MARBLE FALLS
Independent School District

Meeting Date: 11/16/2026 **Date Submitted:** 11/9/2026

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting **Agenda Placement:** Consent Agenda

Subject:

Possible Approval of 2026-2027 Turnaround Plan for Highland Lakes Elementary School

Executive Summary:

Texas schools are required to create improvement plans when they receive ratings of low performance. At the October Board of Trustees meeting, Administration reviewed the student performance data that led to the campus rating, the improvements required by the Texas Education Agency, the intervention measures or sanctions that may be imposed if performance does not improve within a designated period, and provided an overview of the Highland Lakes Elementary Turnaround Plan (TAP). The plan has been posted for public comment on the district website for the required number of days.

The purpose of the school improvement plans are to ensure that campuses engage in a focused and systematic process to identify the root causes of low performance and implement targeted strategies to improve student outcomes. The TAP promotes continuous improvement through regular goal setting, action planning, and progress monitoring. Additionally the improvement plan process provides access to state and district support, helps coordinate resources for improvement, and promotes transparency with parents and the broader school community about how the campuses plan to achieve better academic results.

The key components of the plan include a comprehensive school improvement strategy; curriculum and instructional initiatives designed to enhance student learning; job-embedded professional development to build staff capacity and provide ongoing support; clearly defined milestones to guide implementation; a performance management system to ensure fidelity of execution; and the allocation of necessary resources to sustain implementation efforts.

Administration is recommending approval of the Highland Lakes Elementary Turnaround Plan.

Fiscal Impact: **Funding Source:** **Fiscal Year:** **Ammendment Required?**

How will you present this item to the Board?

Summary Sheet & Supporting Documents

Does this item require any documents to be signed by the Board?

No

Administration's Recommendation:

Administration recommends the MFISD Board of Trustees approve the Highland Lakes Elementary Turnaround Plan.

Submitted By:
Yarda Leflet

Presenter:
Yarda Leflet

Board Approval Required: YES

Highland Lakes Elementary Turnaround Plan 2026–2028 (10.19.26 DRAFT v1)

Highland Lakes Elementary School · Marble Falls ISD · Summer 2026 – Spring 2028

Plan Development and Stakeholder Engagement

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Did the LEA meet statutory requirements for stakeholder engagement, and has the board approved the plan? The district assures that the Campus Intervention Team (CIT) conducted a public meeting at the campus with the principal, campus-level planning and decision-making committee, parents, and community members to review the campus rating and solicit input. Written notice of all public meetings was provided to parents and students and posted on the campus website with date, time, and place. The board posted the plan on the district website before the hearing, conducted a hearing, and approved the plan. Written stakeholder comments, if any, are attached.

Campus: Highland Lakes Elementary School (K–5), Marble Falls ISD
Accountability status: Unacceptable rating, second consecutive year (UA 2); federal Additional Targeted Support (ATS). **59/F, UA2**
Why this matters for exit (School Improvement Playbook): a UA 2 campus must complete a needs assessment, stakeholder engagement, a TAP, and performance management interventions; continued unacceptable ratings escalate toward conservator, board of managers, or closure. The TAP stays in effect until HLES earns a C or better. A Title I campus identified for ATS three consecutive years is escalated to CSI. **HLES is Title I, ATS year 1, TSI is triggered by Hispanic, Econ Dis, EB & SPED/ATS triggered by Hispanic, EB and SPED below 56 CTG score.**
Plan developed by: HLES Principal and Instructional Leadership Team **(K.Payson, K.Civiletto, E. Villarreal, S.Purcell, E.Rios, D.Guthrie)** ; Yarda Leflet, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction; Soor-el Puga, Director of Elementary Education;

Plan development supported by: Dr. Jeff Gasaway, Superintendent; Dr. Shana Fanchar, Assistant Superintendent of Special Services; Dr. Melissa Fields, Director of Assessment and Accountability; Dr. Pedro Garcia, Director of Bilingual/ESL and Migrant Programs; Stan White, Assistant Superintendent of Administration; EDpact LIFT team (Janelle Persall, HLES Campus Coach; Matt Pope, District Coach; Kat Molina, LIFT Lead); Robert Garcia, School Improvement Specialist, ESC Region 13; HLES teachers and stakeholders
Plan development process:

- **Spring 2026:** MFISD completed its TSL Academic Plan with ESC Region 13, organized around Effective District Framework (EDF) Levers 4 and 5. The district analyzed HQIM math options (October 2025–February 2026), selected Savvas Math in March 2026, and received Board of Trustees approval in April 2026.
- **April–June 2026:** EDpact, as LIFT Approved Provider, completed the LIFT Needs Assessment (due June 15) and the MFISD LIFT Action Plan (June 2026).
- **June 22, 2026:** District Leadership Retreat ("Leading with Impact") with EDpact.

