

Coppell Independent School District



Town Center Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

Coppell ISD Mission Statement

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

Value Statement

Coppell ISD 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.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	5
Student Learning	8
School Processes & Programs	22
Perceptions	24
Priority Problem Statements	26
Data Documentation for CNA	29
Improvement Planning Data	30
Accountability Data	30
Student Data: Assessments	30
Student Data: Student Groups	30
Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators	31
Employee Data	31
Parent/Community Data	31
Goals	32
Goal 1 : Accountability for Learning: We as CISD will achieve our full potential by le...	33
Goal 2 : Organization that Cultivates Excellence: We as CISD will maintain high stan...	40
Goal 3 : Safety, Wellness and Belonging: We as CISD will create physically secure ...	46
State Compensatory Education	50
Budget for Town Center Elementary	51
Funding Summary	52
211 - Title I, Part A	53
199 - State Comp Ed	53
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements	54



Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

DEMOGRAPHICS

Town Center 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 462, which represents an increase of 15.7% from the prior year (+63 total learners).

In 2025-26, the student population was 44.6% Asian, 32.3% White, 13.6% Hispanic, 4.1% African American, 0.2% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 5.2% multi-racial. Females made up 47.6% of the learners, and males represented 52.4%. Our economically disadvantaged percentage was 16.5%.

Our Emergent Bilingual (EB) population consisted of 103 learners who made up 22.3% of our campus. The top 5 foreign languages spoken by this student group were: Tamil (20.4%), Telugu (18.4%), Hindi (8.7%), Arabic (8.7%), and Spanish (5.8%). Additionally, 17.5% of our EBs were also economically disadvantaged.

Our 34 gifted and talented learners constituted 7.4% of our population. Our gender split in the GT group was 11.8% female and 88.2% male. Of the four major ethnic groups, our GT learners were 55.9% Asian, 35.3% White, 2.9% Hispanic, and 2.9% African American.

We had 105 learners who qualified for special education services, which represented 22.7% of our population. There were 4 learners with 504 accommodations, which was 0.9% of the total enrollment.

The average daily attendance for our campus in 2025-26 was 96.9%, which increased by 0.8% from the prior year.

STAFFING

Town Center employed 37 educators and 12 instructional aides in the 2025-26 school year. The number of teachers increased by 3 from the prior year, while the number of aides increased by 2. The ethnic breakdown for the teaching staff was 91.9% White, 2.7% Hispanic, 2.7% African American, and 2.7% multi-racial. Females made up 91.9% of the educators, and males represented 8.1%.

Overall, our educators had a varied level of professional experience: 2.7% (1) were new to teaching with 0-1 years of experience, 10.8% (4) had 2-5 years, 21.6% (8) had 6-10 years, 21.6% (8) had 11-15 years, 16.2% (6) had 16-20 years, and 27% (10) had more than 20 years. Looking at longevity within the district, 2.7% of our teachers had 0-1 years in district, 40.5% had 2-5 years, 24.3% had 6-10 years, 13.5% had 11-15 years, 8.1% had 16-20 years, and 10.8% had more than 20 years. The average years of professional experience was 14, with 8.7 years in the district.

Advanced degrees were held by 16.2% of our teachers: 6 with master's degrees. Our campus principal had 25 years of career experience in a professional position (not necessarily as a principal) and 19 years in Coppell. Our assistant principal had 21 years of professional experience and 19 years in the district.

Our educator retention rate from 2024-25 to 2025-26 was 86.1%. For educational aides, it was 50%. We hired 6 new teachers in 2025-26. The characteristics of our new teachers were as follows: 83.3% White, 16.7% multi-racial, 83.3% female, 16.7% male, 16.7% new to teaching, 16.7% with 2-5 years of professional experience, 16.7% with 6-10 years, 33.3% with 11-15 years, 16.7% with more than 20 years and 16.2% new to the campus. The average years of professional experience was 10.8, with 6.3 years in the district. 0% of our new teachers had advanced degrees.

Strengths

- Town Center serves a diverse student population, including learners from a variety of racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. Emergent Bilingual learners represent 22.3% of the campus population and speak a wide range of home languages.
- Town Center has an experienced teaching staff, with educators averaging 14 years of professional experience and 8.7 years of experience within the district.
- Town Center maintained a high average daily attendance rate of 96.9% in 2025–26, an increase of 0.8 percentage points from the previous year.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★	Early Childhood attendance continues to fall below the overall campus attendance rate, resulting in reduced access to consistent Tier I instruction and learning opportunities.	Families may need additional communication and support regarding the importance of consistent Pre-K attendance and the impact of missed instructional time on early learning and school readiness.
2★	Female learners are underrepresented in the campus Gifted and Talented population. While females represent 47.6% of the overall learner population, they represent only 11.8% of identified GT learners.	The significant difference in GT identification by gender indicates a need to further examine referral and identification patterns to determine possible factors that may be contributing to the discrepancy.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

mCLASS K-5:

Click [HERE](#) for Kindergarten-5th grade mCLASS composite score differentials between 25-26 BOY, MOY, and 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
Town Center Elementary						
Total Students	12	18	20	20	19	15
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	29.41%	84.62%	52.94%	53.85%	16.67%
1 Level Higher	-	64.71%	15.38%	47.06%	46.15%	83.33%
2 Levels Higher	-	5.88%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1.95	3	2.26	2.83	2.83	3.47
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	33.33%	0%	5%	0%	5.26%	0%
Intermediate	50%	33.33%	75%	40%	26.32%	13.33%
Advanced	8.33%	27.78%	20%	40%	47.37%	13.33%
Advanced High	8.33%	38.89%	0%	20%	21.05%	73.33%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	17.4	20.9	19.16	20.47
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1562.25	1624.2	1556.53	1488.87
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	21.8	25.5	25.26	26.87
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1468	1530.15	1531.74	1494.33
Writing Raw Score	0	0	11.45	16.2	26.68	28.53
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1474.55	1477.75	1522.42	1454.67
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12.55	20.95	23.21	24.93
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1470.65	1568.85	1586.37	1521.73
Economic Disadvantage						

