

Coppell Independent School District



Wilson Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

"At Wilson Elementary, we provide a safe environment where each learner is loved, valued, and accepted. We embrace and address the needs of the whole child, encourage academic, social and emotional growth, and develop character to the highest level. We promote wonder and build a community of empowered, curious minds. We inspire lifelong learners who positively impact the world."

Wilson Ranger Educator Creed

I am a Wilson Ranger Educator.

I have Great Expectations for my learners and myself.

I accept the challenge to be the best I can be.

It is my responsibility to create a learning environment conducive

to optimum academic, social, and emotional growth. I provide a model of decorum and respect that guides my learners as well as honors them.

I cherish every learner. I change the world one learner at a time.

I am a Wilson Ranger Educator.

Value Statement

CISD 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	23
Perceptions	27
Priority Problem Statements	30
Data Documentation for CNA	34
Improvement Planning Data	35
Accountability Data	35
Student Data: Assessments	35
Student Data: Student Groups	35
Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators	35
Employee Data	35
Parent/Community Data	36
Support Systems and Other Data	36
Goals	37
Goal 1 : Accountability for Learning: We as Wilson Elementary will achieve our full p...	38
Goal 2 : Organization that Cultivates Excellence: We as Wilson Elementary will mai...	45
Goal 3 : Safety, Wellness and Belonging: We as Wilson Elementary will create physi...	49
State Compensatory Education	54
Budget for Wilson Elementary	55
Funding Summary	56
211 - Title I, Part A	57
199 - State Comp Ed	57
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements	58



Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

DEMOGRAPHICS

Wilson 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 521 which represents an increase of 10.3% from the prior year (+49 total learners).

In 2025-26, the student population was 31.5% Asian, 38.6% White, 17.5% Hispanic, 4% African American, 0.8% American Indian/Alaskan Native and 7.7% multi-racial. Females made up 48.2% of the learners and males represented 51.8%. Our economically disadvantaged percentage was 13.8%.

Our Emergent Bilingual (EB) population consisted of 65 learners that made up 12.5% of our campus. The top 5 foreign languages spoken by this student group were: Spanish (29.2%), Nepali (9.2%), Other Languages (9.2%), Urdu (7.7%), and Korean (7.7%). Additionally, 38.5% of our EBs were also economically disadvantaged.

Our 63 gifted and talented learners constituted 12.1% of our population. Our gender split in the GT group was 33.3% female and 66.7% male. Of the four major ethnic groups, our GT learners were 38.1% Asian, 33.3% White, 12.7% Hispanic and 1.6% African American.

We had 127 learners that qualified for special education services, which represented 24.4% of our population. There were 21 learners with 504 accommodations, which was 4% of the total enrollment.

The average daily attendance for our campus in 2025-26 was 97%, which increased by 0.8% from the prior year.

STAFFING

Wilson employed 39 educators and 10 instructional aides in the 2025-26 school year. The number of teachers decreased by 4 from the prior year while the number of aides decreased by 3. The ethnic breakdown for the teaching staff was 87.2% White and 12.8% Hispanic. Females made up 94.9% of the educators and males represented 5.1%.

Overall, our educators had a varied level of professional experience: 12.8% (5) had 2-5 years, 10.3% (4) had 6-10 years, 28.2% (11) had 11-15 years, 20.5% (8) had 16-20 years, and 28.2% (11) had more than 20 years. Looking at longevity within the district, 7.7% of our teachers had 0-1 years in district, 28.2% had 2-5 years, 20.5% had 6-10 years, 20.5% had 11-15 years, 12.8% had 16-20 years and 10.3% had more than 20 years. The average years of professional experience was 15.9 with 10.1 years in the district.

Advanced degrees were held by 23% of our teachers: 9 with master's degrees. Our campus principal had 16 years of career experience in a professional position (not necessarily as a principal) and 10 years in Coppell. Our assistant principal had 15 years of professional experience and 10 years in the district.

Our educator retention rate from 2024-25 to 2025-26 was 38.6%. For educational aides it was 23.1%. We hired 22 new teachers in 2025-26. The characteristics of our new teachers were as follows: 90.9% White and 9.1% Hispanic 95.5% female, 4.5% male, 13.6% with 2-5 years of professional experience, 18.2% with 6-10 years, 31.8% with 11-15 years, 9.1% with 16-20 years, 27.3% with more than 20 years and 56.4% new to the campus. The average years of professional experience was 14.7 with 8 years in the district. 22.7% of our new teachers had advanced degrees.

Strengths

- Wilson serves a culturally and ethnically diverse population, enriching learners' experiences and perspectives.
- Enrollment increased by 10.3%, with 49 additional learners joining the Wilson community.
- As Coppell ISD's elementary campus of choice, Wilson welcomes learners from across the district.
- Wilson maintains strong student attendance, with an average daily attendance rate of 97%, an increase of 0.8 percentage points from the previous year.
- Wilson supports an inclusive learning environment, with 24.4% of learners receiving special education services and 4% receiving Section 504 accommodations.
- Gifted and talented learners represent a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds within the Wilson community.
- Wilson benefits from a highly experienced teaching staff, with 76.9% of educators having more than 10 years of professional experience.
- Educators average 15.9 years of professional experience and 10.1 years of service in Coppell ISD.
- Wilson continues to attract experienced educators. Newly hired teachers averaged 14.7 years of professional experience.
- Nearly one-fourth of Wilson educators hold advanced degrees.
- Wilson benefits from strong family support and high participation in campus events, learning experiences, and school activities.
- The campus's growing enrollment, strong attendance, and active family involvement reflect a connected and engaged school community.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ Wilson serves a high percentage of learners receiving specialized services, requiring sufficient staffing, resources, and professional capacity to support an inclusive learning environment.	Learners receiving special education services represent 24.4% of enrollment, with an additional 4% receiving Section 504 accommodations.
2★ Wilson's growing and increasingly diverse student population creates a need to ensure campus practices are responsive to learners from varied cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and academic backgrounds.	Enrollment increased by 10.3%, and Wilson serves learners from across the district through the campus-of-choice program, resulting in a wider range of experiences and needs.
3★ Significant changes in campus staffing create a need to build continuity, shared understanding, and a strong campus culture.	Wilson's educator retention rate was 38.6%, and the campus hired 22 teachers for the 2025-26 school year. The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together staff with different campus experiences and established practices. Continued collaboration and professional learning are needed to build shared expectations and consistent implementation.
4 The demographic composition of Wilson's teaching staff does not fully reflect the diversity of the student population.	The teaching staff was 87.2% White and 12.8% Hispanic, while the student population was 38.6% White, 31.5% Asian, 17.5% Hispanic, 4% African American, and 7.7% multiracial.
5★ Wilson must ensure that economically disadvantaged learners have equitable access to campus programs, resources, and learning opportunities.	Economically disadvantaged learners represent 13.8% of the campus population, creating a need to monitor access and participation across programs.

