

Coppell Independent School District



Cottonwood Creek Elementary

2026-2027 Campus Improvement Plan

Mission Statement

CISD Mission Statement

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

Vision

Value Statement

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	27
Data Documentation for CNA	31
Improvement Planning Data	32
Accountability Data	32
Student Data: Assessments	32
Student Data: Student Groups	32
Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators	33
Employee Data	33
Parent/Community Data	33
Support Systems and Other Data	33
Goals	35
Goal 1 : Accountability for Learning: We as Cottonwood Creek will achieve our full ...	36
Goal 2 : Organization that Cultivates Excellence: We as Cottonwood Creek will mai...	43
Goal 3 : Safety, Wellness and Belonging: We as Cottonwood Creek will create phys...	49
State Compensatory Education	53
Budget for Cottonwood Creek Elementary	54
Funding Summary	55
211 - Title I, Part A	56
199 - State Comp Ed	56
Policies, Procedures, and Requirements	57



Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Summary

DEMOGRAPHICS

Cottonwood Creek 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 360 which represents a decrease of 11.3% from the prior year (-46 total learners).

In 2025-26, the student population was 43.9% Asian, 30.6% White, 9.7% Hispanic, 6.1% African American, 0.6% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and 9.2% multi-racial. Females made up 45.6% of the learners and males represented 54.4%. Our economically disadvantaged percentage was 11.9%.

Our Emergent Bilingual (EB) population consisted of 67 learners that made up 18.6% of our campus. The top 5 foreign languages spoken by this student group were: Telugu (17.9%), Hindi (16.4%), Japanese (10.4%), Tamil (9%), and Arabic (6%). Additionally, 7.5% of our EBs were also economically disadvantaged.

Our 35 gifted and talented learners constituted 9.7% of our population. Our gender split in the GT group was 40% female and 60% male. Of the four major ethnic groups, our GT learners were 60% Asian, 25.7% White, 5.7% Hispanic and 0% African American.

We had 76 learners that qualified for special education services, which represented 21.1% of our population. There were 18 learners with 504 accommodations, which was 5% of the total enrollment.

The average daily attendance for our campus in 2025-26 was 97.2%, which increased by 0.8% from the prior year.

STAFFING

Cottonwood Creek employed 30 educators and 11 instructional aides in the 2025-26 school year. The number of teachers remained the same from the prior year while the number of aides decreased by 1. The ethnic breakdown for the teaching staff was 3.3% Asian, 86.7% White, 6.7% Hispanic and 3.3% multi-racial. Females made up 96.7% of the educators and males represented 3.3%.

Overall, our educators had a varied level of professional experience: 10% (3) were new to teaching with 0-1 years of experience, 30% (9) had 2-5 years, 13.3% (4) had 6-10 years, 6.7% (2) had 11-15 years, 23.3% (7) had 16-20 years, and 16.7% (5) had more than 20 years. Looking at longevity within the district, 16.7% of our teachers had 0-1 years in district, 40% had 2-5 years, 13.3% had 6-10 years, 6.7% had 11-15 years, 13.3% had 16-20 years and 10% had more than 20 years. The average years of professional experience was 11 with 8 years in the district.

Advanced degrees were held by 23.3% of our teachers: 7 with master's degrees. Our campus principal had 52 years of career experience in a professional position (not necessarily as a principal) and 33 years in Coppell. Our assistant principal had 14 years of professional experience and 7 years in the district.

Our educator retention rate from 2024-25 to 2025-26 was 69.7%. For educational aides it was 75%. We hired 7 new teachers in 2025-26. The characteristics of our new teachers were as follows: 14.3% Asian, 85.7% White, 100% female, 42.9% new to teaching, 28.6% with 2-5 years of professional experience, 28.6% with 16-20 years and 23.3% new to the campus. The average years of professional experience was 5.7 with 1.6 years in the district. 0% of our new teachers had advanced degrees.

Strengths

Our school is proud to have a diverse student population that enriches the learning environment with a variety of cultural perspectives and experiences. This diversity is complemented by a strong multilingual population, which not only enhances communication skills but also prepares our students for a globalized world. We are also proud to have 9.7% of our students identified as Gifted and Talented (GT), which speaks to the high level of academic excellence and potential within our student body. Our school has a strong track record of serving English Bilingual (EB) and Special Education (SPED) students, ensuring that all learners receive the support and resources they need to succeed. Additionally, our high attendance rate of 97.2% reflects the commitment of our students and families to education and the engaging environment we provide.

Our staffing strengths are a cornerstone of our school's success. We are fortunate to have a team of experienced teachers, with an average of 11 years of experience, who bring a wealth of knowledge and expertise to the classroom. Our campus leadership is equally experienced, providing strong guidance and support to both staff and students. We take pride in our strong teacher and aide retention, which fosters a stable and consistent learning environment. Furthermore, 23.3% of our teachers hold master's degrees, demonstrating a commitment to professional growth and advanced knowledge in their fields. The mix of new and experienced teachers on our staff creates a dynamic environment for mentoring and collaboration, allowing for the sharing of innovative ideas and best practices that benefit our entire school community.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ Targeted student groups continue to experience achievement and representation gaps. Economically Disadvantaged students score below campus averages (STAAR Component Score of 34 vs. 62 overall), with 35% meeting standard in Reading and 30% in Math. Emergent Bilingual students saw TELPAS English progress decline from 73% to 47% and had 45% Math Academic Growth. African American students make up 6.1%	Instructional and identification practices are not consistently differentiated or responsive to student needs. PLCs do not consistently plan for daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, language supports are applied inconsistently, and GT identification relies heavily on traditional testing and teacher referrals rather than universal, culturally responsive screening practices.
2★ Campus teacher retention dropped to 69.7% from the 2024-25 to 2025-26 school year, resulting in 42.9% of newly hired teachers being completely new to the profession (0-1 years of experience) and 0% holding advanced degrees.	Onboarding, mentorship, and instructional coaching structures have not provided sufficient targeted daily support to retain experienced educators or accelerate the instructional efficacy of novice teachers managing high classroom diversity
3 Staff well-being placed in the bottom 10th percentile nationally, with teachers reporting high workplace stress.	A high cumulative workload and competing campus priorities exist without sufficient campus-level stress management support.

★ = 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
Cottonwood Creek Elementary						
Total Students	17	11	8	10	11	8
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%	50%	60%	42.86%
1 Level Higher	-	50%	0%	50%	40%	42.86%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	14.29%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.86	2.72	2.15	3.11	3.07	3.13
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	5.88%	18.18%	12.50%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	5.88%	18.18%	50%	20%	9.09%	25%
Advanced	64.71%	27.27%	25%	50%	72.73%	37.50%
Advanced High	23.53%	36.36%	12.50%	30%	18.18%	37.50%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	16.75	21.9	22	18.25
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1552.13	1648.3	1596.09	1547.25
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	19.25	28.8	27.55	29.25
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1423.63	1597.7	1570.18	1608.25
Writing Raw Score	0	0	11.5	18.5	23.45	30.13
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1475.13	1511.1	1492.55	1563
Reading Raw Score	0	0	13.13	21.6	24.91	24.13
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1475	1565.4	1606.09	1607.13
Economic Disadvantage						

Total Students	1	1	-	-	1	2
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	-	-	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	100%	-	-	0%	0%
1 Level Higher	-	0%	-	-	100%	0%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	0%	100%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	-	-	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1	2	-	-	3	2.8
No Rating	0%	0%	-	-	0%	0%
Beginning	100%	0%	-	-	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	100%	-	-	0%	50%
Advanced	0%	0%	-	-	100%	0%
Advanced High	0%	0%	-	-	0%	50%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	-	-	23	14.5
Listening Scale Score	0	0	-	-	1609	1502
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	-	-	28	26
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	-	-	1579	1550
Writing Raw Score	0	0	-	-	22	25.5
Writing Scale Score	0	0	-	-	1483	1511
Reading Raw Score	0	0	-	-	23	21.5
Reading Scale Score	0	0	-	-	1577	1562
Asian						
Total Students	14	11	7	7	7	6
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%	66.67%	66.67%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	50%	0%	33.33%	33.33%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.93	2.72	2.2	2.93	3.03	3.23
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	0%	18.18%	14.29%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	7.14%	18.18%	42.86%	28.57%	0%	16.67%
Advanced	71.43%	27.27%	28.57%	57.14%	85.71%	50%
Advanced High	21.43%	36.36%	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	33.33%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	17.29	21.14	22	19.5
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1559.29	1635.29	1597.57	1562.33
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	20.57	27.14	27.57	30.33

Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1448.29	1565.14	1572	1627.67
Writing Raw Score	0	0	11.29	17.86	24.14	31.67
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1471.29	1501.14	1500.29	1580.33
Reading Raw Score	0	0	13.29	20	23.86	25
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1476.29	1543.71	1593.43	1622.17
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	-	-	-	23	-	-
Listening Scale Score	-	-	-	1649	-	-
Speaking Raw Score	-	-	-	35	-	-
Speaking Scale Score	-	-	-	1725	-	-
Writing Raw Score	-	-	-	21	-	-
Writing Scale Score	-	-	-	1550	-	-
Reading Raw Score	-	-	-	25	-	-
Reading Scale Score	-	-	-	1606	-	-
Hispanic						
Total Students	1	-	-	-	2	1
Date Taken	03/01/26	-	-	-	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	-	-	-	50%	0%
1 Level Higher	-	-	-	-	50%	0%
2 Levels Higher	-	-	-	-	0%	100%
3 Levels Higher	-	-	-	-	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1	-	-	-	3	3.8
No Rating	0%	-	-	-	0%	0%

Beginning	100%	-	-	-	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	-	-	-	0%	0%
Advanced	0%	-	-	-	100%	0%
Advanced High	0%	-	-	-	0%	100%
Listening Raw Score	0	-	-	-	22	24
Listening Scale Score	0	-	-	-	1591.5	1631
Speaking Raw Score	0	-	-	-	27.5	29
Speaking Scale Score	0	-	-	-	1565	1606
Writing Raw Score	0	-	-	-	23	30
Writing Scale Score	0	-	-	-	1495	1555
Reading Raw Score	0	-	-	-	25	26
Reading Scale Score	0	-	-	-	1603	1615
Two or More Races						
Total Students	-	-	-	1	1	-
Date Taken	-	-	-	03/01/26	03/01/26	-
Lower/Same Level	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
1 Level Higher	-	-	-	100%	100%	-
2 Levels Higher	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
3 Levels Higher	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
TELPAS Composite Score	-	-	-	3.5	3.8	-
No Rating	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
Beginning	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
Intermediate	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
Advanced	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
Advanced High	-	-	-	100%	100%	-
Listening Raw Score	-	-	-	22	24	-
Listening Scale Score	-	-	-	1629	1631	-
Speaking Raw Score	-	-	-	35	29	-
Speaking Scale Score	-	-	-	1725	1606	-
Writing Raw Score	-	-	-	23	30	-
Writing Scale Score	-	-	-	1581	1555	-
Reading Raw Score	-	-	-	22	30	-
Reading Scale Score	-	-	-	1566	1678	-
White						
Total Students	2	-	1	1	1	1

Date Taken	03/01/26	-	03/01/26	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	3.3	-	1.8	3.3	2.8	1.8
No Rating	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	-	100%	0%	100%	100%
Advanced	50%	-	0%	100%	0%	0%
Advanced High	50%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%
Listening Raw Score	0	-	13	26	20	5
Listening Scale Score	0	-	1502	1758	1560	1373
Speaking Raw Score	0	-	10	28	26	23
Speaking Scale Score	0	-	1251	1571	1532	1494
Writing Raw Score	0	-	13	16	13	21
Writing Scale Score	0	-	1502	1472	1371	1467
Reading Raw Score	0	-	12	29	27	17
Reading Scale Score	0	-	1466	1676	1629	1509
Currently Emergent Bilingual						
Total Students	17	11	8	10	11	8
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%	50%	60%	42.86%
1 Level Higher	-	50%	0%	50%	40%	42.86%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	14.29%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	2.86	2.72	2.15	3.11	3.07	3.13
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	5.88%	18.18%	12.50%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	5.88%	18.18%	50%	20%	9.09%	25%
Advanced	64.71%	27.27%	25%	50%	72.73%	37.50%
Advanced High	23.53%	36.36%	12.50%	30%	18.18%	37.50%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	16.75	21.9	22	18.25
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1552.13	1648.3	1596.09	1547.25
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	19.25	28.8	27.55	29.25
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1423.63	1597.7	1570.18	1608.25

Writing Raw Score	0	0	11.5	18.5	23.45	30.13
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1475.13	1511.1	1492.55	1563
Reading Raw Score	0	0	13.13	21.6	24.91	24.13
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1475	1565.4	1606.09	1607.13
Special Ed Indicator						
Total Students	1	2	1	1	1	2
Date Taken	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26	03/01/26
Lower/Same Level	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%
1 Level Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
2 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3 Levels Higher	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
TELPAS Composite Score	1	1.5	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.5
No Rating	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Beginning	100%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Intermediate	0%	50%	100%	100%	0%	50%
Advanced	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%
Advanced High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Listening Raw Score	0	0	20	23	19	15
Listening Scale Score	0	0	1595	1649	1547	1500
Speaking Raw Score	0	0	22	22	24	28.5
Speaking Scale Score	0	0	1467	1467	1505	1592.5
Writing Raw Score	0	0	9	15	22	25
Writing Scale Score	0	0	1452	1454	1483	1515.5
Reading Raw Score	0	0	18	17	32	16.5
Reading Scale Score	0	0	1523	1506	1721	1501

	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
Cottonwood Creek Elementary							
Total Students	75	57	63	75	57	63	63
Raw Score	23	24	29	31	30	37	17
Scale Score	1516	1592	1736	1527	1594	1707	0

Percent Score	61.33%	61.10%	68.41%	59.05%	57.62%	70.42%	56.24%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	76%	78.95%	87.30%	82.67%	91.23%	87.30%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	57.33%	56.14%	71.43%	62.67%	70.18%	76.19%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	37.33%	26.32%	42.86%	40%	22.81%	53.97%	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	9.33%	5.26%	9.52%	9.33%	5.26%	7.94%	-
Did Not Meet High	14.67%	15.79%	3.17%	8%	3.51%	4.76%	-
Approaches Low	9.33%	17.54%	9.52%	9.33%	7.02%	6.35%	-
Approaches High	9.33%	5.26%	6.35%	10.67%	14.04%	4.76%	-
Meets	20%	29.82%	28.57%	22.67%	47.37%	22.22%	-
Masters	37.33%	26.32%	42.86%	40%	22.81%	53.97%	-
Economic Disadvantage							
Total Students	9	3	7	9	3	7	7
Raw Score	11	15	18	18	19	24	13
Scale Score	1274	1425	1541	1344	1463	1510	0
Percent Score	28.83%	37.50%	42.52%	35.04%	37.18%	46.15%	43.81%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	11.11%	33.33%	42.86%	44.44%	100%	71.43%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	0%	0%	28.57%	11.11%	0%	28.57%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	0%	0%	14.29%	0%	0%	14.29%	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	55.56%	0%	57.14%	22.22%	0%	28.57%	-
Did Not Meet High	33.33%	66.67%	0%	33.33%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	33.33%	14.29%	22.22%	66.67%	28.57%	-
Approaches High	11.11%	0%	0%	11.11%	33.33%	14.29%	-
Meets	0%	0%	14.29%	11.11%	0%	14.29%	-
Masters	0%	0%	14.29%	0%	0%	14.29%	-
Asian							
Total Students	26	29	33	26	29	33	33