Principals received PLC and observation-feedback training and helped develop the MFISD Instructional Playbook.

- **August–September 2026:** BOY MAP (August 26–September 10), district walkthroughs on the LIFT observation tool (August 24–September 23), and EDpact LIFT observations produced the campus baselines in this plan.
- Community notice, stakeholder input, 30-day posting, hearing, and board approval follow Milestone 1.4.
    - **CEIC: 10/16/26**
    - **HLES Faculty Meetings: 9/23/26; 10/15/26**
    - **All Parent Meeting: 11/03/26**
    - **PTO Meeting: 11/03/26**

Plan to be submitted to TEA by 11/20/2026: Yarda Leflet, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction

TAP development steps (TEA School Improvement Playbook)

The board-approved TAP is due **November 20, 2026**. With the required 30-day public posting, the draft must be posted by roughly mid-October. The Playbook's eleven steps are carried out in Milestone 1.4.

TAP step	Requirement	Due / window
Pre-steps	DCSI named in AskTED (by Sep 4, 2026); SI Orientation and TAP Consultation (Aug 15–Sep 30, 2026)	Yarda Leflet
1. Review most recent rating	2026 preliminary (Aug 15) and final (Aug 28) ratings reviewed with ESC 13	August 2026
2. Notify community	Written notice to HLES parents and students that HLES must develop a TAP (TEC §39A.103), including the date, time, and place of the CIT public meeting; notice posted on the HLES campus website and the MFISD website	10/2/26 10/9/26
3. Solicit community input	Website notice, public meeting(s), forms; documentation kept for submission; CIT public meeting with the principal, campus-level planning and decision-making committee members, parents, and	Posted to website 10/14/26 CEIC: 10/16/26 HLES Faculty Meeting: 10/15/26 All Parent Meeting: 11/03/26 PTO Meeting: 11/03/26

TAP step	Requirement	Due / window
	community members	
4. Root cause analysis	ILT and CIT confirm root causes (confirms the TEC §39A.053 on-site needs assessment findings)	September–October 2026
5. Review academic programs for efficacy	See Academic Program Review and Restructuring	October 2026
6. Identify ESF-aligned strategies	See Four Critical Focus Areas crosswalk	October 2026
7. Develop TAP against success criteria	Draft reviewed by ESC 13 and TEA CSS and checked against the 2026–27 Improvement Plan Success Criteria	Early October 2026
8. Share TAP; solicit written comments	Draft posted on the MFISD website with public comment period at least 30 calendar days before board action (19 TAC §97.1064(e))	Publish on website on 10/14 with a Google form 10/20/26: A-Team/Principal Meeting 10/23/26: District-wide Intervention teachers 10/28/26: DEIC & DOI Committee 11/5/26: All Counselors Campus meetings to be scheduled: CEIC: 10/16/26 HLES Faculty Meetings: 9/23/26; 10/15/26 All Parent Meeting: 11/03/26 PTO Meeting: 11/03/26
9. Board hearing and approval	Plan posted before the hearing (TEC §39A.057(b))	Final board approval 11/16/26
10. Submit board-approved TAP	TEA platform	November 20, 2026
11. Monitor progress	Monthly LIFT PM; MOY milestone review; June Improvement Reflection	Nov 2026–June 2027
Resubmission (only if not	Revised TAP	February 26, 2027

TAP step	Requirement	Due / window
approved)		

