instructional practices, and expectations for learner mastery.

12★

There is a need to consistently implement the CISD Technology Framework to ensure technology is used with intentionality while maintaining an appropriate balance between screen time and hands-on learning experiences.

Panorama family survey data reflects concerns about learner screen time, and educators need continued support in determining when technology enhances learning and when hands-on or pencil-and-paper experiences are more appropriate.

13



There is a continued need to maintain consistent safety practices and preparedness across the campus.

.Ongoing changes to district and state safety requirements require continued staff and learner training, regular drills, clear communication, and consistent review of campus procedures.

14



There is a need to strengthen communication with families regarding learner progress, classroom learning, and ways to support learning at home.

Panorama family feedback indicates that parents would benefit from more individualized information about their child's strengths and areas of need, along with clearer resources and strategies for supporting learning at home.

15



There is a continued need to intentionally support learners' social-emotional needs, character development, relationships, and sense of belonging.

Learners need consistent opportunities to build relationships, develop positive coping and problem-solving skills, and connect with trusted adults and peers through morning meetings, Second Step lessons, the House System, and cross-grade-level experiences.

16



There is a need to ensure learning experiences provide appropriate levels of challenge, support, and differentiation for all learners.

Panorama family feedback indicates a desire for greater academic challenge for learners already performing at or above grade level, while other learners require additional small-group support and individualized feedback.

17



ELAR performance varies across grade levels, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 reading and writing instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.

Educators need continued support in unpacking ELAR standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and HMH resources with fidelity, strengthening instruction in Extended Constructed Responses, analyzing common formative assessments and student work, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT

18



There is a need for intentional, campus-aligned professional learning that strengthens instructional practices, data analysis, and learner engagement.

Educators have varying levels of experience and need continued, job-embedded support in using data to make instructional decisions and implementing research-based practices, including Building Thinking Classrooms and Kagan strategies, to increase engagement and respond to learner needs.



Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

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

Improvement Planning Data

- ☒ District goals
- ☒ Campus goals
- ☒ HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3
- ☒ Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- ☒ Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data

Accountability Data

- ☒ Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- ☒ Student Achievement Domain
- ☒ Student Progress Domain
- ☒ Closing the Gaps Domain
- ☒ Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
- ☒ Accountability Distinction Designations

Student Data: Assessments

- ☒ State and federally required assessment information
- ☒ STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- ☒ STAAR released test questions
- ☒ STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- ☒ Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), Tejas LEE, or other alternate early reading assessment results
- ☒ Student failure and/or retention rates
- ☒ Running Records results
- ☒ Observation Survey results
- ☒ Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) reading assessment data for Grades PK-2

- ☒ Prekindergarten Self-Assessment Tool
- ☒ Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- ☒ Other PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- ☒ Intervention data

Student Data: Student Groups

- ☒ Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- ☒ Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- ☒ Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- ☒ Section 504 data
- ☒ Gifted and talented data
- ☒ Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- ☒ Attendance data
- ☒ Discipline records
- ☒ Student surveys and/or other feedback
- ☒ School safety data
- ☒ Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- ☒ Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- ☒ Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- ☒ Teacher/Student Ratio
- ☒ State certified and high quality staff data
- ☒ Campus leadership data
- ☒ Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data

- ☒ Professional development needs assessment data
- ☒ Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact
- ☒ T-TESS data

Parent/Community Data

- ☒ Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- ☒ Parent engagement rate
- ☒ Community surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- ☒ Organizational structure data
- ☒ Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- ☒ Capacity and resources data
- ☒ Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data



Goals

Goal 1

Accountability for Learning: At Austin, we will achieve our full potential by learning at high levels, taking ownership of our learning and stay focused on our commitment of continuous growth and evidence-based outcomes for all.

Performance Objective 1 HB3 Goal

All Pre-K-5th grade learners will be provided high quality Tier 1 instruction aligned to the TEKS and focused on specific learner growth.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR data, common formative assessments, district assessments, MAP Growth, mCLASS, CLI Engage, student work samples, progress-monitoring data, classroom walkthrough data, and CTT planning agendas and data-analysis.