Raw Score	26	26	32	35	33	40	19
Scale Score	1587	1628	1801	1587	1633	1768	0
Percent Score	70.89%	66.12%	77.13%	66.42%	63.20%	77.45%	62.22%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	92.31%	82.76%	96.97%	84.62%	96.55%	90.91%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	80.77%	65.52%	84.85%	76.92%	82.76%	84.85%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	46.15%	31.03%	57.58%	53.85%	31.03%	75.76%	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	3.85%	0%	3.03%	3.85%	0%	3.03%	-
Did Not Meet High	3.85%	17.24%	0%	11.54%	3.45%	6.06%	-
Approaches Low	3.85%	10.34%	3.03%	3.85%	0%	0%	-
Approaches High	7.69%	6.90%	9.09%	3.85%	13.79%	6.06%	-
Meets	34.62%	34.48%	27.27%	23.08%	51.72%	9.09%	-
Masters	46.15%	31.03%	57.58%	53.85%	31.03%	75.76%	-

Black/African American

Total Students	5	1	5	5	1	5	5
Raw Score	11	18	12	18	18	20	9
Scale Score	1285	1462	1445	1328	1444	1453	0
Percent Score	30.27%	45%	27.62%	33.85%	34.62%	37.69%	28.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	20%	100%	20%	20%	100%	60%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	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%	-
Did Not Meet Low	60%	0%	80%	20%	0%	40%	-
Did Not Meet High	20%	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	100%	20%	0%	100%	40%	-
Approaches High	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	-
Meets	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	-
Masters	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-

Hispanic

Total Students	9	6	6	9	6	6	6
Raw Score	17	20	22	28	27	31	11
Scale Score	1388	1518	1602	1484	1556	1602	0
Percent Score	45.65%	50.42%	52.78%	54.06%	51.92%	58.97%	36.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	66.67%	66.67%	77.78%	100%	66.67%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	22.22%	16.67%	50%	66.67%	50%	66.67%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	11.11%	16.67%	0%	22.22%	16.67%	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	22.22%	0%	0%	22.22%	0%	16.67%	-
Did Not Meet High	11.11%	33.33%	33.33%	0%	0%	16.67%	-
Approaches Low	33.33%	33.33%	16.67%	11.11%	33.33%	0%	-
Approaches High	11.11%	16.67%	0%	0%	16.67%	0%	-
Meets	11.11%	0%	50%	44.44%	33.33%	33.33%	-
Masters	11.11%	16.67%	0%	22.22%	16.67%	33.33%	-

Two or More Races

Total Students	8	3	4	8	3	4	4
Raw Score	27	28	29	36	29	33	17
Scale Score	1613	1640	1724	1599	1580	1625	0
Percent Score	73.99%	70.83%	69.64%	69.23%	55.77%	62.98%	57.50%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	87.50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	87.50%	100%	75%	75%	66.67%	75%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	62.50%	33.33%	50%	62.50%	33.33%	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%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	12.50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	0%	25%	33.33%	0%	-
Meets	25%	66.67%	25%	12.50%	33.33%	75%	-

Masters	62.50%	33.33%	50%	62.50%	33.33%	0%	-
White							
Total Students	27	18	15	27	18	15	15
Raw Score	22	22	29	29	27	38	18
Scale Score	1505	1558	1745	1499	1555	1720	0
Percent Score	59.36%	55.83%	68.73%	55.27%	52.14%	72.44%	59.78%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	70.37%	72.22%	93.33%	88.89%	77.78%	93.33%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	48.15%	50%	73.33%	51.85%	61.11%	86.67%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	37.04%	22.22%	40%	33.33%	11.11%	46.67%	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	3.70%	16.67%	6.67%	11.11%	16.67%	6.67%	-
Did Not Meet High	25.93%	11.11%	0%	0%	5.56%	0%	-
Approaches Low	11.11%	22.22%	13.33%	18.52%	5.56%	6.67%	-
Approaches High	11.11%	0%	6.67%	18.52%	11.11%	0%	-
Meets	11.11%	27.78%	33.33%	18.52%	50%	40%	-
Masters	37.04%	22.22%	40%	33.33%	11.11%	46.67%	-
Currently Emergent Bilingual							
Total Students	11	11	7	11	11	7	7
Raw Score	20	20	21	25	25	24	13
Scale Score	1454	1500	1600	1438	1532	1514	0
Percent Score	54.79%	48.86%	51.02%	47.73%	47.55%	45.33%	43.33%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	72.73%	54.55%	71.43%	63.64%	90.91%	42.86%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	54.55%	27.27%	42.86%	36.36%	36.36%	28.57%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	9.09%	0%	14.29%	27.27%	9.09%	14.29%	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	9.09%	0%	28.57%	9.09%	0%	28.57%	-
Did Not Meet High	18.18%	45.45%	0%	27.27%	9.09%	28.57%	-
Approaches Low	0%	18.18%	14.29%	9.09%	0%	0%	-

Approaches High	18.18%	9.09%	14.29%	18.18%	54.55%	14.29%	-
Meets	45.45%	27.27%	28.57%	9.09%	27.27%	14.29%	-
Masters	9.09%	0%	14.29%	27.27%	9.09%	14.29%	-
First Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	3	7	4	3	7	4	4
Raw Score	31	30	34	38	34	45	21
Scale Score	1699	1702	1893	1606	1653	1845	0
Percent Score	82.88%	75%	80.95%	72.44%	66.21%	86.54%	70.83%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	85.71%	75%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	66.67%	28.57%	50%	66.67%	28.57%	100%	0%
Date Taken	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches Low	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-
Approaches High	0%	14.29%	25%	0%	0%	0%	-
Meets	33.33%	57.14%	25%	33.33%	71.43%	0%	-
Masters	66.67%	28.57%	50%	66.67%	28.57%	100%	-
Second Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	2	2	-	2	2	-	-
Raw Score	29	29	-	39	41	-	-
Scale Score	1628	1748	-	1631	1726	-	-
Percent Score	77.03%	71.25%	-	75%	77.88%	-	-
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	-	-
Meets Grade Level (TX)	100%	50%	-	100%	100%	-	-
Masters Grade Level (TX)	50%	50%	-	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%	50%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Approaches High	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-
Meets	50%	0%	-	50%	0%	-	-
Masters	50%	50%	-	50%	100%	-	-
Third Year of Monitoring							
Total Students	-	-	4	-	-	4	4
Raw Score	-	-	34	-	-	44	18
Scale Score	-	-	1815	-	-	1804	0
Percent Score	-	-	80.36%	-	-	84.13%	58.33%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	-	-	50%	-	-	100%	0%
Date Taken	-	-	05/01/26	-	-	05/01/26	05/01/26
Excluded	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Did Not Meet Low	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Did Not Meet High	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Approaches Low	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Approaches High	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
Meets	-	-	50%	-	-	0%	-
Masters	-	-	50%	-	-	100%	-
Special Ed Indicator							
Total Students	15	7	11	15	7	11	11
Raw Score	14	12	17	19	20	22	11
Scale Score	1339	1376	1531	1363	1457	1487	0
Percent Score	37.30%	30.36%	41.34%	37.31%	37.91%	42.66%	36.67%
Approaches Grade Level (TX)	26.67%	14.29%	54.55%	60%	57.14%	54.55%	0%
Meets Grade Level (TX)	6.67%	0%	27.27%	20%	28.57%	27.27%	0%
Masters Grade Level (TX)	6.67%	0%	9.09%	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%	-
Did Not Meet Low	26.67%	42.86%	36.36%	26.67%	42.86%	36.36%	-

Did Not Meet High	46.67%	42.86%	9.09%	13.33%	0%	9.09%	-
Approaches Low	0%	14.29%	27.27%	26.67%	14.29%	27.27%	-
Approaches High	20%	0%	0%	13.33%	14.29%	0%	-
Meets	0%	0%	18.18%	20%	28.57%	27.27%	-
Masters	6.67%	0%	9.09%	0%	0%	0%	-

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

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

Strengths

Our school has demonstrated strong overall achievement, as evidenced by earning an A in Student Achievement. This accomplishment is further highlighted by the fact that 83% of our students are performing at the Approaches level or higher, 66% at the Meets level or higher, and an impressive 37% at the Masters level. These statistics reflect our commitment to academic excellence and the effectiveness of our instructional strategies.