School Improvement Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Person	Responsibilities in this TAP
Superintendent	Dr. Jeff Gasaway	Sets the instructional vision; takes part in TAP consultation and monthly LIFT PM routines; ensures submissions are accurate and on time; protects the four critical focus areas from initiative overload.
District Coordinator of School Improvement (DCSI)	Yarda Leflet	Required CIT member; leads needs assessment, TAP development, and implementation monitoring; aligns staffing, finance, PD, and curriculum to HLES needs; coordinates ESC and LIFT supports; attends LIFT PM stepbacks; owns the milestone tracker. Playbook expectation: about 50% of the role protected for school improvement.
Principal Manager	Dr. Jeff Gasaway	Coaches and evaluates the HLES principal; co-observes with EDpact; monitors PLC checkpoints and O/F tier data.
Campus Intervention Team (CIT)	K.Payson, K.Civiletto, E. Villarreal, S.Purcell, E.Rios, D.Guthrie, Dr. Pedro Garcia,	Leads, coordinates, and monitors campus-level improvement under TEC Chapter 39A.
HLES Principal and ILT	K.Payson, K.Civiletto, E. Villarreal, S.Purcell, E.Rios, D.Guthrie, Dr. Pedro Garcia	Execute the plan daily: tiered O/F, PLCs, intervention schedule, campus PM routine, staffing recommendations.
ESC Region 13 SI Team	Robert Garcia, School Improvement Specialist	SI orientation; plan review; site visits and touchpoints; stepback support.

Role	Person	Responsibilities in this TAP
TEA Campus Support Specialist (CSS)	Dr. Monette Coleman	TAP consultation; site visits and touchpoints (Sep 14, 2026–Jun 30, 2027); feedback on the TAP draft.
LIFT Approved Provider	EDpact (Janelle Persall, Matt Pope, Kat Molina)	Coaching visits, PLC support cycles, calibration, monthly PM facilitation. Provides 12 additional LIFT-funded campus and Assistant Principal coaching visits; coaching and PM support continue in 2027–28. Capacity builder of record for the school improvement strategy (Success Criteria, Section II).

Campus Context and Needs

HLES has the lowest student achievement and the lowest observed instructional quality of MFISD's four elementary campuses, even though it has the district's densest observation-and-feedback loop. The September 2026 evidence points to a planning and delivery gap (what students are asked to do in the lesson), not an observation-frequency gap.

Student learning baselines (BOY MAP, tested August 26–September 10, 2026)

Measure	HLES	Elementary comparison
Math mean achievement percentile	47th	Colt 57th · MFES 56th · Spicewood 62nd
Math projected STAAR Approaches+ (Gr 2–5)	59%	Colt 73% · MFES 71% · Spicewood 80%
Math students meeting fall-to-fall growth projection	55%	Colt 66% · MFES 65% · Spicewood 68%
Reading (English) mean achievement percentile	37th	Colt 54th · MFES 51st · Spicewood 57th
Reading projected STAAR Approaches+ (Gr 2–5)	60%	Colt 83% · MFES 79% · Spicewood 88%
Reading students meeting growth projection	56%	Colt 67% · MFES 57% · Spicewood 56%
Spanish Reading K–5 (201 students)	Grade medians 43rd–73rd; campus median 53rd	Near national norm

Grade	Math mean %ile · proj. Approaches+	Reading mean %ile · proj. Approaches+
K	46th (n=54)	37th (n=34)
1	52nd (n=48)	43rd (n=26)
2	41st · 53% (n=73)	39th · 74% (n=39)
3	42nd · 51% (n=63)	29th · 51% (n=65); 49% projected Did Not Meet
4	56th · 63% (n=57)	44th · 61% (n=57)
5	46th · 67% (n=70)	35th · 59% (n=70)

Math cohort signals (2026 STAAR vs. BOY MAP projection, Approaches / Meets / Masters): Grade 4 cohort scored 62 / 44 / 20 on 2026 Grade 3 STAAR and projects 63 / 28 / 9. Grade 5 cohort scored 35 / 16 / 6 on 2026 Grade 4 STAAR and projects 67 / 29 / 1. The PM deck labels these directional only.