Strategy 1

Educators will implement district curriculum documents and instructional resources, including STEMscopes and HMH, with fidelity and in alignment with the Coppell ISD pacing guides.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased consistency in the implementation of TEKS-aligned curriculum and instructional resources across grade levels.
Improved quality of Tier 1 instruction and learner growth.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Learning Coach
Educators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3, 5

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

The percentage of 3rd grade students earning Meets Grade Level and above on the STAAR Reading test will increase from 56% in June 2024 to 66% in June 2029.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: NWEA MAP data and different reports to track student growth in the area of early reading foundational skills and reading comprehension

Texas Reading Academies, we are training all state mandated positions as well as key instructional leaders in the Science of Reading and research based best practices for early reading instruction.

CISD Content Academies provide opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning targeted to their grade and the current literacy needs of our students based on current data.

Aware Assessment and Analytics Platform to create and administer common assessments to collect student data in between assessment windows to monitor progress and growth of students in their early literacy skills and reading comprehension.

mClass Intervention is used three times a year to assess foundational reading skills. Students below benchmark are then placed in intervention groups and receive intervention aligned with their goal. They continue to receive the timely and focused intervention lessons until the next assessment window which then determines if there is a need for further intervention.

Data Talks with campus Instructional Leaders, we look at trends in the NWEA MAP and mCLASS data that show or do not show growth and achievement of students in their early literacy skills. When we see areas of opportunity, we make a plan to support the students through intervention and teachers through professional learning.

Heggerty Phonemic Awareness Instruction: Students in PreK, Kindergarten, and First Grade receive daily phonemic awareness instruction through the Heggerty resource. Teachers in 2nd-5th grade have the Bridge the Gap resource to intervene when they have students needing foundational skills.

High-Quality PreK, the early childhood curriculum writing team finalized "Early Childhood Program Standards" to serve as a guide to Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)/PreK staff and administrators on evidence-based practices including required instructional components, an accessible professional learning library, administrative crosswalks and "Look Fors."

Early Childhood staff receive Heggerty professional learning to increase their knowledge and skills on our targeted daily focus of phonemic awareness during literacy. In addition, they've also received developmentally appropriate play-based practices to support emergent writing and math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators
Director of Elementary Literacy and SS
Learning Coach

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 5

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

The percentage of 3rd grade students earning Meets Grade Level and above on the STAAR Math test will increase from 60% in June 2024 to 70% in June 2029.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: NWEA MAP data and different reports to track student growth in the area of early math foundational skills

DreamBox adaptive math program that integrates math curriculum and continuous formative assessment to personalize instruction, develop conceptual understanding, build critical skills, and improve achievement for every student within MTSS interventions or extensions

CISD Content Academies provide opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning targeted to their grade and the current math needs of our students based on current data. Teachers get to observe best practices, try strategies, learn new strategies, and plan for implementation within their own math workshop.

Continue deepening the Math Workshop Model. This model provides the rigor and relevance necessary for skills that students will need in the future. Guided math workshop group: A small group of students working with the teacher to address specific needs, Learning stations: Activities that students work on independently or collaboratively to practice new topics or review past topics, often taking place while the teacher is working with a guided math group. Student reflection: Students think and share about their learning.

Reflex Math as an adaptive and individualized system for mastering basic facts in addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division for grades 2+. Reflex Math takes students at every level and helps them quickly gain math fact fluency and confidence.

Deepen our use of STEMscopes Math which uses the Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) approach, that encourages students to rely on critical thinking, compelling reflection, and collaborative exploration within each scope. The 5E+IA learning model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate, Intervention, and Acceleration) is designed to enhance STEM education through math concepts found in our everyday world while being compatible with Math Workshop and Guided Math

Aware Assessment and Analytics Platform to create and administer common assessments to collect student data in between assessment windows to monitor progress and growth of students in their early math skills. This gives us more data points to see trends in student learning and opportunities to intervene in a timely manner if necessary

Data Talks with campus Instructional Leaders, we look at trends in the NWEA MAP and mCLASS data that show or do not show growth and achievement of students in their early math skills.

Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) professional learning at Region 10 Education Service Center (ESC), district content directors and learning coaches will learn about the cognitive shifts that are research based proven best practices in math instruction and how the balance of conceptual and procedural, depth & coherence of key concepts and productive struggle can create meaningful connections that accelerate math instruction to positively impact mathematics staff in CISD

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators
Director of Elementary Math and Science
Learning Coach

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

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 4

Educators will engage in grade-level-banded vertical teams to strengthen TEKS and curriculum alignment and instructional practices in literacy, math, and science across grade levels. Teams will collaborate with Language Acquisition Specialist to intentionally embed academic vocabulary and language supports for emergent bilingual learners.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased alignment and consistency in literacy, math, and science instruction across grade levels.
Stronger academic vocabulary and language supports for emergent bilingual learners.
Improved collaboration among educators and increased learner readiness for the next grade level.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Learning Coach
Educators
Language Acquisition Specialist

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 3

Title I:

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There is a need to consistently embed ELPS-aligned strategies, academic vocabulary, and language supports across content areas to ensure Emergent Bilingual learners have equitable access to grade-level instruction.	Emergent Bilingual learners represent 21% of the campus population and bring varied levels of English proficiency and diverse linguistic backgrounds, requiring intentional and consistent language support across classrooms and content areas.
2	There is a need to consistently analyze and respond to data across student groups to address achievement gaps while ensuring learners who are meeting or mastering grade-level standards continue to experience growth and extension.	With 22.9% of learners receiving special education services and additional learners identified as Emergent Bilingual, economically disadvantaged, or gifted and talented, campus-wide data can mask differences in performance and growth among student groups.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There are significant achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged learners and the overall campus population in both reading and math	Economically disadvantaged learners may require more consistent access to targeted small-group instruction, timely intervention, and ongoing progress monitoring based on individual skill needs.
2 Learners receiving special education services are performing below the overall campus population at the Meets and Masters Grade Level standards in reading and math	There is a need for stronger collaboration between general education and special education staff to ensure consistent implementation of accommodations, specially designed instruction, grade-level TEKS, and targeted intervention.
3 Math performance varies across grade levels and student groups, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 math instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.	Educators need continued support in unpacking math standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and STEMscopes resources with fidelity, strengthening conceptual instruction, analyzing common formative assessments, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT.
5 ELAR performance varies across grade levels, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 reading and writing instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.	Educators need continued support in unpacking ELAR standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and HMH resources with fidelity, strengthening instruction in Extended Constructed Responses, analyzing common formative assessments and student work, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
3 There is a need to strengthen vertical alignment in literacy, math, and science across PK-5.	Educators need dedicated opportunities to deepen their understanding of standards across grade levels and align curriculum, academic vocabulary, instructional practices, and expectations for learner mastery.

Performance Objective 2

We will analyze and use multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data to identify and respond to the individual needs of all learners.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR data, common formative assessments, district assessments, MAP Growth, mCLASS, CLI Engage, Panorama data, MTSS data, student work samples, progress-monitoring data, classroom walkthrough data, and CTT planning and data-analysis records.

Strategy 1

As a Professional Learning Community, we will continue to strengthen Collaborative Team Time (CTT) by unpacking standards, developing and analyzing common formative assessments, reviewing district assessment data, and planning targeted small-group instruction through a focus on the four essential PLC questions: What do we want learners to know and be able to do? How will we know if they have learned it? How will we respond when they have not learned it? How will we extend learning when they have?

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased consistency and effectiveness of CTT across grade levels.
Stronger alignment among standards, assessments, and instructional planning.
Timely instructional responses for learners needing intervention or extension.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Learning Coach
Educators

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Educators will use multiple data sources, including MAP, mCLASS, and STAAR, to provide targeted intervention and extension during the school-wide Mustang Time block. Special Education, GT, Language Acquisition Specialist, and other support staff will collaborate to address individual learner needs, monitor progress across student groups--including special education, emergent bilingual, economically disadvantaged, and GT learners--and adjust instruction to close achievement gaps.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Targeted intervention and extension based on individual learner needs.
Increased collaboration among classroom teachers and specialized support staff.
Improved learner growth and reduced achievement gaps across student groups.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Learning Coach
Educators
GT Educator
Language Acquisition Specialist

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Educators will utilize the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process to identify learner needs, implement targeted academic and behavioral supports, monitor progress, and adjust interventions based on multiple sources of data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Earlier identification of academic and behavioral needs. Consistent implementation and monitoring of targeted supports. Timely adjustments to interventions based on learner progress.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Counselor
Educators

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 4

Austin will utilize State Compensatory Education funding to provide a certified interventionist who will deliver additional targeted reading and math intervention to identified at-risk learners based on multiple sources of data and ongoing progress monitoring.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased reading and math growth for identified at-risk learners. Additional targeted support based on individual needs. Improved progress toward grade-level standards and reduced achievement gaps