★ = Priority

Student Learning

Summary

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
Wilson Elementary						
Total Students	11	15	9	11	9	7
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	14.29%	85.71%	44.44%	77.78%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	78.57%	14.29%	55.56%	22.22%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	7.14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.53	3.41	2.14	2.93	2.94	2.97
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	27.27%	0%	11.11%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	18.18%	20%	77.78%	9.09%	11.11%	14.29%
Advanced	27.27%	13.33%	11.11%	81.82%	88.89%	57.14%
Advanced High	27.27%	66.67%	0%	9.09%	0%	28.57%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	18.56	20.55	19.67	18.71
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1576.44	1611.64	1560.22	1547.71
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	19.89	28	28.56	26.57
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1434	1574.55	1590	1554.57
Writing Raw Score	0	0	10	16.45	24	28.43
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1457.56	1475.36	1497.67	1543.14
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12.56	20.09	22.33	23.57
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1467.56	1544.09	1573.78	1595.14

Economic Disadvantage						
Total Students	1	5	3	3	5	4
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	40%	100%	0%	80%	66.67%
1 Level Higher	-	60%	0%	100%	20%	33.33%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1	3.02	1.8	2.67	2.88	2.88
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	100%	0%	33.33%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	40%	66.67%	33.33%	0%	25%
Advanced	0%	0%	0%	33.33%	100%	50%
Advanced High	0%	60%	0%	33.33%	0%	25%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	15	17	20.4	19
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1527.67	1556.67	1571.6	1551.5
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	17	26.67	28.2	26.5
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1381	1552.33	1582.4	1550.75
Writing Raw Score	0	0	8.67	14.33	24.2	28.25
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1428.33	1432.33	1500.2	1542
Reading Raw Score	0	0	10	19	20.8	22
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1444.67	1530.33	1552.4	1574.75
Asian						
Total Students	9	8	6	7	3	5
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	0%	80%	57.14%	100%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	85.71%	20%	42.86%	0%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	14.29%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.42	3.6	2.12	3.03	3.03	2.86
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	33.33%	0%	16.67%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	11.11%	12.50%	66.67%	0%	0%	20%
Advanced	33.33%	12.50%	16.67%	100%	100%	60%
Advanced High	22.22%	75%	0%	0%	0%	20%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	18.83	22	20.33	18.2
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1579.67	1635.29	1567.67	1542
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	19.67	28.29	27.67	26

Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1429.17	1578.57	1569.67	1545
Writing Raw Score	0	0	9.67	17.43	24.67	27.4
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1454.67	1494.29	1503.33	1535
Reading Raw Score	0	0	13	21.43	24.33	22
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1470	1560.57	1603.33	1573.6
Black/African American						
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	-	-	-	-
Hispanic						
Total Students	1	5	1	3	5	2
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	40%	100%	0%	60%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	60%	0%	100%	40%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2	3.06	1.8	2.67	2.98	3.25
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Beginning	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	100%	40%	100%	33.33%	0%	0%
Advanced	0%	0%	0%	33.33%	100%	50%
Advanced High	0%	60%	0%	33.33%	0%	50%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	14	17	20.2	20
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1515	1556.67	1567.8	1562
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	20	26.67	28.6	28
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1439	1552.33	1591.8	1578.5
Writing Raw Score	0	0	7	14.33	24.8	31
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1397	1432.33	1509.4	1563.5
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12	19	22.8	27.5
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1466	1530.33	1576	1649
Two or More Races						
Total Students	1	1	-	-	-	-
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	-	-	-	-
Lower/Same Level	-	0%	-	-	-	-
1 Level Higher	-	100%	-	-	-	-
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	-	-
TELPAS Composite Score	4	3.3	-	-	-	-
No Rating	0%	0%	-	-	-	-
Beginning	0%	0%	-	-	-	-
Intermediate	0%	0%	-	-	-	-
Advanced	0%	100%	-	-	-	-
Advanced High	100%	0%	-	-	-	-
Listening Raw Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Listening Scale Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Writing Raw Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Writing Scale Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Reading Raw Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
Reading Scale Score	0	0	-	-	-	-
White						
Total Students	-	-	2	1	1	-

Date Taken	-	-	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	-
Lower/Same Level	-	-	100%	-	100%	-
1 Level Higher	-	-	0%	-	0%	-
2 Levels Higher	-	-	0%	-	0%	-
3 Levels Higher	-	-	0%	-	0%	-
TELPAS Composite Score	-	-	2.4	3	2.5	-
No Rating	-	-	0%	0%	0%	-
Beginning	-	-	0%	0%	0%	-
Intermediate	-	-	100%	0%	100%	-
Advanced	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-
Advanced High	-	-	0%	0%	0%	-
Listening Raw Score	-	-	20	21	15	-
Listening Scale Score	-	-	1597.5	1611	1500	-
Speaking Raw Score	-	-	20.5	30	31	-
Speaking Scale Score	-	-	1446	1613	1642	-
Writing Raw Score	-	-	12.5	16	18	-
Writing Scale Score	-	-	1496.5	1472	1422	-
Reading Raw Score	-	-	11.5	14	14	-
Reading Scale Score	-	-	1461	1470	1474	-
Currently Emergent Bilingual						
Total Students	11	15	9	11	9	7
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	14.29%	85.71%	44.44%	77.78%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	78.57%	14.29%	55.56%	22.22%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	7.14%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.53	3.41	2.14	2.93	2.94	2.97
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	27.27%	0%	11.11%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	18.18%	20%	77.78%	9.09%	11.11%	14.29%
Advanced	27.27%	13.33%	11.11%	81.82%	88.89%	57.14%
Advanced High	27.27%	66.67%	0%	9.09%	0%	28.57%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	18.56	20.55	19.67	18.71
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1576.44	1611.64	1560.22	1547.71
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	19.89	28	28.56	26.57
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1434	1574.55	1590	1554.57

Writing Raw Score	0	0	10	16.45	24	28.43
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1457.56	1475.36	1497.67	1543.14
Reading Raw Score	0	0	12.56	20.09	22.33	23.57
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1467.56	1544.09	1573.78	1595.14
Special Ed Indicator						
Total Students	1	4	2	-	5	-
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	-	03/01/26	-
Lower/Same Level	-	25%	100%	-	60%	-
1 Level Higher	-	50%	0%	-	40%	-
2 Levels Higher	-	25%	0%	-	0%	-
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	-	0%	-
TELPAS Composite Score	1	3.45	2.15	-	2.86	-
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	-	0%	-
Beginning	100%	0%	0%	-	0%	-
Intermediate	0%	25%	100%	-	20%	-
Advanced	0%	0%	0%	-	80%	-
Advanced High	0%	75%	0%	-	0%	-
Listening Raw Score	0	0	17.5	-	19	-
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1563	-	1553.2	-
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	20	-	29.2	-
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1439	-	1601.8	-
Writing Raw Score	0	0	8	-	22.4	-
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1424.5	-	1485.2	-
Reading Raw Score	0	0	15	-	21	-
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1494.5	-	1555.6	-

	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
Wilson Elementary							
Total Students	100	98	96	100	98	96	96
Raw Score	25	28	29	33	33	36	18
Scale Score	1568	1670	1738	1573	1647	1694	0

Percent Score	67.95%	70.08%	68.55%	64.27%	64.05%	69.53%	58.44%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	90%	82.65%	89.58%	90%	91.84%	88.54%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	69%	72.45%	67.71%	72%	74.49%	77.08%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	46%	47.96%	39.58%	47%	44.90%	53.12%	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	3%	4.08%	4.17%	6%	3.06%	8.33%	-
Did Not Meet High	7%	13.27%	6.25%	4%	5.10%	3.12%	-
Approaches Low	12%	6.12%	9.38%	5%	7.14%	6.25%	-
Approaches High	9%	4.08%	12.50%	13%	10.20%	5.21%	-
Meets	23%	24.49%	28.12%	25%	29.59%	23.96%	-
Masters	46%	47.96%	39.58%	47%	44.90%	53.12%	-
Economic Disadvantage							
Total Students	15	16	11	15	16	11	11
Raw Score	20	22	21	23	25	28	12
Scale Score	1445	1544	1589	1422	1532	1565	0
Percent Score	52.97%	55%	50%	45%	48.20%	53.32%	41.52%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	62.50%	72.73%	66.67%	87.50%	72.73%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	33.33%	50%	36.36%	40%	43.75%	54.55%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	20%	12.50%	9.09%	13.33%	12.50%	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	0%	6.25%	18.18%	20%	6.25%	18.18%	-
Did Not Meet High	33.33%	31.25%	9.09%	13.33%	6.25%	9.09%	-
Approaches Low	13.33%	0%	18.18%	13.33%	18.75%	18.18%	-
Approaches High	20%	12.50%	18.18%	13.33%	25%	0%	-
Meets	13.33%	37.50%	27.27%	26.67%	31.25%	45.45%	-
Masters	20%	12.50%	9.09%	13.33%	12.50%	9.09%	-
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Total Students	1	1	-	1	1	-	-