Summary

	Component Score	Scaled Score	Rating	Proportion of Overall Rating
Overall		**59**	**F**	
Student Achievement		**56**	**F**	**0%**
STAAR Performance	30	56		
College, Career and Military Readiness				
Graduation Rate				
School Progress		**58**	**F**	**70%**
Academic Growth	54	58	F	✓
Relative Performance (Eco Dis: 86.6%)		57	F	
Closing the Gaps	**18**	**63**	**D**	**30%**

Identification of Schools for Improvement

This campus is identified for additional targeted support.

STAAR Performance	Reading/Language Arts (RLA)	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Totals	Percentages
Total Tests	188	188	70	-	446	
Approaches GL or Above	116	93	31	-	240	54%
Meets GL or Above	63	52	6	-	121	27%
Masters GL	25	19	2	-	46	10%
Total Percentage Points						91%
Component Score						**30**

Accountability Groups									
	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	High Focus^
All Subjects									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	54%	100%	51%	65%	50%	-	-	50%	52%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	27%	100%	25%	38%	0%	-	-	0%	25%
At Masters GL Standard	10%	50%	9%	15%	0%	-	-	0%	9%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	240	2	184	52	1	-	-	1	217
At Meets GL Standard or Above	121	2	89	30	0	-	-	0	103
At Masters GL Standard	46	1	33	12	0	-	-	0	38
Total Tests	446	2	360	80	2	-	-	2	417
Reading/Language Arts (RLA)									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	62%	100%	58%	76%	100%	-	-	100%	60%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	34%	100%	32%	42%	0%	-	-	0%	31%
At Masters GL Standard	13%	100%	11%	21%	0%	-	-	0%	11%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	116	1	88	25	1	-	-	1	106
At Meets GL Standard or Above	63	1	48	14	0	-	-	0	55
At Masters GL Standard	25	1	17	7	0	-	-	0	20
Total Tests	188	1	152	33	1	-	-	1	176
Mathematics									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	49%	100%	49%	55%	0%	-	-	0%	48%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	28%	100%	24%	42%	0%	-	-	0%	25%
At Masters GL Standard	10%	0%	10%	12%	0%	-	-	0%	9%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	93	1	74	18	0	-	-	0	84
At Meets GL Standard or Above	52	1	37	14	0	-	-	0	44
At Masters GL Standard	19	0	15	4	0	-	-	0	16
Total Tests	188	1	152	33	1	-	-	1	176

Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (EB Current)											
2026 Target									**40%**		
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)									**42%**		
Long Term Target (2037-38)									**46%**		
Points Earned for Accountability Rating									**3**		
Points Evaluated for Federal School Improvement									3		
2026 TELPAS Progress Rate									42%		
2026 TELPAS Progress									84		
2026 TELPAS Total									200		
2025 TELPAS Progress Rate									35%		
Total Points										**3**	**4**

2026-2027 Fall PEIMS School Population

Filters: 027904103 - Highland Lakes EL

School Population	Count
Student Total	443
EE	1
PK	78
KG	54
01	49
02	71
03	65
04	56
05	69

2026-2027 Fall PEIMS Student Demographics

Filters: 027904103 - Highland Lakes EL

Gender	
Female	211
Male	232
Ethnicity	
Hispanic-Latino	346
Race	
American Indian - Alaskan Native	4
Asian	2
Black - African American	6
Native Hawaiian - Pacific Islander	0
White	79

2026-2027 Fall PEIMS Student Programs

Filters: 027904103 - Highland Lakes EL

Dyslexia	19
Gifted and Talented	24
Regional Day School Program for the Deaf	0
Section 504	12
Special Education (SPED)	90
Bilingual/ESL	
Emergent Bilingual (EB)	263
Bilingual	216
English as a Second Language (ESL)	9

Instructional baselines (August 24–September 23, 2026)

HLES completed 43 district walkthroughs (35 on LIFT RLA/Math forms) of 24 teachers, the most of any MFISD campus. 100% of LIFT-form walkthroughs assigned a next step and 88% of feedback was viewed. Instructional quality is the gap: the district-rated average was 2.35 of 4, and 21% of walkthroughs rated high quality (3.0 or higher). EDpact's 5 LIFT observations averaged 1.52, with none rated high quality. Four same-day HLES co-observations differed by 0.09 to 0.25 points, so campus ratings are reasonably calibrated.