Total Students	1	4	1	7	1	4
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	25%	-	50%	100%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	50%	-	50%	0%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	25%	-	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1	3.2	2.3	2.89	2.8	3.03
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	25%	100%	42.86%	0%	25%
Advanced	0%	25%	0%	28.57%	100%	50%
Advanced High	0%	50%	0%	28.57%	0%	25%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	15	21.43	20	16.25
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1527	1630.86	1560	1192
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	26	27	25	21.25
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1530	1554.43	1517	1191
Writing Raw Score	0	0	6	16	26	18
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1343	1477	1524	1124.25
Reading Raw Score	0	0	11	20.71	28	16.25
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1456	1574.86	1644	1171.25
Asian						
Total Students	11	15	16	13	18	11
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	28.57%	90%	54.55%	58.33%	10%
1 Level Higher	-	71.43%	10%	45.45%	41.67%	90%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.04	3.01	2.32	2.82	2.79	3.59
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	27.27%	0%	6.25%	0%	5.56%	0%
Intermediate	54.55%	33.33%	68.75%	38.46%	27.78%	9.09%
Advanced	9.09%	33.33%	25%	38.46%	50%	0%
Advanced High	9.09%	33.33%	0%	23.08%	16.67%	90.91%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	18	20.31	18.94	22
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1571	1611.23	1553.61	1596.82
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	21.69	24.77	25.17	28.91

Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1466.38	1517.08	1530.67	1604.64
Writing Raw Score	0	0	12.13	17.31	26.56	32.36
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1489.69	1494.15	1521.06	1574.82
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12.75	21.54	23	28.09
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1472.63	1581.08	1584	1649.18
Black/African American						
Total Students	1	-	-	-	-	-
Date Taken	03/01/26	-	-	-	-	-
Lower/Same Level	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 Level Higher	-	-	-	-	-	-
2 Levels Higher	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 Levels Higher	-	-	-	-	-	-
TELPAS Composite Score	1	-	-	-	-	-
No Rating	0%	-	-	-	-	-
Beginning	100%	-	-	-	-	-
Intermediate	0%	-	-	-	-	-
Advanced	0%	-	-	-	-	-
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	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic						
Total Students	-	-	3	2	-	1
Date Taken	-	-	03/01/26	03/01/26	-	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	-	66.67%	50%	-	100%
1 Level Higher	-	-	33.33%	50%	-	0%
2 Levels Higher	-	-	0%	0%	-	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	-	0%	0%	-	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	-	-	1.93	2.65	-	2.8
No Rating	-	-	0%	0%	-	0%

Beginning	-	-	0%	0%	-	0%
Intermediate	-	-	100%	50%	-	0%
Advanced	-	-	0%	50%	-	100%
Advanced High	-	-	0%	0%	-	0%
Listening Raw Score	-	-	15	22	-	19
Listening Scale Score	-	-	1527.33	1662	-	1547
Speaking Raw Score	-	-	21	25	-	28
Speaking Scale Score	-	-	1456	1523	-	1579
Writing Raw Score	-	-	9.67	12.5	-	21
Writing Scale Score	-	-	1437.67	1421.5	-	1467
Reading Raw Score	-	-	12	19	-	22
Reading Scale Score	-	-	1465	1532	-	1565
Two or More Races						
Total Students	-	1	-	-	-	-
Date Taken	-	03/01/26	-	-	-	-
Lower/Same Level	-	0%	-	-	-	-
1 Level Higher	-	100%	-	-	-	-
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
TELPAS Composite Score	-	3.8	-	-	-	-
No Rating	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Beginning	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Intermediate	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Advanced	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Advanced High	-	100%	-	-	-	-
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	1	5	1	3

Date Taken	-	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	02/17/26
Lower/Same Level	-	50%	-	50%	0%	0%
1 Level Higher	-	0%	-	50%	100%	100%
2 Levels Higher	-	50%	-	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	-	2.5	2.3	2.92	3.5	3.15
No Rating	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	-	50%	100%	40%	0%	33.33%
Advanced	-	0%	0%	40%	0%	33.33%
Advanced High	-	50%	0%	20%	100%	33.33%
Listening Raw Score	-	0	15	22	23	15.33
Listening Scale Score	-	0	1527	1642.8	1609	1073.67
Speaking Raw Score	-	0	26	27.6	27	19
Speaking Scale Score	-	0	1530	1567	1551	1061.67
Writing Raw Score	-	0	6	14.8	29	17
Writing Scale Score	-	0	1343	1457.6	1547	1010
Reading Raw Score	-	0	11	20.2	27	14.33
Reading Scale Score	-	0	1456	1551.8	1629	1040
Currently Emergent Bilingual						
Total Students	12	18	20	20	18	15
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	29.41%	84.62%	52.94%	53.85%	16.67%
1 Level Higher	-	64.71%	15.38%	47.06%	46.15%	83.33%
2 Levels Higher	-	5.88%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1.95	3	2.26	2.83	2.81	3.47
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	33.33%	0%	5%	0%	5.56%	0%
Intermediate	50%	33.33%	75%	40%	27.78%	13.33%
Advanced	8.33%	27.78%	20%	40%	44.44%	13.33%
Advanced High	8.33%	38.89%	0%	20%	22.22%	73.33%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	17.4	20.9	19.11	20.47
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1562.25	1624.2	1556.33	1488.87
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	21.8	25.5	25.11	26.87
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1468	1530.15	1529.11	1494.33

Writing Raw Score	0	0	11.45	16.2	26.33	28.53
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1474.55	1477.75	1519.17	1454.67
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12.55	20.95	22.72	24.93
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1470.65	1568.85	1578.89	1521.73
Special Ed Indicator						
Total Students	1	4	1	7	1	4
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	50%	100%	71.43%	100%	0%
1 Level Higher	-	50%	0%	28.57%	0%	100%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1	2.35	2.3	2.1	2	3.4
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	75%	100%	85.71%	100%	0%
Advanced	0%	25%	0%	14.29%	0%	25%
Advanced High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	16	17.86	17	22
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1540	1577.86	1522	1594.25
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	23	21.57	23	29.25
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1482	1460.43	1494	1608.25
Writing Raw Score	0	0	11	10	24	28.75
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1479	1382.43	1507	1543.5
Reading Raw Score	0	0	15	13.43	17	24.5
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1494	1462.14	1509	1598.75

	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
Town Center Elementary							
Total Students	72	82	74	72	81	74	74
Raw Score	23	27	28	29	32	36	19
Scale Score	1527	1630	1723	1507	1633	1685	4053