Raw Score	33	8	-	41	21	-	-
Scale Score	1753	1305	-	1660	1487	-	-
Percent Score	89.19%	20%	-	78.85%	40.38%	-	-
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	0%	-	100%	100%	-	-
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	-
Masters Grade Level (TX)	100%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	-
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	-	05/01/26	05/01/26	-	-
Excluded	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	100%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Approaches Low	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	-	0%	100%	-	-
Meets	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Masters	100%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	-

Asian

Total Students	36	21	30	36	21	30	30
Raw Score	27	32	32	37	36	38	18
Scale Score	1605	1741	1805	1619	1686	1727	0
Percent Score	72.15%	79.05%	76.83%	70.46%	70.15%	73.40%	59.44%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	94.44%	95.24%	100%	94.44%	95.24%	90%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	80.56%	90.48%	83.33%	80.56%	85.71%	80%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	55.56%	57.14%	56.67%	61.11%	61.90%	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	2.78%	0%	0%	2.78%	4.76%	6.67%	-
Did Not Meet High	2.78%	4.76%	0%	2.78%	0%	3.33%	-
Approaches Low	11.11%	4.76%	10%	2.78%	9.52%	3.33%	-
Approaches High	2.78%	0%	6.67%	11.11%	0%	6.67%	-
Meets	25%	33.33%	26.67%	19.44%	23.81%	13.33%	-
Masters	55.56%	57.14%	56.67%	61.11%	61.90%	66.67%	-

Black/African American

Total Students	3	4	4	3	4	4	4
Raw Score	28	16	27	40	20	33	14
Scale Score	1612	1443	1747	1681	1463	1626	0
Percent Score	75.68%	40%	63.69%	76.28%	38.46%	62.50%	47.50%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	25%	75%	100%	75%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	0%	50%	100%	25%	50%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	0%	25%	66.67%	0%	25%	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%	0%	25%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	50%	25%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	25%	-
Meets	33.33%	0%	25%	33.33%	25%	25%	-
Masters	66.67%	0%	25%	66.67%	0%	25%	-

Hispanic

Total Students	17	29	15	17	29	15	15
Raw Score	21	27	27	28	31	37	17
Scale Score	1486	1637	1721	1494	1613	1699	0
Percent Score	56.60%	66.55%	65.40%	53.62%	59.55%	70.26%	57.11%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	70.59%	82.76%	86.67%	70.59%	86.21%	86.67%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	35.29%	65.52%	60%	52.94%	65.52%	86.67%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	23.53%	41.38%	40%	29.41%	37.93%	40%	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%	3.45%	13.33%	17.65%	3.45%	6.67%	-
Did Not Meet High	29.41%	13.79%	0%	11.76%	10.34%	6.67%	-
Approaches Low	17.65%	6.90%	6.67%	5.88%	10.34%	0%	-
Approaches High	17.65%	10.34%	20%	11.76%	10.34%	0%	-
Meets	11.76%	24.14%	20%	23.53%	27.59%	46.67%	-

Masters	23.53%	41.38%	40%	29.41%	37.93%	40%	-
Two or More Races							
Total Students	6	8	9	6	8	9	9
Raw Score	26	29	32	32	38	40	20
Scale Score	1575	1677	1779	1556	1713	1766	0
Percent Score	69.82%	73.44%	75.66%	61.54%	73.80%	76.71%	66.30%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	87.50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	87.50%	88.89%	66.67%	100%	88.89%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	50%	62.50%	44.44%	33.33%	75%	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%	12.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	16.67%	0%	11.11%	33.33%	0%	11.11%	-
Approaches High	16.67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Meets	16.67%	25%	44.44%	33.33%	25%	22.22%	-
Masters	50%	62.50%	44.44%	33.33%	75%	66.67%	-
White							
Total Students	37	35	38	37	35	38	38
Raw Score	25	29	26	32	34	34	17
Scale Score	1561	1690	1683	1557	1663	1655	0
Percent Score	67.57%	71.71%	62.09%	62.21%	65.49%	65.23%	57.46%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	91.89%	82.86%	81.58%	91.89%	94.29%	84.21%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	70.27%	74.29%	55.26%	70.27%	77.14%	71.05%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	43.24%	51.43%	26.32%	40.54%	40%	47.37%	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	5.41%	2.86%	5.26%	5.41%	0%	13.16%	-
Did Not Meet High	2.70%	14.29%	13.16%	2.70%	5.71%	2.63%	-
Approaches Low	10.81%	5.71%	10.53%	2.70%	2.86%	7.89%	-

Approaches High	10.81%	2.86%	15.79%	18.92%	14.29%	5.26%	-
Meets	27.03%	22.86%	28.95%	29.73%	37.14%	23.68%	-
Masters	43.24%	51.43%	26.32%	40.54%	40%	47.37%	-
Currently Emergent Bilingual							
Total Students	10	9	7	10	9	7	7
Raw Score	20	25	25	26	22	26	11
Scale Score	1464	1586	1665	1453	1489	1541	0
Percent Score	55.14%	61.39%	59.86%	49.23%	42.09%	50.55%	38.10%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	80%	77.78%	100%	80%	88.89%	71.43%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	40%	55.56%	57.14%	30%	33.33%	42.86%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	10%	22.22%	14.29%	20%	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%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	0%	10%	11.11%	14.29%	-
Did Not Meet High	20%	22.22%	0%	10%	0%	14.29%	-
Approaches Low	20%	0%	42.86%	10%	44.44%	14.29%	-
Approaches High	20%	22.22%	0%	40%	11.11%	14.29%	-
Meets	30%	33.33%	42.86%	10%	33.33%	42.86%	-
Masters	10%	22.22%	14.29%	20%	0%	0%	-
First Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	-	-	2	-	-	2	2
Raw Score	-	-	37	-	-	39	22
Scale Score	-	-	1894	-	-	1741	0
Percent Score	-	-	88.10%	-	-	74.04%	71.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	50%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	50%	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%	-	-	50%	-
Meets	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Masters	-	-	100%	-	-	50%	-
Second Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	6	4	3	6	4	3	3
Raw Score	30	30	30	45	32	36	19
Scale Score	1698	1745	1735	1752	1630	1663	0
Percent Score	79.73%	75%	72.22%	85.58%	62.02%	69.23%	62.22%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	75%	66.67%	100%	75%	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	50%	50%	33.33%	100%	50%	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%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	33.33%	0%	0%	0%	-
Meets	50%	25%	33.33%	0%	25%	66.67%	-
Masters	50%	50%	33.33%	100%	50%	33.33%	-
Third Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	-	-	4	-	-	4	4
Raw Score	-	-	38	-	-	45	19
Scale Score	-	-	1945	-	-	1834	0
Percent Score	-	-	90.48%	-	-	86.54%	62.50%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	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	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Masters	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	-
Special Ed Indicator							
Total Students	17	30	24	17	30	24	24
Raw Score	18	22	22	26	26	27	15
Scale Score	1416	1548	1619	1468	1540	1549	0
Percent Score	49.28%	54.92%	51.39%	50.45%	49.04%	51.28%	51.25%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	64.71%	56.67%	58.33%	70.59%	80%	62.50%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	35.29%	43.33%	37.50%	41.18%	50%	45.83%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	11.76%	23.33%	20.83%	23.53%	13.33%	25%	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	17.65%	10%	16.67%	17.65%	6.67%	29.17%	-
Did Not Meet High	17.65%	33.33%	25%	11.76%	13.33%	8.33%	-
Approaches Low	17.65%	6.67%	12.50%	5.88%	13.33%	16.67%	-
Approaches High	11.76%	6.67%	8.33%	23.53%	16.67%	0%	-
Meets	23.53%	20%	16.67%	17.65%	36.67%	20.83%	-
Masters	11.76%	23.33%	20.83%	23.53%	13.33%	25%	-