In the area of Reading Language Arts (RLA), our performance is particularly noteworthy. With 89% of students achieving Approaches or higher, 74% at Meets or higher, and 41% at the Masters level, our RLA program is clearly thriving. Our ranking in the first quartile for RLA growth, with a growth score of 75%, underscores the significant progress our students are making in this critical subject area.

Our strong subgroup performance is another area of pride. Our Gifted and Talented (GT) students have achieved a remarkable 100% Meets or higher in both RLA and Math. Additionally, our Asian students have shown strong performance with 86% Meets or higher in RLA and 81% in Math. Students identified as Two or More Races have also excelled, with 87% achieving Meets or higher in Math. These achievements reflect our dedication to supporting all students and ensuring equitable opportunities for success.

We are also proud of our strong attendance and English growth metrics. Our TELPAS progress stands at 47%, surpassing the state target of 40%, which indicates our effective support for English language learners. Furthermore, our attendance rate of 96.4% places us in the first quartile statewide, demonstrating our students' commitment to their education and the engaging environment we provide.

Finally, our positive school culture is a cornerstone of our success. With 92% of our community expressing favorable views on supportive relationships, 91% reporting strong teacher-student relationships, and 89% feeling safe from online bullying, we have cultivated an environment where students feel valued, respected, and secure. This positive culture is essential for fostering academic and personal growth.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ Campus-wide STAAR Math Meets Grade Level dropped from 70% to 65% (causing the campus to miss the Math Distinction Designation), while MAP Growth data in Grades K-2 highlights persistent concerns in Computations & Algebraic Relationships.	Unpacking of TEKS during PLC planning lacked campus-wide alignment around computational fluency and problem-solving models, and guided math small-group instruction and manipulative use are not applied daily during Tier I Math Workshop.
2★ Specialized student groups experience substantial achievement gaps, including Economically Disadvantaged students (STAAR Component Score 34 vs. 62 overall; 35% Meets in Reading, 30% in Math), Emergent Bilingual students (TELPAS progress dropped from 73% to 47%; 45% Math growth), and Special Education/504 students (comprising over 26% of the campus).	PLCs have not consistently built in dedicated daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, sheltered instruction strategies and language objectives are not applied consistently, and PLCs lack structured co-planning time between general education and specialized staff to implement accommodations and universal design principles.
3★ Accelerated learning for students who previously missed grade level remains low (36% overall, 29% in Math), the campus earned a Scaled Score of 65 (Rating D) in Domain 2 Relative Performance, and the Closing the Gaps score sits at 64.	Master scheduling did not protect dedicated intervention periods prior to state testing, HB 1416 acceleration tutoring was not tightly linked to common formative assessment data, and PLC data reviews did not systematically disaggregate Tier II/III progress for federal student groups. .
4★ Grade 5 STAAR Science performance reached only 45% Meets and 26% Masters, missing postsecondary readiness targets.	Hands-on lab investigations and science vocabulary spiraling were not aligned vertically across Grades K-5.

★ = Priority

School Processes & Programs

Summary

In our commitment to enhancing instruction and assessment, we have integrated STEMscopes Math and the Science of Reading into our curriculum, alongside mCLASS, to ensure a robust educational foundation. To effectively monitor student progress, we utilize AWARE and MAP, which provide us with valuable insights into student learning trajectories. Additionally, we have incorporated digital learning tools such as DreamBox and Reflex to support and enrich our students' learning experiences.

Our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) convene weekly to meticulously review data, plan instruction, and identify necessary interventions, ensuring that our teaching strategies are data-driven and responsive to student needs. Through our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and House Bill 1416 tutoring, we offer targeted support to students, addressing their unique learning challenges and promoting academic success.

To support our diverse student body, we employ English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)-aligned language supports, ensuring that English learners receive the assistance they need. Our Gifted and Talented (GT) and Special Education programs provide differentiated instruction and accommodations, catering to the varied learning needs of our students. Furthermore, initiatives like STEAM and Genius Hour empower students with choice, fostering creativity and leadership skills.

We prioritize a positive school culture and safety by implementing Social Emotional Learning (SEL), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), character education, and counseling services. Regular safety drills and established safety procedures are in place to ensure a secure learning environment for all.

To foster staff and family engagement, we support new teachers through comprehensive mentoring and coaching programs, aiding their professional growth and integration into our school community. For effective communication with families, we utilize platforms such as ParentSquare and Frankly, ensuring that parents are well-informed and actively involved in their children's education.

Strengths

Our school culture and climate are characterized by strong relationships, with 92% of our students expressing favorable connections with both adults and peers. This indicates a nurturing environment where students feel supported and valued, fostering a sense of belonging and community. Additionally, 91% of our students report positive teacher-student relationships, highlighting the mutual respect and understanding that exists within our classrooms. This respect is foundational to creating an engaging and effective learning environment. Furthermore, 83% of our staff feel trusted to teach, and 91% feel safe at school, underscoring the supportive and secure atmosphere we strive to maintain. Our commitment to a strong school climate and effective communication is evident, with 92% of our community expressing satisfaction in these areas, ensuring that families are well-informed and engaged in their children's education.

In terms of organizational strengths, our school excels in utilizing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and data-driven decision-making. Our teams consistently employ tools such as CFA, mCLASS, and MAP data to inform instruction and improve student outcomes. This systematic approach ensures that our teaching strategies are evidence-based and tailored to meet the diverse needs of our students. We also prioritize social-emotional learning (SEL) support, partnering with the Momentous Institute to provide comprehensive character education and support for both staff and families. This collaboration enhances our ability to address the holistic development of our students. Additionally, our commitment to safety is unwavering, as we meet all safety requirements through regular drills and audits, ensuring a secure environment for our entire school community.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 ★ Professional Learning Community structures fail to systematically adjust early interventions or close foundational skill gaps across writing and math.	PLCs lack embedded co-planning time between general education and specialized staff, PLC data reviews do not systematically disaggregate student progress to adjust Tier II/III interventions, and district professional learning decisions lack alignment on data collection from learner and staff needs.
2 ★ The campus Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework faces challenges in consistently accelerating learning and closing foundational gaps for students requiring targeted intervention-- resulting in an overall accelerated learning rate of 36% (and 29% in math), a Closing the Gaps score of 64, and high growth variance across the 26.1% of students receiving Special Education or Section 504.	Scheduling, co-planning, and data review systems do not consistently support responsive instruction. Intervention time is not consistently protected, PLCs do not consistently use student data to adjust interventions, and general education and specialized staff lack dedicated time to co-plan and align supports.
3 ★ Favorable parent responses regarding school safety dropped 16 points to 72%, highlighting an ongoing need to revisit safety efforts and state security requirements for learners, staff, and facilities	Proactive communication detailing physical security routines, door audits, and safety procedures was insufficient.
4 ★ Staff perceptions of Feedback and Coaching fell to the 20th percentile nationally, with only 22% of staff feeling feedback helps them grow.	Classroom walkthroughs focused on compliance monitoring rather than growth-oriented instructional coaching conversations, and campus decision-making lacked focus on evidence-based, sustainable professional learning alignment.

★ = Priority

Perceptions

Summary

At our school, we pride ourselves on fostering a welcoming community where students and families feel valued, welcomed, and connected. This sense of belonging is integral to our mission, ensuring that every individual who walks through our doors knows they are an important part of our school family.

The strength of our school lies in the relationships we cultivate. With 92% of our community reporting positive relationships and 91% highlighting positive interactions with teachers, it is clear that our commitment to building strong, supportive connections is recognized and appreciated.

Safety is a top priority, and we maintain a safe school environment through regular safety drills, comprehensive audits, and a team of trained staff dedicated to ensuring the well-being of everyone on campus. This proactive approach helps us create a secure atmosphere conducive to learning.

Our school climate is another area of pride, with 92% of families rating it positively. This positive climate is a testament to our efforts in creating an environment where students and families feel comfortable and supported.