Percent Score	62.20%	66.62%	66.96%	56.60%	62.44%	69.52%	62.70%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	77.78%	85.37%	86.49%	80.56%	92.59%	91.89%	82.42%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	56.94%	67.07%	67.57%	59.72%	75.31%	78.38%	56.76%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	37.50%	43.90%	35.14%	37.50%	39.51%	51.35%	33.78%
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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	12.50%	3.66%	5.41%	12.50%	4.94%	2.70%	5.41%
Did Not Meet High	9.72%	10.98%	8.11%	6.94%	2.47%	5.41%	12.16%
Approaches Low	6.94%	8.54%	10.81%	9.72%	8.64%	6.76%	13.51%
Approaches High	13.89%	9.76%	8.11%	11.11%	8.64%	6.76%	12.16%
Meets	19.44%	23.17%	32.43%	22.22%	35.80%	27.03%	22.97%
Masters	37.50%	43.90%	35.14%	37.50%	39.51%	51.35%	33.78%
Economic Disadvantage							
Total Students	10	10	12	10	10	12	12
Raw Score	18	22	22	24	29	32	15
Scale Score	1411	1535	1621	1415	1585	1624	3702
Percent Score	47.84%	54.75%	52.38%	45.38%	55.77%	61.22%	50.83%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	60%	80%	58.33%	70%	80%	83.33%	66.67%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	20%	50%	41.67%	40%	70%	58.33%	33.33%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	20%	10%	8.33%	20%	20%	41.67%	16.67%
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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	20%	10%	16.67%	20%	20%	0%	16.67%
Did Not Meet High	20%	10%	25%	10%	0%	16.67%	16.67%
Approaches Low	20%	20%	8.33%	10%	0%	25%	8.33%
Approaches High	20%	10%	8.33%	20%	10%	0%	25%
Meets	0%	40%	33.33%	20%	50%	16.67%	16.67%
Masters	20%	10%	8.33%	20%	20%	41.67%	16.67%
Asian							
Total Students	27	44	35	27	43	35	35

Raw Score	25	29	33	31	35	40	22
Scale Score	1581	1687	1824	1535	1670	1738	4328
Percent Score	66.97%	73.41%	79.12%	59.62%	67.53%	76.48%	72.38%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	81.48%	88.64%	100%	81.48%	93.02%	100%	94.29%%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	79.55%	88.57%	62.96%	81.40%	94.29%	77.14%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	40.74%	61.36%	54.29%	40.74%	58.14%	62.86%	51.43%
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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	11.11%	0%	0%	7.41%	2.33%	0%	0%
Did Not Meet High	7.41%	11.36%	0%	11.11%	4.65%	0%	5.71%
Approaches Low	3.70%	4.55%	2.86%	11.11%	4.65%	2.86%	8.57%
Approaches High	11.11%	4.55%	8.57%	7.41%	6.98%	2.86%	8.57%
Meets	25.93%	18.18%	34.29%	22.22%	23.26%	31.43%	25.71%
Masters	40.74%	61.36%	54.29%	40.74%	58.14%	62.86%	51.43%

Black/African American

Total Students	3	3	1	3	3	1	1
Raw Score	16	17	18	25	24	15	8
Scale Score	1370	1459	1543	1452	1516	1400	3125
Percent Score	43.24%	43.33%	42.86%	48.72%	46.15%	28.85%	26.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	66.67%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	0%	0%	0%	33.33%	33.33%	0%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	0%	33.33%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Did Not Meet High	33.33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Approaches Low	33.33%	33.33%	100%	33.33%	33.33%	0%	0%
Approaches High	33.33%	33.33%	0%	33.33%	33.33%	0%	0%
Meets	0%	0%	0%	33.33%	33.33%	0%	0%
Masters	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Hispanic

Total Students	11	13	7	11	13	7	7
Raw Score	20	21	19	27	28	31	14
Scale Score	1452	1516	1557	1467	1564	1599	3613
Percent Score	53.56%	51.35%	45.58%	51.75%	53.11%	59.34%	48.10%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	72.73%	69.23%	57.14%	81.82%	84.62%	71.43%	71.43%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	36.36%	30.77%	28.57%	54.55%	53.85%	71.43%	28.57%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	27.27%	7.69%	0%	27.27%	23.08%	42.86%	14.29%
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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	27.27%	7.69%	28.57%	18.18%	15.38%	14.29%	28.57%
Did Not Meet High	0%	23.08%	14.29%	0%	0%	14.29%	0%
Approaches Low	18.18%	15.38%	14.29%	18.18%	23.08%	0%	14.29%
Approaches High	18.18%	23.08%	14.29%	9.09%	7.69%	0%	28.57%
Meets	9.09%	23.08%	28.57%	27.27%	30.77%	28.57%	14.29%
Masters	27.27%	7.69%	0%	27.27%	23.08%	42.86%	14.29%

Two or More Races

Total Students	2	3	3	2	3	3	3
Raw Score	24	21	23	31	34	31	14
Scale Score	1524	1521	1620	1524	1636	1625	3622
Percent Score	64.86%	53.33%	53.97%	59.62%	64.74%	60.26%	46.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	66.67%	100%	100%	100%	33.33%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	50%	33.33%	33.33%	50%	100%	33.33%	33.33%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	0%	0%	33.33%	50%	0%	33.33%	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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	33.33%	0%	0%	0%	66.67%
Approaches Low	0%	33.33%	33.33%	0%	0%	33.33%	0%
Approaches High	50%	33.33%	0%	50%	0%	33.33%	0%
Meets	50%	33.33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	33.33%

Masters	0%	0%	33.33%	50%	0%	33.33%	0%
White							
Total Students	29	19	28	29	19	28	28
Raw Score	23	27	25	29	31	34	17
Scale Score	1522	1619	1657	1501	1614	1658	3896
Percent Score	62.81%	67.11%	59.35%	56.23%	59.51%	65.80%	57.26%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	75.86%	89.47%	78.57%	75.86%	94.74%	89.29%	78.57%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	62.07%	78.95%	57.14%	62.07%	78.95%	67.86%	42.86%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	44.83%	42.11%	21.43%	41.38%	21.05%	42.86%	21.43%
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%	0%
Did Not Meet Low	10.34%	5.26%	7.14%	17.24%	5.26%	0%	12.5%
Did Not Meet High	13.79%	5.26%	14.29%	6.90%	0%	10.71%	12.5%
Approaches Low	3.45%	5.26%	14.29%	3.45%	5.26%	10.71%	25%
Approaches High	10.34%	5.26%	7.14%	10.34%	10.53%	10.71%	12.5%
Meets	17.24%	36.84%	35.71%	20.69%	57.89%	25%	12.5%
Masters	44.83%	42.11%	21.43%	41.38%	21.05%	42.86%	25%
Currently Emergent Bilingual							
Total Students	19	18	15	19	18	15	8
Raw Score	20	26	26	24	27	33	17
Scale Score	1461	1620	1696	1418	1557	1633	3834
Percent Score	53.63%	64.86%	62.86%	45.34%	52.03%	63.08%	55%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	63.16%	72.22%	73.33%	63.16%	83.33%	93.33%	75%%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	42.11%	66.67%	46.67%	47.37%	61.11%	66.67%	37.5%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	21.05%	44.44%	40%	15.79%	16.67%	26.67%	25%
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%	0
Did Not Meet Low	21.05%	0%	6.67%	21.05%	5.56%	0%	12.5%
Did Not Meet High	15.79%	27.78%	20%	15.79%	11.11%	6.67%	12.5%
Approaches Low	5.26%	5.56%	6.67%	5.26%	11.11%	20%	25%