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/Emergent Bilingual
- Data Collection for Accelerated Instruction - Tutoring/ Documentation of Learner Growth

Strengths

- Wilson demonstrates strong overall STAAR achievement in Grades 3–5 RLA and mathematics.
- Across the six tested RLA and mathematics areas, between 82.7% and 91.8% of learners reached Approaches Grade Level.
- Between 67.7% and 77.1% of learners reached Meets Grade Level across RLA and mathematics.
- Masters performance was strong across grade levels, ranging from 39.6% to 53.1%.
- Grade 5 RLA was a notable strength, with 77.1% of learners reaching Meets and 53.1% reaching Masters.
- Grade 3 mathematics was also a strength, with 90% reaching Approaches and 46% reaching Masters.
- Asian learners demonstrated consistently strong performance, with at least 80% reaching Meets in every RLA and mathematics assessment.
- Learners identifying as two or more races demonstrated strong achievement, particularly in Grades 4 and 5.
- Formerly emergent bilingual learners generally maintained strong academic performance after exiting language-support services.
- Educators use multiple assessment sources to identify learner needs, monitor growth, and adjust instruction.
- Collaborative team structures support regular review of learner progress and instructional decision-making.
- Wilson's MTSS process is aligned with priority standards and provides a structure for targeted academic support.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ There is a need to reduce achievement gaps between the overall campus population and learners who are economically disadvantaged, receiving special education services, or currently identified as emergent bilingual.	Tier 1 differentiation, targeted intervention, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent depth and frequency across all grade levels and student groups.
2★ There is a need to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged learners reaching Meets and Masters Grade Level in RLA and mathematics.	Learners do not consistently receive timely, targeted instruction and intervention based on identified prerequisite-skill gaps and ongoing progress-monitoring data.
3 There is a need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction and early intervention so that more learners progress from Did Not Meet and Approaches to Meets and Masters Grade Level.	The consistent use of high-impact instructional practices, priority standards, flexible grouping, and evidence-based interventions varies across classrooms and grade levels.
4 There is a need to consistently use multiple data sources to identify learner needs, provide targeted support, monitor progress, and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and intervention.	Although mCLASS, MAP, STAAR, TELPAS, classroom assessments, and progress-monitoring tools are available, expectations for analyzing the data and responding instructionally are not yet implemented consistently across teams.
5 There is a need to accelerate language development and academic achievement for currently emergent bilingual learners.	Language-development strategies and targeted support across listening, speaking, reading, and writing are not consistently embedded within daily content instruction.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

Curriculum and Instruction

Wilson Elementary is Coppell ISD's wall-to-wall International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme campus and an elementary school of choice. Families from across Coppell ISD may apply for their children to attend Wilson through the district transfer process. Following the consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton, the campus serves learners with varied cultural, linguistic, academic, and social-emotional backgrounds.

The IB PYP framework guides teaching and learning through inquiry, concept-based instruction, student agency, international-mindedness, and development of the IB Learner Profile. Educators use the Coppell ISD curriculum and High Priority Learning Standards while designing transdisciplinary units that encourage learners to ask questions, investigate ideas, make connections, and apply their learning in authentic contexts. Hands-on learning is supported through campus resources such as the Ranger Ranch garden, STEAM experiences, and robotics and coding tools.

Educators participate in IB unit-design and reflection days throughout the year. These opportunities allow teams to evaluate learner outcomes, reflect on instructional practices, and revise units based on assessment data and learner needs.

Professional Development

Professional learning is aligned with campus and district priorities, including inquiry-based instruction, effective Tier 1 practices, differentiation, MTSS, assessment literacy, and inclusive support for Wilson's diverse learner population. Educators receive ongoing support from the IB coordinator, instructional leaders, campus administrators, and district specialists.

Because Wilson welcomed a significant number of new educators in 2025–26, professional learning also focuses on building shared understanding of the IB PYP, campus instructional expectations, collaborative practices, and Wilson's schoolwide systems. T-TESS goals are used to identify areas for professional growth and connect educator learning to measurable learner outcomes.

Professional Learning Communities

Wilson continues to use a formal Professional Learning Community structure. Collaborative planning time is built into the master schedule so grade-level teams can focus on the three big ideas and four guiding questions of a PLC.

Teams meet regularly to:

- Analyze common assessment and progress-monitoring data
- Identify priority standards and learner needs
- Plan differentiated Tier 1 instruction
- Develop and monitor targeted interventions
- Review the progress of individual learners and student groups
- Reflect on the effectiveness of instructional practices

Each grade level also has protected WIN time within the school day. This time is used to provide targeted intervention, extension, enrichment, and flexible-group instruction based on current learner data.

Leadership and Decision-Making

Campus decisions are informed by multiple sources of data, including STAAR, TELPAS, MAP, mCLASS, common assessments, classroom performance, behavior information, and stakeholder feedback. Campus administrators, instructional leaders, the IB coordinator, team leaders, and collaborative teams share responsibility for reviewing data and determining instructional priorities.

Staff members participate in decision-making through leadership teams, campus committees, collaborative teams, and opportunities to provide feedback. This shared approach supports collective ownership of campus goals and promotes greater consistency across classrooms and grade levels.

Communication

Wilson uses multiple communication methods to keep staff and families informed. Campus newsletters, email, digital platforms, social media, family events, conferences, and individual communication provide families with information about learning, campus expectations, upcoming events, and available support.

The campus continues to evaluate communication practices to ensure that information is accessible to families with different home languages, schedules, and levels of familiarity with school systems. Family participation in campus activities remains a strength and supports a strong school-community partnership.

Organization, Scheduling, and Support Services

The master schedule includes protected time for core instruction, collaborative planning, WIN intervention and enrichment, lunch, recess, and encore classes. Scheduling decisions are designed to maximize instructional time while ensuring learners have access to academic, behavioral, social-emotional, and specialized support.

Wilson provides services for learners receiving special education, Section 504 accommodations, dyslexia intervention, gifted and talented services, language support, and tiered intervention. Collaborative teams meet regularly to identify learner needs, establish measurable goals, monitor progress, and adjust support.

The campus has continued to refine its MTSS process. Educators use multiple data sources to develop academic, language, behavioral, and social-emotional goals and select targeted interventions aligned with identified needs.

Schoolwide Culture and Behavior Support

Wilson introduced the LEAD behavior framework to establish consistent schoolwide expectations and responses. LEAD teaches learners to Lead with Respect, Encourage Others, Accept Responsibility, and Demonstrate Kindness.

The framework includes direct instruction of expectations, common language across school settings, a consistent response process, LEADership Points, Ranger of the Week recognition, and Ranger Round-Up celebrations. These systems support positive behavior, learner leadership, belonging, and shared responsibility for the campus community.

Extracurricular and Cocurricular Opportunities

Wilson educators support development of the whole child by providing enrichment and leadership experiences beyond the regular instructional day. Campus clubs and activities offer learners opportunities to explore interests, develop new skills, build relationships, and participate in the school community.

Wilson also integrates cocurricular opportunities into the school day through IB inquiry units, learner-action projects, fine arts, physical education, Spanish, STEAM, robotics, coding, and the Ranger Ranch garden.

Community Partnerships

Wilson values partnerships that provide learners with additional academic and social-emotional support. Through the campus's partnership with First United Methodist Church of Coppell, identified learners may be paired with a Reading Buddy who provides individual reading practice, encouragement, and mentoring.

Learners are identified using multiple criteria, which may include academic need, social-emotional need, educator recommendation, and family input.