We actively engage families and the community through events, partnerships, and regular communication. These efforts help to strengthen the bonds between the school and the wider community, fostering a collaborative spirit that benefits everyone involved.

Student leadership is encouraged through initiatives such as the Colt Council, Genius Hour, and STEAM activities. These programs are designed to promote leadership and creativity, providing students with opportunities to develop essential skills for their future.

Our inclusive culture ensures that new families and diverse learners are welcomed and supported. We strive to create an environment where every student feels included and has the resources they need to succeed.

Student well-being is at the forefront of our priorities, supported by programs in social-emotional learning (SEL), mindfulness, counseling, and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). These initiatives are designed to address the diverse needs of our students, promoting their overall well-being.

Our staff is a cornerstone of our success, with 83% feeling trusted to teach and 91% feeling safe at work. This trust and sense of security empower our educators to deliver high-quality education and support to our students.

While we celebrate our successes, we also recognize areas for growth. We are committed to improving student engagement and belonging, enhancing staff well-being and coaching, and increasing family participation and input. These areas are crucial for our continued development and success as a school community.

Strengths

Our school community is built on the foundation of strong relationships, as evidenced by the 92% favorable perception among our students. This indicates that our students feel supported and valued, fostering an environment where they can thrive academically and socially. Additionally, with 91% of students expressing that they feel respected by their teachers, it is clear that our educators are successfully creating a classroom atmosphere of mutual respect and understanding. Furthermore, the fact that 89% of students feel safe from online bullying highlights our commitment to providing a secure and supportive digital environment, which is crucial in today's technology-driven world.

Our staff's perception of strong teamwork is a testament to the collaborative culture we have cultivated within our school. The stronger connections reported among colleagues enhance our ability to work together effectively, ultimately benefiting our students' learning experiences. With 83% of teachers feeling trusted to teach, it is evident that we empower our educators to exercise their professional judgment and creativity in the classroom. Moreover, the 91% of staff who feel safe on campus underscores our dedication to maintaining a secure and welcoming workplace for all employees.

The positive perception of our school climate among families, with a 92% favorable rating, reflects the supportive and inclusive

environment we strive to maintain. The overwhelming 98% of families who feel their children are safe at school is a powerful endorsement of our safety measures and protocols. Additionally, the 92% favorable rating for clear communication indicates that our efforts to keep families informed and engaged are effective, fostering a strong partnership between home and school.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1★ Student classroom engagement is low at 48% favorable (with only 27% discussing topics outside of school), and student survey scores in Learning Strategies fell 15 points (with only 31% knowing how to try alternate approaches when stuck).	Daily lessons rely mostly on teacher-led instruction and recall tasks rather than active, choice-driven project-based learning and explicit metacognitive problem-solving strategies.
2★ Student survey feedback showed a 5-point drop in Sense of Belonging (down to 67%), alongside a 17-point decline in students feeling that teachers genuinely care about their well-being	Pacing demands reduced opportunities for teachers to build informal, individual relationships with students, while SEL check-ins and class meetings were applied inconsistently without a uniform peer-connection routine.
3★ Significant barriers remain in fully addressing the mental health, social-emotional, and wellness needs of learners and staff.	Campus structures faced barriers in fully implementing wellness resources and delivering the health enrichment TEKS--including mental health conditions, substance abuse, emotional management, positive relationships, responsible decision-making, and suicide prevention.
4★ Family perception that staff value their input dropped 22 points (to 78%), while overall family engagement sits at 25%.	Communication platforms were used mostly for one-way announcements rather than interactive two-way dialogue.
5★ Staff trust in the evaluation system dropped 42 points, with only 17% of staff viewing evaluations as objective.	Clear calibration and open communication regarding T-TESS rubrics and TIA growth measures were lacking across the campus.

★ = Priority



Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1
★

Student classroom engagement is low at 48% favorable (with only 27% discussing topics outside of school), and student survey scores in Learning Strategies fell 15 points (with only 31% knowing how to try alternate approaches when stuck).

Daily lessons rely mostly on teacher-led instruction and recall tasks rather than active, choice-driven project-based learning and explicit metacognitive problem-solving strategies.

2
★

Campus-wide STAAR Math Meets Grade Level dropped from 70% to 65% (causing the campus to miss the Math Distinction Designation), while MAP Growth data in Grades K-2 highlights persistent concerns in Computations & Algebraic Relationships.

Unpacking of TEKS during PLC planning lacked campus-wide alignment around computational fluency and problem-solving models, and guided math small-group instruction and manipulative use are not applied daily during Tier I Math Workshop.

3
★

Targeted student groups continue to experience achievement and representation gaps. Economically Disadvantaged students score below campus averages (STAAR Component Score of 34 vs. 62 overall), with 35% meeting standard in Reading and 30% in Math. Emergent Bilingual students saw TELPAS English progress decline from 73% to 47% and had 45% Math Academic Growth. African American students make up 6.1%

Instructional and identification practices are not consistently differentiated or responsive to student needs. PLCs do not consistently plan for daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, language supports are applied inconsistently, and GT identification relies heavily on traditional testing and teacher referrals rather than universal, culturally responsive screening practices.

4
★

Professional Learning Community structures fail to systematically adjust early interventions or close foundational skill gaps across writing and math.

PLCs lack embedded co-planning time between general education and specialized staff, PLC data reviews do not systematically disaggregate student progress to adjust Tier II/III interventions, and district professional learning decisions lack alignment on data collection from learner and staff needs.

5
★

The campus Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework faces challenges in consistently accelerating learning and closing foundational gaps for students requiring targeted intervention--resulting in an overall accelerated learning rate of 36% (and 29% in math), a Closing the Gaps score of 64, and high growth variance across the 26.1% of students receiving Special Education or Section 504.

Scheduling, co-planning, and data review systems do not consistently support responsive instruction. Intervention time is not consistently protected, PLCs do not consistently use student data to adjust interventions, and general education and specialized staff lack dedicated time to co-plan and align supports.

6
★

Specialized student groups experience substantial achievement gaps, including Economically Disadvantaged students (STAAR Component Score 34 vs. 62 overall; 35% Meets in Reading, 30% in Math), Emergent Bilingual students (TELPAS progress dropped from 73% to 47%; 45% Math growth), and Special Education/504 students (comprising over 26% of the campus).

PLCs have not consistently built in dedicated daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, sheltered instruction strategies and language objectives are not applied consistently, and PLCs lack structured co-planning time between general education and specialized staff to implement accommodations and universal design principles.

7
★

Accelerated learning for students who previously missed grade level remains low (36% overall, 29% in Math), the campus earned a Scaled Score of 65 (Rating D) in Domain 2 Relative Performance, and the Closing the Gaps score sits at 64.

Master scheduling did not protect dedicated intervention periods prior to state testing, HB 1416 acceleration tutoring was not tightly linked to common formative assessment data, and PLC data reviews did not systematically disaggregate Tier II/III progress for federal student groups. .

8
★

Campus teacher retention dropped to 69.7% from the 2024-25 to 2025-26 school year, resulting in 42.9% of newly hired teachers being completely new to the profession (0-1 years of experience) and 0% holding advanced degrees.

Onboarding, mentorship, and instructional coaching structures have not provided sufficient targeted daily support to retain experienced educators or accelerate the instructional efficacy of novice teachers managing high classroom diversity

9
★

Grade 5 STAAR Science performance reached only 45% Meets and 26% Masters, missing postsecondary readiness targets.

Hands-on lab investigations and science vocabulary spiraling were not aligned vertically across Grades K-5.

10
★

Student survey feedback showed a 5-point drop in Sense of Belonging (down to 67%), alongside a 17-point decline in students feeling that teachers genuinely care about their well-being

Pacing demands reduced opportunities for teachers to build informal, individual relationships with students, while SEL check-ins and class meetings were applied inconsistently without a uniform peer-connection routine.

11
★

Family perception that staff value their input dropped 22 points (to 78%), while overall family engagement sits at 25%.