Approaches High	15.79%	0%	20%	10.53%	11.11%	6.67%	12.5%
Meets	21.05%	22.22%	6.67%	31.58%	44.44%	40%	12.5%
Masters	21.05%	44.44%	40%	15.79%	16.67%	26.67%	25%
First Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	-	2	5	-	2	5	8
Raw Score	-	32	34	-	43	40	20
Scale Score	-	1723	1841	-	1835	1761	4124
Percent Score	-	80%	81.43%	-	81.73%	77.31%	66.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	87.5%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	75%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	-	50%	60%	-	50%	60%	50%
Date Taken	-	05/01/26	05/01/26	-	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	-	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	-	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	-	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	-	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-
Approaches High	-	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-
Meets	-	50%	40%	-	50%	40%	-
Masters	-	50%	60%	-	50%	60%	-
Fourth Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	-	4	-	-	4	-	-
Raw Score	-	30	-	-	36	-	-
Scale Score	-	1676	-	-	1658	-	-
Percent Score	-	74.38%	-	-	68.75%	-	-
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	-
Meets Grade Level (TX)	-	75%	-	-	100%	-	-
Masters Grade Level (TX)	-	75%	-	-	50%	-	-
Date Taken	-	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	-	25%	-	-	0%	-	-
Meets	-	0%	-	-	50%	-	-
Masters	-	75%	-	-	50%	-	-
Second Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	2	1	-	2	1	-	-
Raw Score	31	36	-	39	46	-	-
Scale Score	1759	1830	-	1642	1838	-	-
Percent Score	83.78%	90%	-	75%	88.46%	-	-
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	-
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	-
Masters Grade Level (TX)	50%	100%	-	50%	100%	-	-
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	-	05/01/26	05/01/26	-	-
Excluded	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Approaches Low	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Meets	50%	0%	-	50%	0%	-	-
Masters	50%	100%	-	50%	100%	-	-
Special Ed Indicator							
Total Students	24	17	18	24	17	18	18
Raw Score	17	23	20	21	25	29	14
Scale Score	1401	1559	1583	1390	1525	1579	3653
Percent Score	46.51%	57.50%	48.28%	41.19%	47.96%	55.77%	48.15%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	50%	70.59%	61.11%	58.33%	94.12%	83.33%	66.67%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	29.17%	52.94%	33.33%	29.17%	47.06%	44.44%	22.22%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	16.67%	35.29%	5.56%	12.50%	11.76%	22.22%	5.56%
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%	0
Did Not Meet Low	29.17%	11.76%	16.67%	33.33%	5.88%	5.56%	5.56%

Did Not Meet High	20.83%	17.65%	22.22%	8.33%	0%	11.11%	27.78%
Approaches Low	8.33%	11.76%	16.67%	12.50%	35.29%	16.67%	22.22%
Approaches High	12.50%	5.88%	11.11%	16.67%	11.76%	22.22%	22.22%
Meets	12.50%	17.65%	27.78%	16.67%	35.29%	22.22%	16.67%
Masters	16.67%	35.29%	5.56%	12.50%	11.76%	22.22%	5.56%

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
- 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 Accelerated Instruction - Tutoring/ Documentation of Learner Growth

Strengths

- Overall student achievement on NWEA MAP was strong. Spring grade-level achievement percentiles ranged from the 92nd–99th percentile in reading and the 94th–99th percentile in math across grades K–5.
- Learners demonstrated strong academic growth across content areas as measured by NWEA MAP. In reading and math, all K–5 grade levels met or exceeded yearly projected growth as a grade level. In science, all grade levels assessed (2–5) met or exceeded yearly projected growth.
- Learners demonstrated strong achievement in Reading Language Arts on STAAR, particularly in grades 4 and 5. In Grade 4, 75.31% of learners performed at Meets Grade Level or above, and in Grade 5, 78.38% performed at Meets Grade Level or above, including 51.35% at Masters Grade Level.
- TELPAS data demonstrated areas of strong English language development, particularly in Grade 5, where 83.33% of learners with comparable data increased one proficiency level and 73.33% of Grade 5 Emergent Bilingual learners performed at the Advanced High level. Grade 1 also demonstrated positive language growth, with 70.59% of learners increasing at least one proficiency level.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★	While overall reading achievement and growth are strong, literacy performance is not yet consistent across grade levels, with areas of need evident in foundational reading skills, fluency, and comprehension.	There is a continued need to strengthen consistency in the use of formative data, targeted small-group instruction, and differentiated literacy supports to address specific learner needs across grade levels.
2★	English language proficiency growth for Emergent Bilingual learners is inconsistent across grade levels, with TELPAS data showing substantially lower rates of proficiency-level growth in grades 2-4 than in grades 1 and 5.	There is a continued need to strengthen consistent implementation of language-development supports and intentional integration of language objectives within Tier I instruction across grade levels.
3★	Students receiving special education services continue to demonstrate achievement gaps in reading and math compared with overall campus performance, particularly at the Meets Grade Level standard on STAAR.	There is a continued need to strengthen alignment between general education and special education instruction, including consistent co-planning, targeted small-group instruction, progress monitoring, and responsive instructional supports based on individual learner needs.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Town Center Elementary utilizes district curriculum, state standards, and a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework to meet the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of learners. The campus prioritizes high-quality Tier I instruction while providing targeted intervention and enrichment based on learner need. Grade-level intervention and enrichment time, “Prime Time,” is built into the master schedule to allow educators to flexibly group learners and provide targeted support and extension.

Collaborative planning and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are key components of the campus instructional process. Extended collaborative planning time is built into the master schedule on a two-week rotation, allowing teams to engage in the four critical questions of a PLC, analyze formative and summative assessment data, plan instruction, and determine appropriate responses for learners who need additional support or enrichment. Educators utilize formative assessments, progress-monitoring data, and district and state assessments to inform instructional decisions and monitor learner progress.