Technology Integration

Technology is integrated as a tool for inquiry, collaboration, creativity, assessment, communication, and personalized learning. Educators use district-approved digital resources to provide instruction, gather learner data, monitor progress, and adjust support.

Learners use technology to research questions, create products, communicate their understanding, practice skills, and engage in coding and robotics experiences. Technology use is planned intentionally to support learning goals, digital citizenship, accessibility, and responsible use rather than serving as a replacement for high-quality instruction.

Strengths

- - Wilson has established systems that support the effective implementation of Professional Learning Communities, including protected collaborative planning time and daily WIN intervention and enrichment time within the master

schedule.

- The campus professional learning plan provides sustained learning in inquiry-based instruction, high-quality Tier 1 practices, differentiation, MTSS, and the IB PYP framework.
- Wilson's new LEAD behavior framework provides shared expectations and consistent language across campus. Through LEAD, learners are taught to Lead with Respect, Encourage Others, Accept Responsibility, and Demonstrate Kindness.
- As Coppel ISD's wall-to-wall IB Primary Years Programme and elementary choice campus, Wilson provides inquiry-based, concept-driven learning that develops student agency, international-mindedness, and the IB Learner Profile.
- Learners connect with local and global audiences and demonstrate their learning through authentic products, digital tools, robotics, coding, STEAM experiences, and hands-on learning in the Ranger Ranch garden.
- Wilson provides academic, social-emotional, and mentorship opportunities through specialized support services, Reading Buddies, staff-sponsored clubs, and campus enrichment experiences.
- The campus MTSS process includes consistent collaborative review cycles in which educators analyze multiple data sources, establish measurable goals, monitor learner progress, and adjust academic, language, behavioral, and social-emotional interventions.
- Educators use mCLASS, MAP, STAAR, TELPAS, common assessments, classroom performance, and progress-monitoring data to identify needs and make instructional decisions.
- Campus leaders, the IB coordinator, instructional specialists, and collaborative teams provide educators with ongoing coaching and support.
- Wilson benefits from strong family and community participation, which supports learner success and strengthens connections between school, home, and the broader community.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ There is a need to continue building shared understanding and consistent implementation of Wilson's instructional, behavioral, and organizational systems.	The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together experienced educators from two campuses with different systems, practices, and campus experiences. Continued collaboration, professional learning, and collective reflection are needed to develop consistent practices while honoring the strengths of both communities.
2★ There is a need to deepen and strengthen consistent implementation of inquiry-based, concept-driven instruction and the IB PYP framework across all grade levels.	Educators have varying levels of experience with the PYP framework, creating a need for continued professional learning, collaborative unit design, coaching, and reflection.
3★ There is a need to consistently teach, reinforce, and respond to learner behavior through Wilson's LEAD framework.	The LEAD framework is newly implemented, and staff members need continued practice, feedback, and monitoring to ensure consistency across classrooms and common areas.
4★ There is a need to ensure collaborative planning and PLC time consistently result in responsive instruction, targeted intervention, and improved learner outcomes.	Collaborative structures are established, but teams vary in their use of standards, assessment data, intervention records, and common planning expectations.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

Wilson Elementary is a community committed to ensuring every learner feels safe, valued, supported, and included. Family survey results reflect strong perceptions of campus safety, climate, communication, and staff-family relationships. School Safety received an 88% favorable rating and ranked near the 90th percentile nationally. School Climate received an 83% favorable rating and ranked near the 80th percentile, reflecting families' overall confidence in the learning environment. Families' perceptions of teacher respect for learners increased to 89%.

Staff-family relationships continue to be a campus strength, receiving an 88% favorable rating and improving by six percentage points. Families reported growth in staff members' welcoming attitudes and responsiveness to family input. School-family communication also remained strong at 87%; however, families reported declines in the ease of understanding information and its perceived usefulness. Wilson will continue reviewing the clarity, accessibility, timing, and consistency of communication across campus platforms.

Family engagement received a 46% favorable rating, despite ranking near the 90th percentile nationally. Only 20% of families reported attending in-person teacher meetings, identifying an opportunity to strengthen participation and provide more flexible and meaningful ways for families to connect with educators and their children's learning.

Following the consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton, the campus continues to build a shared identity that honors the strengths and traditions of both communities. Survey results indicate that perceptions of how well the school values learners' diverse backgrounds declined slightly to 80%. This creates an opportunity to strengthen inclusive practices, celebrate the campus's cultural and linguistic diversity, and ensure all learners and families experience a sense of belonging.

As Coppell ISD's IB Primary Years Programme choice campus, Wilson promotes inquiry, international-mindedness, student agency, and the IB Learner Profile. The campus's new LEAD framework provides shared expectations for building a positive culture. Learners are taught to Lead with Respect, Encourage Others, Accept Responsibility, and Demonstrate Kindness. LEADership Points, Ranger of the Week, and Ranger Round-Up celebrations recognize positive choices, leadership, growth, and contributions to the school community.

Wilson provides opportunities for learners and families to build connections through clubs, fine arts, Student Council, robotics, the Ranger Ranch garden, family events, IB learning experiences, PTO activities, and community partnerships. These opportunities support learner belonging and strengthen connections among school, home, and the broader Coppell community.

Overall, perception data reflects a safe and supportive campus with strong family relationships and a positive school climate. Continued priorities include increasing family participation, simplifying communication, strengthening inclusive practices, and continuing to build a unified campus culture.

Strengths

- Wilson has a strong sense of pride and community, strengthened by the continued blending of the Wilson and Pinkerton communities.
- Families view Wilson as a safe and supportive school. School Safety received an 88% favorable rating and ranked near the 90th percentile nationally.
- School Climate received an 83% favorable rating and ranked near the 80th percentile nationally, reflecting strong overall satisfaction with the campus environment.
- Staff-family relationships are a significant strength, receiving an 88% favorable rating and improving by six percentage points.
- Families reported increased perceptions of staff members' welcoming attitudes, responsiveness to family input, and respect for learners.
- School-family communication received an 87% favorable rating, reflecting families' positive perceptions of campus communication.
- Parents, volunteers, the PTO, and community partners actively support campus events and experiences such as WilsonFest, International Night, family book fairs, and IB learning opportunities.

- Wilson supports the whole child academically, socially, emotionally, and behaviorally through the IB PYP and the campuswide LEAD framework.
- LEAD provides shared language and expectations centered on respect, encouragement, responsibility, kindness, leadership, and belonging.
- As Coppell ISD's IB PYP choice campus, Wilson promotes inquiry, concept-driven instruction, student agency, international-mindedness, and the IB Learner Profile.
- Learners have access to extracurricular and cocurricular opportunities through clubs, fine arts, leadership, robotics, coding, athletics, and the Ranger Ranch garden.
- Wilson's family events, clubs, community partnerships, and recognition systems provide learners and families with meaningful opportunities to connect with the school community.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★ There is a need to increase meaningful family participation in learner conferences, campus activities, and opportunities connected directly to teaching and learning.	Although families express positive perceptions of Wilson, barriers related to scheduling, awareness, accessibility, and the format of engagement opportunities may limit participation.
2 ★ There is a need to improve the clarity, usefulness, accessibility, and consistency of school-family communication.	Wilson uses multiple communication platforms, which may result in information being repeated, difficult to locate, or presented inconsistently.
3 ★ There is a need to promote purposeful, developmentally appropriate, and balanced use of technology to support learner engagement, creativity, collaboration, and well-being.	Technology is widely available and used across learning environments, but expectations for instructional purpose, screen-time balance, digital citizenship, and the use of hands-on and interpersonal learning experiences are not consistently defined or implemented.
4 ★ There is a need to strengthen inclusive practices so all learners and families feel represented, valued, and connected to the Wilson community.	The consolidation brought together two communities with different experiences and traditions. Family perceptions of how well the school values learners' diverse backgrounds declined three percentage points to 80%.