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Funding Sources: Instructional Tutor 199 - State Comp Ed, 199-11-6128-00-103-24-000, \$4,348

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement	Root Cause
2 There is a need to consistently analyze and respond to data across student groups to address achievement gaps while ensuring learners who are meeting or mastering grade-level standards continue to experience growth and extension.	With 22.9% of learners receiving special education services and additional learners identified as Emergent Bilingual, economically disadvantaged, or gifted and talented, campus-wide data can mask differences in performance and growth among student groups.
3 Although Austin hired only one new educator for the current school year, staffing changes in previous years have created an ongoing need to ensure all educators have a consistent understanding of campus and district expectations, including working effectively as a Professional Learning Community.	Varying levels of experience with campus and district systems have resulted in a need for continued onboarding, professional learning, and support around PLC practices and instructional expectations.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There are significant achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged learners and the overall campus population in both reading and math	Economically disadvantaged learners may require more consistent access to targeted small-group instruction, timely intervention, and ongoing progress monitoring based on individual skill needs.
2 Learners receiving special education services are performing below the overall campus population at the Meets and Masters Grade Level standards in reading and math	There is a need for stronger collaboration between general education and special education staff to ensure consistent implementation of accommodations, specially designed instruction, grade-level TEKS, and targeted intervention.
3 Math performance varies across grade levels and student groups, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 math instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.	Educators need continued support in unpacking math standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and STEMscopes resources with fidelity, strengthening conceptual instruction, analyzing common formative assessments, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT.

4

There is a need to ensure learners who have not yet met grade-level standards receive targeted intervention while learners performing at the Meets and Masters levels continue to experience growth and extension.

Instructional planning and data analysis have not always consistently examined the needs of learners at every performance level or provided a systematic balance of intervention and extension.

5

ELAR performance varies across grade levels, demonstrating a need to strengthen Tier 1 reading and writing instruction and ensure consistent learner growth.

Educators need continued support in unpacking ELAR standards, implementing CISD curriculum documents and HMH resources with fidelity, strengthening instruction in Extended Constructed Responses, analyzing common formative assessments and student work, and planning targeted intervention and extension through CTT

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

There is a need to continue strengthening Collaborative Team Time as a Professional Learning Community focused on the four essential PLC questions.

Varying levels of experience with campus and district systems have resulted in a need for continued support with unpacking standards, developing and analyzing common formative assessments, reviewing learner data, and planning targeted intervention and extension.

2

There is a need to strengthen the consistency of MTSS documentation, progress monitoring, and instructional response for learners receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.

Educators are continuing to build capacity in using Panorama and multiple sources of data to establish targeted goals, document interventions, monitor progress, and adjust academic and behavioral supports.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement

Root Cause

4

There is a need to ensure learning experiences provide appropriate levels of challenge, support, and differentiation for all learners.

Panorama family feedback indicates a desire for greater academic challenge for learners already performing at or above grade level, while other learners require additional small-group support and individualized feedback.

Performance Objective 3

Austin educators will engage in professional learning opportunities designed to strengthen instructional practices and support the identified needs of all learners.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR data, common formative assessments, district assessments, MAP Growth, mCLASS, CLI Engage, Panorama data, MTSS data, student work samples, progress-monitoring data, classroom walkthrough data, and CTT planning and data-analysis records.

Strategy 1

Instructional leaders will plan and facilitate professional learning aligned with campus goals, learner data, and instructional priorities. Educators will engage in learning designed to strengthen instructional practices, deepen data analysis, and increase learner engagement, including Building Thinking Classrooms, Kagan strategies, and data analysis in collaboration with members of the Curriculum and Instruction team.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased educator capacity to analyze data and implement effective instructional practices.
More intentional use of data to create flexible small groups and plan targeted intervention and extension during classroom instruction and Mustang Time.
Increased learner engagement through collaborative, differentiated, and cognitively demanding learning experiences.
Improved alignment between professional learning, campus priorities, and identified learner needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators
Director of Literacy & Social Studies
Director of Math & Science

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 6

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
6 There is a need for intentional, campus-aligned professional learning that strengthens instructional practices, data analysis, and learner engagement.	Educators have varying levels of experience and need continued, job-embedded support in using data to make instructional decisions and implementing research-based practices, including Building Thinking Classrooms and Kagan strategies, to increase engagement and respond to learner needs.