Town Center utilizes a collaborative approach to meeting diverse learner needs. Classroom educators work with campus and district support staff, including special education staff, the GT specialist, Language Acquisition Specialist, learning coaches, counselor, librarian, and administrators. Continued emphasis is placed on strengthening collaboration and co-planning between general education and special education staff, as well as the consistent use of instructional and language supports for Emergent Bilingual learners.

Through the MTSS process, educators, families, administrators, counselors, and campus and district specialists collaborate to identify learner needs, determine appropriate interventions and supports, monitor progress, and adjust plans based on learner response. The campus continues to strengthen consistency in progress monitoring, implementation of targeted supports, and the use of data to determine next instructional steps.

Town Center also supports the whole child through character development and social-emotional learning, counseling and student support services, positive behavior supports, family engagement opportunities, and partnerships with families and the community. Professional learning is aligned with campus and district priorities and identified learner needs, with an emphasis on building educator capacity to provide responsive Tier I instruction and supports for all learners.

Strengths

- Educators serve in leadership capacities at both the campus and district levels, contributing their expertise to collaborative decision-making and professional learning.
- Campus structures support effective Professional Learning Communities, including protected collaborative planning time and regular opportunities for teams to analyze learner data, plan instruction, and respond to learner needs.
- A dedicated grade-level intervention and enrichment block (“Prime Time”) provides time for flexible grouping and targeted academic support based on learner needs.
- Multiple assessment and progress-monitoring tools, including NWEA MAP, mCLASS, formative assessments, and state assessments, are used to monitor learner achievement and growth and inform instructional decisions.
- Technology is strategically integrated as a tool for learning, creation, collaboration, and access to instructional resources.
- Learners have access to a range of specialized services and supports, including Special Education, Emergent Bilingual, Gifted and Talented, 504, dyslexia, counseling, and instructional support services.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★ Learners need more authentic enrichment and hands-on learning with real-world applications.	The campus is working to strengthen cross-curricular and real-world connections and provide more consistent structures for hands-on learning and learner showcasing.
2 ★ Learners demonstrate inconsistent levels of perseverance, academic stamina, and self-regulation when engaged in challenging learning tasks.	Learners need more consistent opportunities across classrooms to develop and practice strategies for perseverance, productive struggle, self-regulation, and sustained engagement with challenging tasks.
3 ★ There is a need to continue revisiting and improving efforts with safety and security for the district.	New state requirements or identified areas of need by the district or campus need to be addressed.
4 ★ The implementation of a new K-5 literacy curriculum requires consistent instructional practices, collaborative planning, and ongoing monitoring to support effective Tier I literacy instruction.	The transition to a new literacy curriculum requires educators to develop familiarity with new resources, instructional routines, and expectations for implementation.
5 ★ There is a continued need to support intentional and balanced use of technology within the learning environment while maintaining opportunities for hands-on learning, collaboration, and social interaction.	Implementation of the new CISD Technology Framework requires continued staff learning and alignment around district screen-time expectations and the purposeful use of technology to enhance learning.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Town Center Elementary strives to create a welcoming and connected school community in which learners, educators, and families feel valued and supported. Campus practices reflect Coppell ISD's core values of Relationships, Engagement, Great Teaching, and Redefining Success.

Learner perception data reflects strong relationships and connection to the school community. Spring survey results for learners in grades 3–5 indicate that Supportive Relationships and Sense of Belonging rank around the 90th percentile nationally, while Engagement ranks around the 80th percentile. These results indicate that learners generally feel supported by adults and peers and connected to their school community. Survey data also identifies opportunities for continued growth in student perceptions of safety and respectful behavior, including peer interactions and access to adult support when concerns arise.

Family perception data reflects a positive overall experience at Town Center. Families report strong perceptions of School Climate, School Safety, School-Family Communication, and Staff-Family Relationships. Communication is a particular strength, with 96% favorable responses for School-Family Communication, 100% of responding families reporting that they receive information from the school, and 98% indicating that the information they receive is useful. Opportunities remain to continue expanding varied ways for families to participate in the school community and build connections with one another.

Town Center provides learners with opportunities to explore interests and build connections beyond the classroom through enrichment experiences, clubs, fine arts, academic activities, and other opportunities supported by staff, families, and community partners. The campus also provides multiple opportunities for families to connect with the school through academic and family events, volunteer experiences, parent meetings, and community activities.

Town Center utilizes learner and family perception data, along with other campus and district data, to inform decision-making and identify opportunities to strengthen the experiences of learners, educators, and families.

Strengths

- Learners report strong supportive relationships and a strong sense of belonging, with both areas ranking around the 90th percentile nationally on spring learner perception surveys.
- Families report a positive school climate and strong relationships with the campus, with School Climate receiving 92% favorable responses and School-Family Communication receiving 96% favorable responses.
- Communication with families is a significant campus strength, with 100% of responding families reporting that they receive information from the school and 98% indicating that the information they receive is useful.
- Learners have opportunities for choice, enrichment, mentoring, and connection beyond the classroom through a variety of clubs, activities, and campus experiences, while families have multiple opportunities to participate in academic, social, and community events.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ Family survey data indicates opportunities to strengthen parent participation and connections among families, while perceptions of school-family communication and staff-family relationships remain strong.	The campus can continue to expand varied and accessible opportunities for families to participate and build connections with other families within the school community.
2★ Learner perception data indicates an opportunity to strengthen respectful interactions and positive relationships among peers.	Learners need continued opportunities to develop and practice skills related to respectful communication, empathy, conflict resolution, and positive peer interactions.

★ = Priority



Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1
★

Early Childhood attendance continues to fall below the overall campus attendance rate, resulting in reduced access to consistent Tier I instruction and learning opportunities.

Families may need additional communication and support regarding the importance of consistent Pre-K attendance and the impact of missed instructional time on early learning and school readiness.

2
★

While overall reading achievement and growth are strong, literacy performance is not yet consistent across grade levels, with areas of need evident in foundational reading skills, fluency, and comprehension.

There is a continued need to strengthen consistency in the use of formative data, targeted small-group instruction, and differentiated literacy supports to address specific learner needs across grade levels.

3
★

Learners need more authentic enrichment and hands-on learning with real-world applications.

The campus is working to strengthen cross-curricular and real-world connections and provide more consistent structures for hands-on learning and learner showcasing.

4
★

Learners demonstrate inconsistent levels of perseverance, academic stamina, and self-regulation when engaged in challenging learning tasks.