★ = Priority



Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1
★

Wilson's growing and increasingly diverse student population creates a need to ensure campus practices are responsive to learners from varied cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and academic backgrounds.

Enrollment increased by 10.3%, and Wilson serves learners from across the district through the campus-of-choice program, resulting in a wider range of experiences and needs.

2
★

There is a need to continue building shared understanding and consistent implementation of Wilson's instructional, behavioral, and organizational systems.

The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together experienced educators from two campuses with different systems, practices, and campus experiences. Continued collaboration, professional learning, and collective reflection are needed to develop consistent practices while honoring the strengths of both communities.

3
★

There is a need to ensure collaborative planning and PLC time consistently result in responsive instruction, targeted intervention, and improved learner outcomes.

Collaborative structures are established, but teams vary in their use of standards, assessment data, intervention records, and common planning expectations.

4
★

There is a need to increase meaningful family participation in learner conferences, campus activities, and opportunities connected directly to teaching and learning.

Although families express positive perceptions of Wilson, barriers related to scheduling, awareness, accessibility, and the format of engagement opportunities may limit participation.

5
★

There is a need to strengthen inclusive practices so all learners and families feel represented, valued, and connected to the Wilson community.

The consolidation brought together two communities with different experiences and traditions. Family perceptions of how well the school values learners' diverse backgrounds declined three percentage points to 80%.

6
★

Significant changes in campus staffing create a need to build continuity, shared understanding, and a strong campus culture.

Wilson's educator retention rate was 38.6%, and the campus hired 22 teachers for the 2025-26 school year. The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together staff with different campus experiences and established practices. Continued collaboration and professional learning are needed to build shared expectations and consistent implementation.

7
★

Wilson serves a high percentage of learners receiving specialized services, requiring sufficient staffing, resources, and professional capacity to support an inclusive learning environment.

Learners receiving special education services represent 24.4% of enrollment, with an additional 4% receiving Section 504 accommodations.

8
★

There is a need to consistently teach, reinforce, and respond to learner behavior through Wilson's LEAD framework.

The LEAD framework is newly implemented, and staff members need continued practice, feedback, and monitoring to ensure consistency across classrooms and common areas.

9
★

Wilson must ensure that economically disadvantaged learners have equitable access to campus programs, resources, and learning opportunities.

Economically disadvantaged learners represent 13.8% of the campus population, creating a need to monitor access and participation across programs.

10
★

There is a need to reduce achievement gaps between the overall campus population and learners who are economically disadvantaged, receiving special education services, or currently identified as emergent bilingual.

Tier 1 differentiation, targeted intervention, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent depth and frequency across all grade levels and student groups.

11
★

There is a need to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged learners reaching Meets and Masters Grade Level in RLA and mathematics.

Learners do not consistently receive timely, targeted instruction and intervention based on identified prerequisite-skill gaps and ongoing progress-monitoring data.

12
★

There is a need to deepen and strengthen consistent implementation of inquiry-based, concept-driven instruction and the IB PYP framework across all grade levels.

Educators have varying levels of experience with the PYP framework, creating a need for continued professional learning, collaborative unit design, coaching, and reflection.

13
★

There is a need to improve the clarity, usefulness, accessibility, and consistency of school-family communication.

Wilson uses multiple communication platforms, which may result in information being repeated, difficult to locate, or presented inconsistently.

14
★

There is a need to promote purposeful, developmentally appropriate, and balanced use of technology to support learner engagement, creativity, collaboration, and well-being.

Technology is widely available and used across learning environments, but expectations for instructional purpose, screen-time balance, digital citizenship, and the use of hands-on and interpersonal learning experiences are not consistently defined or implemented.

★ = 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

Accountability Data

- ☒ Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data

Student Data: Assessments

- ☒ State and federally required assessment information
- ☒ STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- ☒ Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- ☒ Running Records results
- ☒ Observation Survey results
- ☒ Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP) reading assessment data for Grades PK-2

Student Data: Student Groups

- ☒ Dyslexia 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
- ☒ Campus leadership data

- ☒ Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data

Parent/Community Data

- ☒ Parent surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- ☒ Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- ☒ Communications data
- ☒ Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data



Goals

Goal 1

Accountability for Learning: We as Wilson Elementary 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 High Priority

Wilson Elementary will ensure all learners demonstrate continuous academic growth and achievement through high-quality Tier 1 instruction, learner ownership, targeted support, and evidence-based decision-making.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR, MAP, mCLASS, TELPAS, common assessments, classroom assessments, learner work samples, PLC documentation, MTSS progress-monitoring data, intervention records, walkthrough data, and student-group performance data.

Strategy 1

Campus leaders and teams will use shared Tier 1 instructional look-fors focused on clear learning goals, inquiry, engagement, hands-on learning, student discussion, checks for understanding, differentiation, and independent practice. Administrators will conduct monthly walkthroughs and share campus trends each nine weeks.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Tier 1 instruction will become more consistent across classrooms. Learners will demonstrate increased engagement, ownership, and ability to apply learning independently. Walkthrough data will show growth in implementation of the identified instructional practices.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, IB Coordinator, Team Leaders

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

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Collaborative teams will meet at least twice monthly to review learner progress, including results by student group, and adjust instruction, intervention, and enrichment. Teams will collaborate with support staff to plan language supports, accommodations, and specially designed instruction based on identified needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners receiving intervention will have a documented skill need, measurable goal, and current progress-monitoring data. Teams will use this evidence to adjust support and improve academic growth.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, MTSS Team, Special Education Staff, and Language Acquisition Specialist.

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

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Strategy 3

Grade-level teams will use current learner data to create flexible WIN-time groups for targeted reading and mathematics intervention and extension. Groups will be reviewed at least every six weeks, and participating learners will receive instruction aligned with identified skills and CISD High Priority Learning Standards.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will receive timely, skill-specific intervention or extension based on current needs. Participating learners will demonstrate measurable growth on progress-monitoring measures, classroom assessments, MAP, and mCLASS.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, Classroom Educators

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 1, 2

Funding Sources: Before/After School Tutoring 199 - State Comp Ed, \$1,000, Math/Reading Intervention Resources 199 - State Comp Ed, \$800

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Strategy 4

Collaborative teams will implement HMH as the core reading resource while intentionally integrating IB PYP elements, including inquiry, key concepts, learner agency, the Learner Profile, purposeful discussion, authentic texts, and meaningful opportunities to apply literacy skills within units of inquiry.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will receive consistent, standards-aligned reading instruction while engaging in meaningful inquiry and concept-based learning. Educators will strengthen alignment between HMH, the CISD curriculum, and IB units, resulting in improved learner engagement, reading growth, comprehension, and independent application of literacy skills.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, IB Coordinator, Team Leaders, and classroom educators

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1, 2

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement

Root Cause

2

Wilson's growing and increasingly diverse student population creates a need to ensure campus practices are responsive to learners from varied cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and academic backgrounds.

Enrollment increased by 10.3%, and Wilson serves learners from across the district through the campus-of-choice program, resulting in a wider range of experiences and needs.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

There is a need to reduce achievement gaps between the overall campus population and learners who are economically disadvantaged, receiving special education services, or currently identified as emergent bilingual.

Tier 1 differentiation, targeted intervention, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent depth and frequency across all grade levels and student groups.

2

There is a need to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged learners reaching Meets and Masters Grade Level in RLA and mathematics.

Learners do not consistently receive timely, targeted instruction and intervention based on identified prerequisite-skill gaps and ongoing progress-monitoring data.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

There is a need to continue building shared understanding and consistent implementation of Wilson's instructional, behavioral, and organizational systems.

The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together experienced educators from two campuses with different systems, practices, and campus experiences. Continued collaboration, professional learning, and collective reflection are needed to develop consistent practices while honoring the strengths of both communities.