Goal 2

Organization that Cultivates Excellence: At Austin, we will maintain high standards as we re-imagine how we teach, learn and define success to adapt, innovate and meet the unique needs of all learners

Performance Objective 1

All Pre-K-5th grade learners will have opportunities to participate in relationship-driven, real-world, and engaging learning experiences that provide choice, honor individual learning styles, incorporate hands-on and service-oriented learning, and build a strong sense of community.

Evaluation Data Source: Student participation and attendance records
Leadership, service, and extracurricular activity records
Panorama survey data - students & families
Academic family event attendance
Student work samples and learning artifacts
Classroom walkthrough data
Documentation of hands-on, service-oriented, and real-world learning experiences

Strategy 1

Learners will have opportunities to participate in leadership, service, and extracurricular experiences, including Student Council, Mustang Live Broadcasting, Principal Advisory Committee, Morning Greeters, Library Helpers, Recycling Club, Yearbook Committee, Marimba Club, and Running Club, to promote real-world learning and build community.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased learner participation in leadership, service, and extracurricular opportunities.
Stronger relationships, student leadership skills, and sense of belonging within the campus community.
Increased opportunities for learners to apply skills in authentic settings.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators
Counselor

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Title I: 2.5.2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Each grade level will host at least one academic event for families that showcases learner growth, real-world learning, and authentic application of skills (e.g., Poetry Cafe, Fairy Tale Ball,

and Living History Museum).

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased family engagement in student learning. Opportunities for learners to demonstrate growth and apply their learning in authentic ways. Stronger connections among learners, educators, and families.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Title I:

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There is a continued need to intentionally support learners' social-emotional needs, character development, relationships, and sense of belonging.	Learners need consistent opportunities to build relationships, develop positive coping and problem-solving skills, and connect with trusted adults and peers through morning meetings, Second Step lessons, the House System, and cross-grade-level experiences.
2 There is a continued need to provide meaningful and accessible opportunities for parent and family engagement.	Families have diverse schedules, needs, and interests and require multiple ways to participate in campus events, academic experiences, volunteer opportunities, and school decision-making.

Performance Objective 2

We will strengthen partnerships with parents and families to support learner success and build a strong connection between home and school.

Evaluation Data Source: Parent-teacher conference participation
Team and campus newsletters
Parent and family surveys
Panorama family engagement data
ParentSquare communication and engagement data
Family attendance at campus and academic events
Documentation of student work and progress shared with families
Resources provided to support learning at home

Strategy 1

Educators will maintain consistent communication with parents and families through parent-teacher conferences, team newsletters, the sharing of student work and progress, and resources that provide families with ways to support learning at home.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased consistency and effectiveness of communication between educators and families.
Greater family awareness of learner progress and ways to support learning at home.
Stronger partnerships between home and school to support learner success.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators
Learning Coach

Problem Statements: Perceptions 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
3	There is a need to strengthen communication with families regarding learner progress, classroom learning, and ways to support learning at home.	Panorama family feedback indicates that parents would benefit from more individualized information about their child's strengths and areas of need, along with clearer resources and strategies for supporting learning at home.

Performance Objective 3

Austin educators will use technology with intentionality to enhance learning while maintaining a balance between technology use and hands-on learning experiences.

Evaluation Data Source: Classroom walkthrough and observation data
Lesson plans and instructional materials
Student work samples and learning artifacts
CISD Technology Framework implementation evidence
Digital citizenship and responsible-use lesson documentation
Evidence of hands-on learning experiences

Strategy 1

We will implement the CISD Technology Framework with a focus on teaching the responsible use of technology, reducing unnecessary screen time, aligning instruction with the state Technology Applications TEKS, and balancing technology use with hands-on learning experiences.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased responsible and intentional use of technology by educators and learners.
Improved alignment with the Technology Applications TEKS.
A more appropriate balance between technology use and hands-on learning experiences.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Educators
Learning Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
4 There is a need to consistently implement the CISD Technology Framework to ensure technology is used with intentionality while maintaining an appropriate balance between screen time and hands-on learning experiences.	Panorama family survey data reflects concerns about learner screen time, and educators need continued support in determining when technology enhances learning and when hands-on or pencil-and-paper experiences are more appropriate.