Learners need more consistent opportunities across classrooms to develop and practice strategies for perseverance, productive struggle, self-regulation, and sustained engagement with challenging tasks.

5
★

Family survey data indicates opportunities to strengthen parent participation and connections among families, while perceptions of school-family communication and staff-family relationships remain strong.

The campus can continue to expand varied and accessible opportunities for families to participate and build connections with other families within the school community.

6
★

English language proficiency growth for Emergent Bilingual learners is inconsistent across grade levels, with TELPAS data showing substantially lower rates of proficiency-level growth in grades 2-4 than in grades 1 and 5.

There is a continued need to strengthen consistent implementation of language-development supports and intentional integration of language objectives within Tier I instruction across grade levels.

7★

Learner perception data indicates an opportunity to strengthen respectful interactions and positive relationships among peers.

Learners need continued opportunities to develop and practice skills related to respectful communication, empathy, conflict resolution, and positive peer interactions.

8★

Students receiving special education services continue to demonstrate achievement gaps in reading and math compared with overall campus performance, particularly at the Meets Grade Level standard on STAAR.

There is a continued need to strengthen alignment between general education and special education instruction, including consistent co-planning, targeted small-group instruction, progress monitoring, and responsive instructional supports based on individual learner needs.

9★

There is a need to continue revisiting and improving efforts with safety and security for the district.

New state requirements or identified areas of need by the district or campus need to be addressed.

10★

The implementation of a new K-5 literacy curriculum requires consistent instructional practices, collaborative planning, and ongoing monitoring to support effective Tier I literacy instruction.

The transition to a new literacy curriculum requires educators to develop familiarity with new resources, instructional routines, and expectations for implementation.

11★

There is a continued need to support intentional and balanced use of technology within the learning environment while maintaining opportunities for hands-on learning, collaboration, and social interaction.

Implementation of the new CISD Technology Framework requires continued staff learning and alignment around district screen-time expectations and the purposeful use of technology to enhance learning.

12★

Female learners are underrepresented in the campus Gifted and Talented population. While females represent 47.6% of the overall learner population, they represent only 11.8% of identified GT learners.

The significant difference in GT identification by gender indicates a need to further examine referral and identification patterns to determine possible factors that may be contributing to the discrepancy.

★ = Priority



Data Documentation for CNA

Data Documentation for CNA

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

Improvement Planning Data

- ☒ District goals
- ☒ Campus goals
- ☒ HB3 CCMR goals
- ☒ Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- ☒ Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data

Accountability Data

- ☒ Community Based Accountability System (CBAS)

Student Data: Assessments

- ☒ State and federally required assessment information
- ☒ Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- ☒ Local benchmark or common assessments data
- ☒ Observation Survey results
- ☒ Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- ☒ Grades that measure student performance based on the TEKS

Student Data: Student Groups

- ☒ Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- ☒ Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- ☒ Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- ☒ Section 504 data
- ☒ Gifted and talented data
- ☒ Dyslexia data

- ☒ Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- ☒ Attendance data
- ☒ Discipline records
- ☒ Student surveys and/or other feedback

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



Goals

Goal 1

Accountability for Learning: We as CISD will achieve our full potential by learning at high levels, taking ownership of our learning, and staying focused on our commitment to continuous growth and evidence-based outcomes for all.

Performance Objective 1

Increase the percentage of all learners earning Meets Grade Level and above on the 2027 Spring Reading STAAR from 74% to 80%, the 2027 Spring Math STAAR from 66% to 75%, and the 2027 Spring Science STAAR from 58% to 70%.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR, NWEA MAP Projections

Strategy 1

The percentage of 3rd-grade learners earning Meets Grade Level and above on the STAAR Reading test will increase from 72% in June 2024 to 80% in June 2029, and the percentage of 3rd-grade learners earning 'Meets Grade Level' and above on the STAAR Math test will increase from 66% in June 2024 to 76% in June 2029.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Third-grade learners will demonstrate increased mastery of grade-level Reading and Math TEKS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Teachers, Learning Coach, Language Acquisition Specialist, Special Education Staff

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Provide targeted small-group reading and math instruction based on mCLASS, MAP, STAAR, formative assessment, and progress-monitoring data.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will demonstrate increased mastery of grade-level Reading and Math TEKS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 3

Funding Sources: Intervention materials 199 - State Comp Ed, 199-11-6399-00-108-24-000-21171, \$6,157

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Use Collaborative Team Time to analyze multiple sources of learner data, develop or select formative assessments, and make timely instructional decisions for intervention and enrichment.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instructional adjustments occur in real time, improving growth for all sub-populations.

Collaborative team decisions result in consistent intervention and enrichment plans, improving growth for all sub-populations.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators, GT Specialist, Language Acquisition Specialist

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 4

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 4

Utilize interventionists to provide targeted reading and math support for learners at risk of not meeting grade-level standards or not demonstrating expected growth.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased achievement and growth for learners receiving targeted intervention, including learners requiring accelerated instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Learning Coach, Classroom Teachers, Interventionist

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2

Funding Sources: Campus Interventionist 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6128-00-108-24-000-21171, \$12,000, Intervention Materials 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6399-00-108-11-000-21171, \$14,500

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 5

Participate in district Content Academies and apply the learning to strengthen standards-aligned planning and Tier I instruction in reading and math.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased consistency and rigor in Tier I reading and math instruction, resulting in increased learner engagement, achievement, and growth.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators

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

Formative Reviews

November	February	April	June
----------	----------	-------	------

Strategy 6

Implement HMH Into Reading and continue implementation of STEMscopes Math through collaborative planning, professional learning, and instructional support to strengthen consistent Tier I reading and math instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will consistently implement aligned literacy and math curriculum resources and instructional practices, resulting in strengthened Tier I literacy and math instruction and improved learner achievement and growth in reading and math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators, Content Directors

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4

Funding Sources: Vertical Design Days 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6112-00-108-11-000-21171, \$6,250

Formative Reviews

November	February	April	June
----------	----------	-------	------

Strategy 7

Strengthen the consistent use of language-development supports and intentional language objectives within Tier I instruction for Emergent Bilingual learners.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Emergent Bilingual learners will have increased opportunities to develop academic language within content instruction, supporting growth in English language proficiency and academic achievement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Language Acquisition Specialist, Administrators, Teachers, Learning Coach

Problem Statements: Student Learning 2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 8

Review GT referral and identification data and processes, including gender representation, and compare identification patterns with campus achievement data to identify trends and determine whether additional campus actions are needed.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus staff will develop a clearer understanding of GT referral and identification patterns, including how they relate to achievement patterns by gender, and use the findings to determine whether additional actions or supports are needed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, GT Specialist, GTI Committee Members

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement

Root Cause

2

Female learners are underrepresented in the campus Gifted and Talented population. While females represent 47.6% of the overall learner population, they represent only 11.8% of identified GT learners.