2

There is a need to deepen and strengthen consistent implementation of inquiry-based, concept-driven instruction and the IB PYP framework across all grade levels.

Educators have varying levels of experience with the PYP framework, creating a need for continued professional learning, collaborative unit design, coaching, and reflection.

4

There is a need to ensure collaborative planning and PLC time consistently result in responsive instruction, targeted intervention, and improved learner outcomes.

Collaborative structures are established, but teams vary in their use of standards, assessment data, intervention records, and common planning expectations.

Performance Objective 2 High Priority HB3 Goal

The percentage of Wilson third-grade students who achieve Meets Grade Level or above on the STAAR Reading assessment will increase from 63% in June 2024 to 73% by June 2029.

Evaluation Data Source: STAAR Reading results, MAP Growth Reading data, district and campus common assessments, curriculum-based assessments, student work samples, and MTSS progress-monitoring data.

Strategy 1

K-5 teams will use HMH Into Reading and district-aligned foundational literacy instruction to strengthen phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Teams will review reading data at least every six weeks and adjust small-group instruction and intervention.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will demonstrate growth in foundational reading skills and comprehension, with increased percentages meeting reading benchmarks and progress toward the third-grade STAAR Reading goal.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, Classroom Educators, Instructional Coach

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

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

K-3 teams will use reading assessment data to provide targeted WIN-time intervention and extension. Teams will monitor progress at least every three weeks for learners receiving intervention and adjust support based on their response.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will demonstrate growth in identified reading skills, increasing the percentage prepared to meet grade-level expectations and achieve Meets Grade Level or above on third-grade STAAR Reading.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, Classroom Educators, Instructional Coach

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

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There is a need to reduce achievement gaps between the overall campus population and learners who are economically disadvantaged, receiving special education services, or currently identified as emergent bilingual.	Tier 1 differentiation, targeted intervention, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent depth and frequency across all grade levels and student groups.
2 There is a need to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged learners reaching Meets and Masters Grade Level in RLA and mathematics.	Learners do not consistently receive timely, targeted instruction and intervention based on identified prerequisite-skill gaps and ongoing progress-monitoring data.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
4 There is a need to ensure collaborative planning and PLC time consistently result in responsive instruction, targeted intervention, and improved learner outcomes.	Collaborative structures are established, but teams vary in their use of standards, assessment data, intervention records, and common planning expectations.

Performance Objective 3 High Priority HB3 Goal

The percentage of 3rd grade students earning Meets Grade Level and above on the STAAR Math test will increase from 61% in June 2024 to 71% in June 2029.

Evaluation Data Source:

Strategy 1

Teams will use district math curriculum, STEMScopes, to strengthen number sense, mathematical reasoning, and problem-solving through hands-on learning, visual models, discussion, and small-group instruction. Teams will review assessment data every six weeks and adjust support.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will demonstrate increased mathematics growth and achievement, including progress toward the third-grade STAAR Mathematics goal.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, Instructional Coach, and Classroom Educators.

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

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Strategy 2

K-3 teams will use math assessments and learner work to identify skill gaps and provide targeted WIN-time intervention and extension. Instruction will include manipulatives, visual models, and practice explaining mathematical thinking. Teams will monitor intervention progress at least every three weeks and adjust support.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will strengthen foundational math skills and problem-solving, increasing the percentage prepared to achieve Meets Grade Level or above on third-grade STAAR Mathematics.

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

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

Formative Reviews

NovemberFebruaryAprilJune

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There is a need to reduce achievement gaps between the overall campus population and learners who are economically disadvantaged, receiving special education services, or currently identified as emergent bilingual.	Tier 1 differentiation, targeted intervention, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent depth and frequency across all grade levels and student groups.
2	There is a need to increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged learners reaching Meets and Masters Grade Level in RLA and mathematics.	Learners do not consistently receive timely, targeted instruction and intervention based on identified prerequisite-skill gaps and ongoing progress-monitoring data.

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
4	There is a need to ensure collaborative planning and PLC time consistently result in responsive instruction, targeted intervention, and improved learner outcomes.	Collaborative structures are established, but teams vary in their use of standards, assessment data, intervention records, and common planning expectations.

Goal 2

Organization that Cultivates Excellence: We as Wilson Elementary 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

Wilson Elementary will strengthen professional practices and campus systems to provide consistent, inquiry-based, innovative, and responsive learning experiences that meet the unique needs of all learners.

Evaluation Data Source: IB unit planners and reflections, collaborative planning documentation, walkthrough data, professional learning participation and feedback, staff surveys, learner work samples, and student achievement data.

Strategy 1

Wilson will use Title I funds to provide supplemental professional learning opportunities, including collaborative design days, instructional coaching, learning walks, campus visits, conference registration, and a book study focused on evidence-based, inquiry-based practices that improve instruction, student engagement, and academic achievement for all learners, particularly those at risk of not meeting academic standards.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Educators will strengthen inquiry-based practices, resulting in increased learner engagement, ownership, and academic achievement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, IB Coordinator, and Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - School Processes & Programs 1

Funding Sources: Professional Learning Conferences 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6299-00-106-11-000-21171, \$3,000, Design Day Subs 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6112-00-106-11-000-21171, \$17,000

Title I: 2.5.1, 2.5.3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Collaborative teams will plan and reflect on each IB unit to strengthen inquiry, conceptual learning, learner agency, assessment, and authentic application.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: IB PYP implementation will become more consistent, and learners will experience deeper inquiry and stronger conceptual understanding.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, IB Coordinator, Assistant Principal, and Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 3 - School Processes & Programs 2, 4

Funding Sources: Professional learning books and materials for a campus book study focused on inquiry-based instruction, student engagement, and academic achievement. 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6399-00-106-11-000-21171, \$1,000

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Wilson will provide supplemental instructional materials and hands-on resources that support inquiry-based learning and identified academic needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will have more opportunities to explore, collaborate, create, and apply academic skills in meaningful ways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, IB Coordinator, Team Leaders, and Classroom Educators

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

Funding Sources: Supplemental Materials for Hands-On Learning 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6399-00-106-11-000-21171, \$1,000

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 4

Staff new to Wilson will receive a designated mentor or team support partner and participate in monthly check-ins focused on district curriculum, IB PYP, PLC/MTSS processes, and LEAD expectations. Campus leaders will use staff feedback to plan additional support.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: New staff will demonstrate increased confidence and consistent use of campus practices, as shown through check-in feedback, planning documents, and walkthroughs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, IB Coordinator, Team Leaders, and Mentors.

Problem Statements: Demographics 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement	Root Cause
3 Significant changes in campus staffing create a need to build continuity, shared understanding, and a strong campus culture.	Wilson's educator retention rate was 38.6%, and the campus hired 22 teachers for the 2025-26 school year. The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together staff with different campus experiences and established practices. Continued collaboration and professional learning are needed to build shared expectations and consistent implementation.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There is a need to reduce achievement gaps between the overall campus population and learners who are economically disadvantaged, receiving special education services, or currently identified as emergent bilingual.	Tier 1 differentiation, targeted intervention, and progress monitoring are not yet implemented with consistent depth and frequency across all grade levels and student groups.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There is a need to continue building shared understanding and consistent implementation of Wilson's instructional, behavioral, and organizational systems.	The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together experienced educators from two campuses with different systems, practices, and campus experiences. Continued collaboration, professional learning, and collective reflection are needed to develop consistent practices while honoring the strengths of both communities.
2 There is a need to deepen and strengthen consistent implementation of inquiry-based, concept-driven instruction and the IB PYP framework across all grade levels.	Educators have varying levels of experience with the PYP framework, creating a need for continued professional learning, collaborative unit design, coaching, and reflection.

4

There is a need to ensure collaborative planning and PLC time consistently result in responsive instruction, targeted intervention, and improved learner outcomes.