Communication platforms were used mostly for one-way announcements rather than interactive two-way dialogue.

12



Significant barriers remain in fully addressing the mental health, social-emotional, and wellness needs of learners and staff.

Campus structures faced barriers in fully implementing wellness resources and delivering the health enrichment TEKS--including mental health conditions, substance abuse, emotional management, positive relationships, responsible decision-making, and suicide prevention.

13



Favorable parent responses regarding school safety dropped 16 points to 72%, highlighting an ongoing need to revisit safety efforts and state security requirements for learners, staff, and facilities

Proactive communication detailing physical security routines, door audits, and safety procedures was insufficient.

14



Staff perceptions of Feedback and Coaching fell to the 20th percentile nationally, with only 22% of staff feeling feedback helps them grow.

Classroom walkthroughs focused on compliance monitoring rather than growth-oriented instructional coaching conversations, and campus decision-making lacked focus on evidence-based, sustainable professional learning alignment.

15



Staff trust in the evaluation system dropped 42 points, with only 17% of staff viewing evaluations as objective.

Clear calibration and open communication regarding T-TESS rubrics and TIA growth measures were lacking across the campus.

★ = 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 Reading and math goals for PreK-3
- ☒ Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- ☒ State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- ☒ Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- ☒ Student Achievement Domain
- ☒ Student Progress Domain
- ☒ Closing the Gaps Domain
- ☒ Accountability Distinction Designations

Student Data: Assessments

- ☒ State and federally required assessment information
- ☒ STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- ☒ STAAR released test questions
- ☒ Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- ☒ Local benchmark or common assessments data

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
- ☒ Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data

- ☒ Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- ☒ At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- ☒ Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- ☒ Section 504 data
- ☒ Gifted and talented data
- ☒ Dyslexia data
- ☒ Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- ☒ Attendance data
- ☒ 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
- ☒ Professional development needs assessment data
- ☒ Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact
- ☒ Staff mobility/stability

Parent/Community Data

- ☒ Parent surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- ☒ Organizational structure data
- ☒ Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation



Focus Group(s) data



Goals

Goal 1

Accountability for Learning: We as Cottonwood Creek 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 HB3 Goal

Increase campus-wide academic performance and growth across Reading, Mathematics, and Science, with an intentional focus on subgroup progress and HB3 Early Childhood Literacy and Mathematics goals.

Specifically Measured by:

- * HB3 Early Childhood Literacy Goal (3rd Grade Reading): Increase the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring at or above Meets Grade Level on STAAR Reading from 57% (June 2025 baseline) to 80% by June 2029
- * HB3 Early Childhood Math Goal (3rd Grade Math): Increase the percentage of 3rd-grade students scoring at or above Meets Grade Level on STAAR Math from 63% (June 2025 baseline) to 78% by June 2029
- * Subgroup Acceleration Focus: Accelerate growth among African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and Emergent Bilingual learners to close performance gaps on 3rd-5th grade STAAR components

Evaluation Data Source: -NWEA MAP Math RIT scores

- Dreambox/Reflex usage logs
- Weekly CFA data in Aware
- Math Workshop walkthrough checklists

Strategy 1

Strengthen daily Tier 1 math instruction through faithful implementation of STEMscopes Math, the Math Workshop model, and the Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) instructional sequence. Teachers will use district-provided STEMscopes Math resources, provide daily guided math small groups, incorporate hands-on manipulatives, and utilize Reflex Math and DreamBox to build fact fluency and support adaptive practice.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -NWEA MAP Math RIT scores

- Dreambox/Reflex usage logs
- Weekly CFA data in Aware
- Math Workshop walkthrough checklists

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Learning Coaches, Classroom Educators

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 4

Funding Sources: These funds will be used to hire substitutes for staff to plan for data driven lessons, interventions, and extensions as well as to purchase supporting supplies aligned to our core Tier 1 Instructional Programs. 199 - State Comp Ed, \$2,922

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Establish campus-wide vertical alignment in mathematics across Grades K-5 by consistently spiraling mathematical vocabulary, problem-solving strategies, and hands-on learning experiences. Teachers will build on prior knowledge and use concrete, visual, and abstract representations to deepen conceptual understanding and mathematical reasoning.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Increased understanding of math vocabulary

-Application of problem-solving strategies with increasing independence and flexibility across grade levels

-Improved conceptual understanding of mathematical concepts

-Teachers will demonstrate greater consistency in math instruction, vocabulary, and problem-solving approaches across Grades K-5

-Increased readiness for grade-level learning.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Classroom Teachers

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

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Strengthen student engagement and mathematical thinking by explicitly teaching and integrating metacognitive learning strategies and alternative problem-solving approaches across all Tier 1 core instruction. Teachers will model "thinking aloud," use rubric self-assessment, provide multiple problem-solving strategies, and engage students in explaining, reflecting on, and evaluating their learning.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Increased willingness to try new strategies and overcome challenges

-Increased use of academic vocabulary and problem solving approaches

-increased engagement and active participation in mathematics through discussion, collaboration, and problem-solving

-Increase student persistence and confidence when solving complex math tasks

-Increased independence, use of rubrics and self reflections to monitor their own progress

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Learning Coaches, and Classroom Educators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Targeted student groups continue to experience achievement and representation gaps. Economically Disadvantaged students score below campus averages (STAAR Component Score of 34 vs. 62 overall), with 35% meeting standard in Reading and 30% in Math. Emergent Bilingual students saw TELPAS English progress decline from 73% to 47% and had 45% Math Academic Growth. African American students make up 6.1%

Instructional and identification practices are not consistently differentiated or responsive to student needs. PLCs do not consistently plan for daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, language supports are applied inconsistently, and GT identification relies heavily on traditional testing and teacher referrals rather than universal, culturally responsive screening practices.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Campus-wide STAAR Math Meets Grade Level dropped from 70% to 65% (causing the campus to miss the Math Distinction Designation), while MAP Growth data in Grades K-2 highlights persistent concerns in Computations & Algebraic Relationships.

Unpacking of TEKS during PLC planning lacked campus-wide alignment around computational fluency and problem-solving models, and guided math small-group instruction and manipulative use are not applied daily during Tier I Math Workshop.

2

Specialized student groups experience substantial achievement gaps, including Economically Disadvantaged students (STAAR Component Score 34 vs. 62 overall; 35% Meets in Reading, 30% in Math), Emergent Bilingual students (TELPAS progress dropped from 73% to 47%; 45% Math growth), and Special Education/504 students (comprising over 26% of the campus).

PLCs have not consistently built in dedicated daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, sheltered instruction strategies and language objectives are not applied consistently, and PLCs lack structured co-planning time between general education and specialized staff to implement accommodations and universal design principles.

4

Grade 5 STAAR Science performance reached only 45% Meets and 26% Masters, missing postsecondary readiness targets.

Hands-on lab investigations and science vocabulary spiraling were not aligned vertically across Grades K-5.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Professional Learning Community structures fail to systematically adjust early interventions or close foundational skill gaps across writing and math.

PLCs lack embedded co-planning time between general education and specialized staff, PLC data reviews do not systematically disaggregate student progress to adjust Tier II/III interventions, and district professional learning decisions lack alignment on data collection from learner and staff needs.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Student classroom engagement is low at 48% favorable (with only 27% discussing topics outside of school), and student survey scores in Learning Strategies fell 15 points (with only 31% knowing how to try alternate approaches when stuck).

Daily lessons rely mostly on teacher-led instruction and recall tasks rather than active, choice-driven project-based learning and explicit metacognitive problem-solving strategies.

Performance Objective 2 High Priority

Eliminate academic performance and progress disparities for African American, Economically Disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and Special Education student groups to satisfy State and Federal accountability standards.