The significant difference in GT identification by gender indicates a need to further examine referral and identification patterns to determine possible factors that may be contributing to the discrepancy.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

While overall reading achievement and growth are strong, literacy performance is not yet consistent across grade levels, with areas of need evident in foundational reading skills, fluency, and comprehension.

There is a continued need to strengthen consistency in the use of formative data, targeted small-group instruction, and differentiated literacy supports to address specific learner needs across grade levels.

2

English language proficiency growth for Emergent Bilingual learners is inconsistent across grade levels, with TELPAS data showing substantially lower rates of proficiency-level growth in grades 2-4 than in grades 1 and 5.

There is a continued need to strengthen consistent implementation of language-development supports and intentional integration of language objectives within Tier I instruction across grade levels.

3

Students receiving special education services continue to demonstrate achievement gaps in reading and math compared with overall campus performance, particularly at the Meets Grade Level standard on STAAR.

There is a continued need to strengthen alignment between general education and special education instruction, including consistent co-planning, targeted small-group instruction, progress monitoring, and responsive instructional supports based on individual learner needs.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement

Root Cause

4

The implementation of a new K-5 literacy curriculum requires consistent instructional practices, collaborative planning, and ongoing monitoring to support effective Tier I literacy instruction.

The transition to a new literacy curriculum requires educators to develop familiarity with new resources, instructional routines, and expectations for implementation.

Performance Objective 2

By May 2027, increase the percentage of learners receiving special education services who meet or exceed one year's expected growth in reading and math by at least 5 percentage points, as measured by identified campus and district growth measures.

Evaluation Data Source: 4th-5th STAAR, Kinder- 3rd NWEA MAP

Strategy 1

Strengthen co-teaching and inclusive instructional practices to increase access to grade-level instruction and targeted support for learners receiving special education services.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners receiving special education services will have increased access to grade-level content and appropriately targeted instructional support.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Special Education Teachers, General Education Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Strategy 2

Monitor the academic progress of learners receiving special education services at least every other week and use the data to adjust instructional supports and interventions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Timely instructional adjustments will support increased growth in reading and math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Special Education Teachers, General Education Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Strategy 3

Provide structured collaboration and co-planning opportunities for general education and special education staff to align instruction, supports, and interventions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Instructional plans and supports will be better aligned to grade-level expectations and individual learner needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Special Education Teachers, General Education Teachers, Learning Coach, Administrators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

3

Students receiving special education services continue to demonstrate achievement gaps in reading and math compared with overall campus performance, particularly at the Meets Grade Level standard on STAAR.

There is a continued need to strengthen alignment between general education and special education instruction, including consistent co-planning, targeted small-group instruction, progress monitoring, and responsive instructional supports based on individual learner needs.

Goal 2

Organization that Cultivates Excellence: We as CISD will maintain high standards as we reimagine how we teach, learn and define success to adapt, innovate and meet the unique needs of all learners.

Performance Objective 1

By May 2027, 100% of K-5 learners will participate in at least two authentic learning, enrichment, service-learning, or career-awareness experiences that extend learning beyond the traditional classroom setting.

Evaluation Data Source: Grade-level learner participation tracker/roster, club participation records; service-learning documentation; community partnership records; classroom/campus evidence of authentic learning experiences

Strategy 1

Leverage partnerships with local businesses, organizations, and community members to provide authentic STEAM, career-awareness, and real-world learning experiences for learners.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will have increased access to authentic, real-world experiences that extend classroom learning and expose them to a variety of interests, skills, and career pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Teachers, Counselor

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

November	February	April	June
----------	----------	-------	------

Strategy 2

Provide a variety of enrichment clubs and activities that allow learners to explore interests, develop skills, and extend learning beyond the core instructional program.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will have opportunities to explore individual interests, develop new skills, and participate in engaging experiences beyond the core instructional program.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Club Sponsors

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Strategy 3

Provide opportunities for learners to participate in service-learning experiences that allow them to make meaningful contributions to the school or broader community.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will apply their skills and learning in authentic contexts while developing leadership, responsibility, and a sense of connection to their school and community.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Teachers, Counselor

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 2

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1Learners need more authentic enrichment and hands-on learning with real-world applications.	The campus is working to strengthen cross-curricular and real-world connections and provide more consistent structures for hands-on learning and learner showcasing.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
2Learner perception data indicates an opportunity to strengthen respectful interactions and positive relationships among peers.	Learners need continued opportunities to develop and practice skills related to respectful communication, empathy, conflict resolution, and positive peer interactions.

Performance Objective 2

By May 2027, maintain at least 90% favorable responses in School-Family Communication in the family perception survey and provide at least four varied academic, cultural, or community-building family

engagement opportunities throughout the school year.

Evaluation Data Source: Family perception survey results; family engagement event calendar; family participation/attendance records

Strategy 1

Maintain multiple accessible communication methods for families and monitor access to identify and address communication needs, including translation and technology access.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will have consistent access to school information and resources, supporting continued strong school-family communication.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Strategy 2

Collaborate with district and campus staff to plan and implement at least four varied academic, cultural, or community-building opportunities for families to engage in learning and connect with the school community.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will have multiple opportunities to participate in campus experiences, strengthen home-school connections, and build connections within the school community.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - Perceptions 1

Funding Sources: Family Engagement Night Materials & Presenter Costs 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-61-6399-00-108-11-000-21171, \$1,499

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Strategy 3

Provide families with practical tools and strategies to support learning at home and reinforce campus and grade-level learning priorities.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families will have practical tools to support and reinforce student learning at home, and an increase in family perception of school engagement and belonging.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Teachers, Campus Specialists

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

Funding Sources: Reading Materials - Take home book bag sets w/parent resources 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6329-00-108-24-000-21171, \$750

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	While overall reading achievement and growth are strong, literacy performance is not yet consistent across grade levels, with areas of need evident in foundational reading skills, fluency, and comprehension.	There is a continued need to strengthen consistency in the use of formative data, targeted small-group instruction, and differentiated literacy supports to address specific learner needs across grade levels.
2	English language proficiency growth for Emergent Bilingual learners is inconsistent across grade levels, with TELPAS data showing substantially lower rates of proficiency-level growth in grades 2-4 than in grades 1 and 5.	There is a continued need to strengthen consistent implementation of language-development supports and intentional integration of language objectives within Tier I instruction across grade levels.
3	Students receiving special education services continue to demonstrate achievement gaps in reading and math compared with overall campus performance, particularly at the Meets Grade Level standard on STAAR.	There is a continued need to strengthen alignment between general education and special education instruction, including consistent co-planning, targeted small-group instruction, progress monitoring, and responsive instructional supports based on individual learner needs.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 Family survey data indicates opportunities to strengthen parent participation and connections among families, while perceptions of school-family communication and staff-family relationships remain strong.	The campus can continue to expand varied and accessible opportunities for families to participate and build connections with other families within the school community.