Goal 3

Safety, Wellness and Belonging: At Austin, we will create physically secure and emotionally safe environments which allow others to be seen, valued, and supported within a culture of belonging and engagement.

Performance Objective 1

We will implement intentional systems focused on building relationships, supporting social-emotional needs, and fostering character development.

Evaluation Data Source: Panorama student survey data
Second Step lesson implementation data
Morning meeting documentation
Mustang of the Week recognition records
House meeting and spirit assembly documentation
Student discipline and behavior data
Counselor referral data
Attendance data
Threat Assessment Data

Strategy 1

Educators will support social-emotional learning and character education through intentional morning meetings and the implementation of weekly Second Step lessons.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased consistency in the implementation of morning meetings and Second Step lessons.
Improved learner self-awareness, self-management, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.
A more positive and supportive classroom environment.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Counselor
Educators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

We will continue to focus on the Austin House System to build relationships, foster a sense of belonging, promote positive character traits, and strengthen our campus community through spirit assemblies, Mustang of the Week recognitions, and House meetings dedicated to service projects.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased sense of belonging and connection among learners and staff.
Stronger relationships and community across grade levels.
Increased recognition and demonstration of positive character traits.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Counselor
Educators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There is a continued need to intentionally support learners' social-emotional needs, character development, relationships, and sense of belonging.	Learners need consistent opportunities to build relationships, develop positive coping and problem-solving skills, and connect with trusted adults and peers through morning meetings, Second Step lessons, the House System, and cross-grade-level experiences.

Performance Objective 2

We will implement and maintain district and state safety policies and practices to support a safe and secure learning environment.

Evaluation Data Source: Required safety drill records and documentation
Staff and learner safety training records
Campus safety audit results
District and state safety compliance documentation

Strategy 1

We will conduct all required safety drills, provide staff and learners with training on campus safety practices, and identify and address additional safety needs based on district and state requirements and recommendations.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased staff and learner understanding of campus safety procedures.
Consistent and effective implementation of all required safety drills.
Timely identification and response to campus safety needs.
A safe and secure learning environment for learners and staff.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators
Counselor
SRO
Educators

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Title I:

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
5 There is a continued need to maintain consistent safety practices and preparedness across the campus.	.Ongoing changes to district and state safety requirements require continued staff and learner training, regular drills, clear communication, and consistent review of campus procedures.



State Compensatory Education

State Compensatory

Budget for Austin Elementary

Total SCE Funds: \$4,348.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

We have a certified educator who will be providing small group instruction within the school day to students who are at-risk of not meeting grade level expectations.



Funding Summary

Funding Summary

199 - State Comp Ed

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	2	4	Instructional Tutor	199-11-61 28-00-1 03-24-0 00	\$4,348.00
				Sub-Total	\$4,348.00



Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

Title	Person Responsible	Review Date	Addressed By	Addressed On
Bullying Prevention	Director of Student and Staff Services and Campus Administrators	7/24/2023	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Child Abuse and Neglect	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Campus Administrators and Campus Counselors	12/15/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Coordinated Health Program	Coordinator of Health Services and Director of Child Nutrition, Campus Administrators	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Decision-Making and Planning Policy Evaluation	Superintendent	7/5/2023	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	Director of Student and Staff Services and Campus Administrators	1/30/2023	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Dropout Prevention	Assistant Superintendent of C&I	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026
Dyslexia Treatment Program	Executive Director of Intervention Services and Campus Administrators	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Pregnancy Related Services	Assistant Superintendent of C&I and Campus Counselors	4/1/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026
Post-Secondary Preparedness	Assistant Superintendent of C&I	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/17/2026
Recruiting Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Assistant Superintendent of C&I and Assistant Superintendent of Administrative Services	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026
Student Welfare: Crisis Intervention Programs and Training	Assistant Superintendent of C&I and Support Counselors	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026
Student Welfare: Discipline/Conflict/Violence Management	Assistant Superintendent of C&I and Support Counselors	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026
Technology Integration	Assistant Superintendent of C&I and Executive Director of Technology	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026
Job Description for Peace Officers, Resource				

Officers & Security Personnel				
Texas Behavior Support Initiative (TBSI)	Executive Director of Intervention Services	11/12/2025	Carrie Boyle	8/19/2026