Collaborative structures are established, but teams vary in their use of standards, assessment data, intervention records, and common planning expectations.

Performance Objective 2

Wilson will use the district technology framework to guide purposeful, age-appropriate technology use and a healthy balance of digital and non-digital learning.

Evaluation Data Source: Walkthrough observations, lesson and unit plans, technology-use reflections, learner work samples, and staff and learner feedback.

Strategy 1

Educators will use the district technology framework to balance purposeful digital learning with hands-on learning, reading, writing, movement, and discussion. Staff will teach age-appropriate digital citizenship and online safety aligned with district expectations. Teams will review implementation each nine weeks.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will demonstrate responsible technology use and participate in a balanced range of digital and non-digital learning experiences

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

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 promote purposeful, developmentally appropriate, and balanced use of technology to support learner engagement, creativity, collaboration, and well-being.

Technology is widely available and used across learning environments, but expectations for instructional purpose, screen-time balance, digital citizenship, and the use of hands-on and interpersonal learning experiences are not consistently defined or implemented.

Goal 3

Safety, Wellness and Belonging: We as Wilson Elementary 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 High Priority

Wilson will strengthen learner safety, well-being, and positive behavior through consistent expectations and supportive relationships.

Evaluation Data Source: Behavior and attendance data, safety drill records, campus observations, and learner and staff surveys.

Strategy 1

Staff will explicitly teach and reinforce LEAD expectations, consistently implement the campus behavior-response process, and review behavior data each nine weeks. Supplemental Title I materials will support explicit instruction, reteaching, learner reflection, and positive classroom environments to reduce disruptions and increase instructional time.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: More consistent expectations, fewer classroom disruptions, and increased learner responsibility and engagement.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, and Behavior Committee

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 1, 3 - Perceptions 4

Funding Sources: Resources for Behavior Framework 211 - Title I, Part A, 211-11-6399-00-106-11-000-21171, \$5,000

Title I: 2.5.3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Campus staff will review attendance at least monthly, identify learners with repeated absences or tardies, and partner with families to address barriers. Individual attendance supports will be documented and monitored.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners receiving attendance support will improve attendance compared with their initial attendance pattern.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principal, Attendance Clerk, Counselor, and Classroom Educators.

Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Perceptions 1, 4

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Strategy 3

Campus leaders will implement district-required safety drills, door checks, and staff training. The campus safety team will review drill results and identified concerns and document follow-up actions.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Required safety activities will be completed on schedule, and identified concerns will receive documented follow-up.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Strategy 4

The counselor and campus teams will teach emotional regulation, positive relationships, help-seeking, and bullying prevention. Learners needing additional support will receive targeted interventions monitored through MTSS.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners receiving support will demonstrate progress toward identified behavior and wellness goals.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselor, Assistant Principal, MTSS Team, and Classroom Educators.

Problem Statements: Demographics 2, 5 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November February April June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Wilson serves a high percentage of learners receiving specialized services, requiring sufficient staffing, resources, and professional capacity to support an inclusive learning environment.	Learners receiving special education services represent 24.4% of enrollment, with an additional 4% receiving Section 504 accommodations.
2	Wilson's growing and increasingly diverse student population creates a need to ensure campus practices are responsive to learners from varied cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and academic backgrounds.	Enrollment increased by 10.3%, and Wilson serves learners from across the district through the campus-of-choice program, resulting in a wider range of experiences and needs.
5	Wilson must ensure that economically disadvantaged learners have equitable access to campus programs, resources, and learning opportunities.	Economically disadvantaged learners represent 13.8% of the campus population, creating a need to monitor access and participation across programs.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There is a need to continue building shared understanding and consistent implementation of Wilson's instructional, behavioral, and organizational systems.	The consolidation of Wilson and Pinkerton brought together experienced educators from two campuses with different systems, practices, and campus experiences. Continued collaboration, professional learning, and collective reflection are needed to develop consistent practices while honoring the strengths of both communities.
3	There is a need to consistently teach, reinforce, and respond to learner behavior through Wilson's LEAD framework.	The LEAD framework is newly implemented, and staff members need continued practice, feedback, and monitoring to ensure consistency across classrooms and common areas.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	There is a need to increase meaningful family participation in learner conferences, campus activities, and opportunities connected directly to teaching and learning.	Although families express positive perceptions of Wilson, barriers related to scheduling, awareness, accessibility, and the format of engagement opportunities may limit participation.
4	There is a need to strengthen inclusive practices so all learners and families feel represented, valued, and connected to the Wilson community.	The consolidation brought together two communities with different experiences and traditions. Family perceptions of how well the school values learners' diverse backgrounds declined three percentage points to 80%.

Performance Objective 2

By June 2027, favorable family responses indicating that Wilson values learners' diverse backgrounds will increase from 80% to 85%.

Evaluation Data Source: Family survey results, conference participation records, family learning event participation, and family feedback.

Strategy 1

Wilson will use LEADership Points, Ranger of the Week, and Ranger Round-Up to celebrate leadership, growth, and positive contributions. Teams will review recognition records each nine weeks to ensure a broad range of learners are celebrated.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Learners will feel valued and demonstrate increased leadership and connection to the school community.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, IB Coordinator, and Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

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

Strategy 2

Wilson will offer flexible conference options and at least two family learning opportunities. Campus leaders will review communication and family feedback each nine weeks to improve clarity and accessibility.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased family participation and stronger understanding of campus information and ways to support learning.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Counselor, IB Coordinator, and Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Perceptions 1, 2

Formative Reviews

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

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement	Root Cause
2 Wilson's growing and increasingly diverse student population creates a need to ensure campus practices are responsive to learners from varied cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and academic backgrounds.	Enrollment increased by 10.3%, and Wilson serves learners from across the district through the campus-of-choice program, resulting in a wider range of experiences and needs.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 There is a need to increase meaningful family participation in learner conferences, campus activities, and opportunities connected directly to teaching and learning.	Although families express positive perceptions of Wilson, barriers related to scheduling, awareness, accessibility, and the format of engagement opportunities may limit participation.
2 There is a need to improve the clarity, usefulness, accessibility, and consistency of school-family communication.	Wilson uses multiple communication platforms, which may result in information being repeated, difficult to locate, or presented inconsistently.
4 There is a need to strengthen inclusive practices so all learners and families feel represented, valued, and connected to the Wilson community.	The consolidation brought together two communities with different experiences and traditions. Family perceptions of how well the school values learners' diverse backgrounds declined three percentage points to 80%.



State Compensatory Education

State Compensatory

Budget for Wilson Elementary

Total SCE Funds: \$5,009.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

SCE funds will supplement the regular education program by providing targeted before- and after-school tutoring, evidence-based reading and math intervention materials, hands-on math manipulatives, and teacher training focused on effective instructional and intervention practices. These services provide additional time, resources, and support for students who are at risk of not meeting grade level standards.



Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I, Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
2	1	1	Professional Learning Conferences	211-11-62 99-00-1 06-11-0 00-21171	\$3,000.00
2	1	1	Design Day Subs	211-11-61 12-00-1 06-11-0 00-21171	\$17,000.00
2	1	2	Professional learning books and materials for a campus book study focused on inquiry-based instruction, student engagement, and academic achievement.	211-11-63 99-00-1 06-11-0 00-21171	\$1,000.00
2	1	3	Supplemental Materials for Hands-On Learning	211-11-63 99-00-1 06-11-0 00-21171	\$1,000.00
3	1	1	Resources for Behavior Framework	211-11-63 99-00-1 06-11-0 00-21171	\$5,000.00
				Sub-Total	\$27,000.00

199 - State Comp Ed

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	3	Before/After School Tutoring	--	\$1,000.00
1	1	3	Math/Reading Intervention Resources	--	\$800.00
				Sub-Total	\$1,800.00



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