Performance Objective 3

By May 2027, strengthen the intentional and balanced use of technology within instruction through the implementation of the CISD Technology Framework, including district screen-time expectations, Technology TEKS, hands-on learning, collaboration, and purposeful use of digital tools.

Evaluation Data Source: CISD Technology Framework implementation evidence; classroom walkthrough/ observation data; staff professional learning and implementation evidence; staff/family feedback

Strategy 1

Implement the CISD Technology Framework through staff learning, collaborative planning, and ongoing instructional support focused on district screen-time expectations, Technology TEKS, purposeful use of digital tools, and a balance of technology with hands-on, collaborative learning experiences.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will implement the CISD Technology Framework with increased consistency, resulting in purposeful use of technology that supports critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, and differentiated learning while maintaining a balance of hands-on learning, collaboration, and social interaction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Teachers, Librarian, Learning Coach

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 5

Formative Reviews

November	February	April	June
----------	----------	-------	------

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement

Root Cause

5

There is a continued need to support intentional and balanced use of technology within the learning environment while maintaining opportunities for hands-on learning, collaboration, and social interaction.

Implementation of the new CISD Technology Framework requires continued staff learning and alignment around district screen-time expectations and the purposeful use of technology to enhance learning.

Goal 3

Safety, Wellness and Belonging: We as CISD will create physically secure and emotionally safe environments that allow others to be seen, valued, and supported within a culture of belonging and engagement.

Performance Objective 1

By May 2027, strengthen learner belonging, well-being, and engagement through consistent relationship-building practices, character education, and targeted supports that address social-emotional, behavioral, and attendance needs.

Evaluation Data Source: Panorama/student perception survey data; attendance data; discipline and behavior data; MTSS/intervention documentation; counseling/SEL support records; implementation evidence from class meetings

Strategy 1

Implement consistent character education, class meetings, and relationship-building practices that support positive peer relationships, self-regulation, responsible decision-making, and a sense of belonging.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will demonstrate increased understanding and application of positive character traits, relationship skills, and strategies for managing emotions and resolving conflicts.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Counselor, Teachers

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Formative Reviews

November	February	April	June
----------	----------	-------	------

Strategy 2

Utilize MTSS processes and learner data to identify learners demonstrating additional social-emotional or behavioral needs and provide targeted supports.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners needing additional support will receive timely, targeted interventions designed to strengthen behavioral, social-emotional, and relationship skills.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Counselor, Teachers, Intervention/Support Staff

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Monitor attendance regularly, with a specific focus on Early Childhood, and provide targeted communication and support to families of learners demonstrating attendance concerns.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners with attendance concerns will receive timely support, resulting in improved attendance and more consistent access to instruction and learning opportunities.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Early Childhood Teachers, Counselor, Attendance Clerk

Problem Statements: Demographics 1

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 4

Reinforce consistent campus-wide behavior expectations and positive behavior supports to promote respectful interactions, responsible decision-making, and a positive school community.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will experience consistent behavioral expectations and recognition across campus, supporting positive peer interactions, responsible behavior, and a stronger sense of belonging.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Counselor, Teachers

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 Early Childhood attendance continues to fall below the overall campus attendance rate, resulting in reduced access to consistent Tier I instruction and learning opportunities.	Families may need additional communication and support regarding the importance of consistent Pre-K attendance and the impact of missed instructional time on early learning and school readiness.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
2 Learner perception data indicates an opportunity to strengthen respectful interactions and positive relationships among peers.	Learners need continued opportunities to develop and practice skills related to respectful communication, empathy, conflict resolution, and positive peer interactions.

Performance Objective 2

By May 2027, maintain a safe and secure learning environment through consistent implementation, monitoring, and review of district and state safety procedures and practices.

Evaluation Data Source: Safety drill documentation; campus safety audit and door sweep data; staff safety training records; safety procedure documentation; threat assessment and safety support records, as applicable.

Strategy 1

Implement, monitor, and reinforce campus safety procedures through required drills, staff and learner training, regular safety checks, and timely response to identified safety concerns.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Staff and learners will demonstrate understanding of and consistently follow established safety procedures, while identified safety concerns are addressed in a timely manner to maintain a safe and secure learning environment.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, Teachers, Campus Staff

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

November	February	April	June
----------	----------	-------	------

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
3 There is a need to continue revisiting and improving efforts with safety and security for the district.	New state requirements or identified areas of need by the district or campus need to be addressed.



State Compensatory Education

State Compensatory

Budget for Town Center Elementary

Total SCE Funds: \$6,157.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

State Compensatory Education funds will be used to purchase supplemental intervention materials and resources to support students identified as at risk and/or in need of additional academic support. These resources will primarily support students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions through the campus RTI/MTSS process, including students who did not meet standards on previous district or state assessments or who are not currently on track to meet grade-level expectations. The materials will supplement the regular education program by providing targeted, evidence-based intervention and additional opportunities for students to strengthen identified areas of academic need and accelerate learning.



Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I, Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	4	Campus Interventionist	211-11-61 28-00-1 08-24-0 00-21171	\$12,000.00
1	1	4	Intervention Materials	211-11-63 99-00-1 08-11-0 00-21171	\$14,500.00
1	1	6	Vertical Design Days	211-11-61 12-00-1 08-11-0 00-21171	\$6,250.00
2	2	2	Family Engagement Night Materials & Presenter Costs	211-61-6 399-00- 108-11-0 00-21171	\$1,499.00
2	2	3	Reading Materials - Take home book bag sets w/ parent resources	211-11-63 29-00-1 08-24-0 00-21171	\$750.00
				Sub-Total	\$34,999.00

199 - State Comp Ed

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	Intervention materials	199-11-6 399-00- 108-24- 000-211 71	\$6,157.00
				Sub-Total	\$6,157.00



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