Evaluation Data Source: -Aware STAAR disaggregated data

- Tier II intervention tracking sheets
- mCLASS reading benchmark data
- NWEA MAP BOY, MOY and EOY data
- TELPAS data

Strategy 1

Structure Tier II small-group differentiation and poverty-informed instructional routines within PLCs specifically focused on accelerating African American and Economically Disadvantaged student performance in Mathematics and RLA.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Aware STAAR disaggregated data

- Tier II intervention tracking sheets
- mCLASS reading benchmark data
- NWEA MAP BOY, MOY, and EOY data

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, MTSS Committee, Classroom Educators, Learning Coaches

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Systematize daily alignment of instruction to the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS), including clear content and language objectives and structured opportunities for oral language development across all general education content areas to support Emergent Bilingual learners.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Improved TELPAS progress ratings
-Increased use of ELPS for targeted student growth

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Language Acquisition Specialists (LAS), Learning Coaches, General Education Educators

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2, 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Tightly link HB 1416 acceleration tutoring and Tier III intervention logs directly to classroom Common Formative Assessment (CFA) data points in Aware, ensuring targeted skills are retaught.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Panorama HB 1416 tracking logs
-CFA progress monitoring dashboards
-Tier III progress logs

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Intervention Specialists, Learning Coaches

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

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Targeted student groups continue to experience achievement and representation gaps. Economically Disadvantaged students score below campus averages (STAAR Component Score of 34 vs. 62 overall), with 35% meeting standard in Reading and 30% in Math. Emergent Bilingual students saw TELPAS English progress decline from 73% to 47% and had 45% Math Academic Growth. African American students make up 6.1%

Instructional and identification practices are not consistently differentiated or responsive to student needs. PLCs do not consistently plan for daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, language supports are applied inconsistently, and GT identification relies heavily on traditional testing and teacher referrals rather than universal, culturally responsive screening practices.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

2

Specialized student groups experience substantial achievement gaps, including Economically Disadvantaged students (STAAR Component Score 34 vs. 62 overall; 35% Meets in Reading, 30% in Math), Emergent Bilingual students (TELPAS progress dropped from 73% to 47%; 45% Math growth), and Special Education/504 students (comprising over 26% of the campus).

PLCs have not consistently built in dedicated daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, sheltered instruction strategies and language objectives are not applied consistently, and PLCs lack structured co-planning time between general education and specialized staff to implement accommodations and universal design principles.

3

Accelerated learning for students who previously missed grade level remains low (36% overall, 29% in Math), the campus earned a Scaled Score of 65 (Rating D) in Domain 2 Relative Performance, and the Closing the Gaps score sits at 64.

Master scheduling did not protect dedicated intervention periods prior to state testing, HB 1416 acceleration tutoring was not tightly linked to common formative assessment data, and PLC data reviews did not systematically disaggregate Tier II/III progress for federal student groups.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement

Root Cause

2

The campus Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework faces challenges in consistently accelerating learning and closing foundational gaps for students requiring targeted intervention--resulting in an overall accelerated learning rate of 36% (and 29% in math), a Closing the Gaps score of 64, and high growth variance across the 26.1% of students receiving Special Education or Section 504.

Scheduling, co-planning, and data review systems do not consistently support responsive instruction. Intervention time is not consistently protected, PLCs do not consistently use student data to adjust interventions, and general education and specialized staff lack dedicated time to co-plan and align supports.

Goal 2

Organization that Cultivates Excellence: We as Cottonwood Creek 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

Strengthen teacher capacity, retention, and trust through ongoing professional development, actionable instructional coaching, and collaborative learning that promote student engagement, higher-order thinking, creativity, problem-solving, and responsive instruction for diverse academic needs.

Evaluation Data Source: -Panorama Staff Survey results

- Administrative walkthrough logs,
- Coaching conference records
- T-TESS observations
- Professional Development opportunities attended
- PLC notes

Strategy 1

Shift administrative classroom walkthroughs and PLC check-in protocols from compliance monitoring toward growth-oriented, actionable coaching dialogues and feedback using a T-TESS rubric.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Improved student achievement

- Increased T-TESS ratings
- Improved Staff Wellbeing and Happiness
- Improved Panorama Staff Survey results

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Learning Coaches

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 4

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Implement campus-wide well-being initiatives, streamline administrative reporting requirements, and conduct a staff survey to identify workload concerns and inform mental health and stress-management supports for educators.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Panorama Staff Survey (Well-being topic)

- Staff retention rates
- Documentation of supports offered and used
- Committee feedback meeting notes

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Campus SEL Committee, Counselor

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Perceptions 1, 2, 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 3

Strengthen teacher capacity to meet diverse academic needs through instructional practices that promote student engagement, higher-order thinking, creativity, and problem-solving.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Increased capacity to differentiate instruction and respond to diverse student academic needs
-Increased engagement and active participation in learning
-Application of higher-order thinking, creativity, and problem-solving skills across content areas.
-Increased use instructional strategies that promote student ownership, collaboration, and productive struggle
-Improved student performance and academic growth
-Greater consistency in rigorous, engaging, and student-centered learning experiences

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, Learning Coaches

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1, 5

Funding Sources: Staff Need Based Professional Development 211 - Title I, Part A, \$3,210

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
2	Campus teacher retention dropped to 69.7% from the 2024-25 to 2025-26 school year, resulting in 42.9% of newly hired teachers being completely new to the profession (0-1 years of experience) and 0% holding advanced degrees.	Onboarding, mentorship, and instructional coaching structures have not provided sufficient targeted daily support to retain experienced educators or accelerate the instructional efficacy of novice teachers managing high classroom diversity

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Professional Learning Community structures fail to systematically adjust early interventions or close foundational skill gaps across writing and math.	PLCs lack embedded co-planning time between general education and specialized staff, PLC data reviews do not systematically disaggregate student progress to adjust Tier II/III interventions, and district professional learning decisions lack alignment on data collection from learner and staff needs.
4	Staff perceptions of Feedback and Coaching fell to the 20th percentile nationally, with only 22% of staff feeling feedback helps them grow.	Classroom walkthroughs focused on compliance monitoring rather than growth-oriented instructional coaching conversations, and campus decision-making lacked focus on evidence-based, sustainable professional learning alignment.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

	Problem Statement	Root Cause
1	Student classroom engagement is low at 48% favorable (with only 27% discussing topics outside of school), and student survey scores in Learning Strategies fell 15 points (with only 31% knowing how to try alternate approaches when stuck).	Daily lessons rely mostly on teacher-led instruction and recall tasks rather than active, choice-driven project-based learning and explicit metacognitive problem-solving strategies.
2	Student survey feedback showed a 5-point drop in Sense of Belonging (down to 67%), alongside a 17-point decline in students feeling that teachers genuinely care about their well-being	Pacing demands reduced opportunities for teachers to build informal, individual relationships with students, while SEL check-ins and class meetings were applied inconsistently without a uniform peer-connection routine.
3	Significant barriers remain in fully addressing the mental health, social-emotional, and wellness needs of learners and staff.	Campus structures faced barriers in fully implementing wellness resources and delivering the health enrichment TEKS--including mental health conditions, substance abuse, emotional management, positive relationships, responsible decision-making, and suicide prevention.

4

Family perception that staff value their input dropped 22 points (to 78%), while overall family engagement sits at 25%.

Communication platforms were used mostly for one-way announcements rather than interactive two-way dialogue.

5

Staff trust in the evaluation system dropped 42 points, with only 17% of staff viewing evaluations as objective.

Clear calibration and open communication regarding T-TESS rubrics and TIA growth measures were lacking across the campus.

Performance Objective 2

Optimize organizational structures, scheduling, and digital learning platforms to maximize instructional time, track whole-child development, and promote critical thinking.

Evaluation Data Source: -Master schedule audit logs

-Intervention attendance logs

-MTSS notes and logs

-Panorama Student Success Platform

Strategy 1

Protect dedicated, uninterrupted daily intervention and enrichment blocks in the campus master schedule to ensure at-risk learners receive Tier II/III support without missing core instruction.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Increased access to consistent, scheduled Tier II and Tier III interventions for students with identified academic needs

-Reduced loss of core instructional time for students receiving intervention services

-Improved alignment between student assessment data and targeted intervention instruction

-Increased student progress toward grade-level standards through timely reteaching and enrichment

-More consistent documentation and monitoring of intervention participation and student growth.

-Improved opportunities for students to receive support based on individual learning needs.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Learning Coaches, Team Leaders

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 3

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Strategy 2

Provide teachers with a choice of creative digital portfolio tools allowing them to document SLO progress, track TIA growth, and showcase students' whole-child achievements.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Increased teacher ownership and engagement in selecting digital portfolio tools that meet instructional and student needs
 -Consistent documentation of SLO progress and TIA growth
 -Increased opportunities for students to reflect on and showcase academic, creative, and whole-child achievements
 -Improved visibility of student growth and accomplishments for students, families, and educators
 -Increased teacher capacity to use digital portfolios to support reflection, goal-setting, and student learning

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Educational Technology Specialists, Learning Coaches

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 4 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Demographics

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Targeted student groups continue to experience achievement and representation gaps. Economically Disadvantaged students score below campus averages (STAAR Component Score of 34 vs. 62 overall), with 35% meeting standard in Reading and 30% in Math. Emergent Bilingual students saw TELPAS English progress decline from 73% to 47% and had 45% Math Academic Growth. African American students make up 6.1%

Instructional and identification practices are not consistently differentiated or responsive to student needs. PLCs do not consistently plan for daily intervention time or poverty-informed strategies, language supports are applied inconsistently, and GT identification relies heavily on traditional testing and teacher referrals rather than universal, culturally responsive screening practices.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

3

Accelerated learning for students who previously missed grade level remains low (36% overall, 29% in Math), the campus earned a Scaled Score of 65 (Rating D) in Domain 2 Relative Performance, and the Closing the Gaps score sits at 64.

Master scheduling did not protect dedicated intervention periods prior to state testing, HB 1416 acceleration tutoring was not tightly linked to common formative assessment data, and PLC data reviews did not systematically disaggregate Tier II/III progress for federal student groups.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
4 Staff perceptions of Feedback and Coaching fell to the 20th percentile nationally, with only 22% of staff feeling feedback helps them grow.	Classroom walkthroughs focused on compliance monitoring rather than growth-oriented instructional coaching conversations, and campus decision-making lacked focus on evidence-based, sustainable professional learning alignment.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
1 Student classroom engagement is low at 48% favorable (with only 27% discussing topics outside of school), and student survey scores in Learning Strategies fell 15 points (with only 31% knowing how to try alternate approaches when stuck).	Daily lessons rely mostly on teacher-led instruction and recall tasks rather than active, choice-driven project-based learning and explicit metacognitive problem-solving strategies.

Goal 3

Safety, Wellness and Belonging: We as Cottonwood Creek 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

Foster an inclusive school environment where students report high sense of belonging, strong teacher-student connections, and active investment in classroom learning.

Evaluation Data Source: Panorama Student Survey (Sense of Belonging & Teacher-Student Relationships), Discipline referral logs, Momentous lesson logs

Strategy 1

Systematize daily morning class meetings, SEL check-ins, and restorative discipline routines across all classrooms.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: -Students will experience consistent opportunities to build relationships, develop social-emotional skills, and feel a sense of belonging
-Improved self-awareness, communication, and conflict-resolution skills
-Increased predictable routines that promote a safe, respectful, and supportive learning environment
-Consistent use of SEL and restorative practices to address student needs and resolve conflicts
-Increased student engagement and readiness

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Campus Counselor, Classroom Educators

Problem Statements: Perceptions 2

Funding Sources: Momentous Institute Materials and Professional Development 211 - Title I, Part A, \$4,000

Formative Reviews

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

Strategy 2

Incorporate student choice, hands-on learning, STEAM challenges, and peer collaboration into Tier I instruction to increase student interest and classroom engagement.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Panorama Student Survey (Engagement topic), STEAM Showcase participation records, Walkthrough engagement indicators

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, STEAM Teacher, Classroom Educators, Learning Coaches

Problem Statements: Student Learning 4 - Perceptions 1

Formative Reviews

November

February

April

June

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning

Problem Statement

Root Cause

4

Grade 5 STAAR Science performance reached only 45% Meets and 26% Masters, missing postsecondary readiness targets.

Hands-on lab investigations and science vocabulary spiraling were not aligned vertically across Grades K-5.

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement

Root Cause

1

Student classroom engagement is low at 48% favorable (with only 27% discussing topics outside of school), and student survey scores in Learning Strategies fell 15 points (with only 31% knowing how to try alternate approaches when stuck).

Daily lessons rely mostly on teacher-led instruction and recall tasks rather than active, choice-driven project-based learning and explicit metacognitive problem-solving strategies.

2

Student survey feedback showed a 5-point drop in Sense of Belonging (down to 67%), alongside a 17-point decline in students feeling that teachers genuinely care about their well-being

Pacing demands reduced opportunities for teachers to build informal, individual relationships with students, while SEL check-ins and class meetings were applied inconsistently without a uniform peer-connection routine.

Performance Objective 2

Strengthen two-way family partnerships and maintain high physical security standards through proactive communication and transparent safety protocols.

Evaluation Data Source: Panorama Family Survey (Staff-Family Relationships & Family Engagement), ParentSquare engagement analytics

Strategy 1

Expand two-way communication channels and parent advisory feedback loops on ParentSquare to actively solicit and value parent input regarding campus programs and school climate.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Panorama Family Survey (Staff-Family Relationships & Family Engagement), ParentSquare engagement analytics

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, Parent Advisory Committee, Classroom Educators

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

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

Strategy 2

Proactively communicate campus physical security routines, daily door audit procedures, safety drill schedules, and threat assessment protocols to families through dedicated ParentSquare updates.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Panorama Family Survey (School Safety topic), Daily door sweep audit logs, TEA Safety Audit reports

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administrators, School Resource Officer(SRO), Campus Safety Committee

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 3

Formative Reviews

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

Strategy 3

Strengthen family partnerships by providing meaningful, accessible opportunities for parents and caregivers to engage in campus activities, support student learning, and contribute to a positive school culture.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved family survey data, Increased parent participation in campus events, Improve student achievement, Improved parent-teacher relationships

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, Counselor

Problem Statements: Perceptions 4

Funding Sources: Frankly Parent Engagement Building Capacity Platform 211 - Title I, Part A, \$3,240, Supplies for Parent Engagement Activities 211 - Title I, Part A, \$5,000

Formative Reviews

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement	Root Cause
3 Favorable parent responses regarding school safety dropped 16 points to 72%, highlighting an ongoing need to revisit safety efforts and state security requirements for learners, staff, and facilities	Proactive communication detailing physical security routines, door audits, and safety procedures was insufficient.

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions

Problem Statement	Root Cause
4 Family perception that staff value their input dropped 22 points (to 78%), while overall family engagement sits at 25%.	Communication platforms were used mostly for one-way announcements rather than interactive two-way dialogue.



State Compensatory Education

State Compensatory

Budget for Cottonwood Creek Elementary

Total SCE Funds: \$2,922.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

These funds will be used to hire substitutes for staff to plan for data driven lessons, interventions, and extensions as well as to purchase supporting supplies aligned to our core Tier 1 Instructional Programs.



Funding Summary

Funding Summary

211 - Title I, Part A

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	2	1	Substitutes for Data-driven Design Days Focusing on Sub-Population Intervention	--	\$5,049.00
2	1	3	Staff Need Based Professional Development	--	\$3,210.00
3	1	1	Momentous Institute Materials and Professional Development	--	\$4,000.00
3	2	3	Frankly Parent Engagement Building Capacity Platform	--	\$3,240.00
3	2	3	Supplies for Parent Engagement Activities	--	\$5,000.00
				Sub-Total	\$20,499.00

199 - State Comp Ed

Goal	Performance Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1	These funds will be used to hire substitutes for staff to plan for data driven lessons, interventions, and extensions as well as to purchase supporting supplies aligned to our core Tier 1 Instructional Programs.	--	\$2,922.00
				Sub-Total	\$2,922.00



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