LIFT indicator (1–4 scale)	HLES (district walkthroughs, n=35)	District RLA/Math average
LE: Classroom Management	2.97	3.13

LIFT indicator (1–4 scale)	HLES (district walkthroughs, n=35)	District RLA/Math average
LE: Routines	2.57	2.87
ID: Pacing	2.45	2.83
MR: Checks for Understanding	2.38	2.77
MR: Monitoring	2.35	2.74
MR: Responding	2.31	2.75
ID: Academic Language	2.31	2.76
ID: Frequent Practice	2.26	2.72
ID: Breadth of Practice	2.20	2.63
ID: Depth of Practice	2.19	2.47
ID: Explicit Model	2.13	2.70
ID: Questions & Tasks	2.09	2.46

Problems of practice and root-cause hypotheses

The September 28 PM routine named a district problem of practice that applies directly to HLES: *students are not consistently doing the grade-level thinking work of the lesson*. It also asked what support beyond observation, such as lesson internalization, would change practice at HLES.

Root-cause hypothesis	Evidence at HLES	Evidence still needed
Lesson internalization: teachers do not consistently plan the must-do tasks and how every student will engage before teaching Savvas and HMH lessons.	Q&T 2.09 and Explicit Model 2.13 are HLES's lowest indicators; EDpact's most frequent action step was "Internalize Math Lessons."	Observe one RLA and one Math PLC; review internalization artifacts.
Feedback focus and targeting: next steps are dispersed (36 different districts next steps in September), and observation time is spread evenly rather than concentrated where teachers need the most support.	HLES assigns next steps 100% of the time, yet ratings remain lowest.	Was the prior action step observed again at the next visit? Which teachers account for the lowest ratings?
Tier 1 access for EB and SPED students is	English Reading 37th %ile vs. Spanish 53rd median;	Observations in bilingual and high-SPED classrooms.

Root-cause hypothesis	Evidence at HLES	Evidence still needed
inconsistent.	Responding 2.31.	

Student Outcome Goals for Highland Lakes Elementary

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Essential question (Section VI): Are the goals ambitious but achievable and likely to move the campus to a C or better in two or fewer years? Campus goals for student outcomes in RLA and Math narrow the focus, prioritize actions, and monitor progress. STAAR goals reflect a two-year outcome for the TAP that will grant the campus a C or higher rating, set using TEA's A–F Estimator Tool. (Domain and component-point goals for each year of the plan are retained from the prior criteria.)

Goals cover all three A–F domains and the ATS student group(s), because the Playbook ties exit to the domains that led to identification. Targets must be set by HLES and MFISD so that the campus is reasonably expected to reach a C or better within two years. Per the 2026–27 Success Criteria, the STAAR goals below reflect a two-year outcome that earns HLES a C or higher, verified with TEA's A–F Estimator Tool. Estimator result: [72 (June 2027) and 80 (June 2028)

Goal	2026 baseline	June 2027 target	June 2028 target
Overall state rating	UA (second consecutive)	72 (C)	C or better (TAP exit)
Domain 1, Student Achievement scaled score	56	65	75
% of Gr 3–5 students at Approaches / Meets / Masters, STAAR RLA	60,31,11	69,35,16	75,45,25
% of Gr 3–5 students at Approaches / Meets / Masters, STAAR Math	48,25,9	59,29,11	65,35,16
Domain 2, School Progress scaled score	58	62	72
Domain 3, Closing the Gaps scaled score	63	73	76
Domain 3 Academic Achievement	8 of 32 points	16/32	20/32

Goal	2026 baseline	June 2027 target	June 2028 target
component points			
Domain 3 Growth Status component points	0 of 32 points	8/32	10/32
Domain 3 ELP Status component points	3 of 4 points	4/4	4/4
Domain 3 Student Success Status component points	4 of 16 points	8/16	10/16
ATS-identified student group(s): % of Domain 3 indicators met	Hispanic 48 EB 51 SPED 30	Hispanic, EB and SPED 57	Above the CSI identification threshold

Interim progress measures

Interim measure	BOY 2026 baseline	MOY target (Jan 2027)	EOY target (May 2027)	Year 2 target
MAP Math projected Approaches+ (Gr 2–5)	59%	60%	60%	70%
MAP Reading projected Approaches+ (Gr 2–5)	60%	63%	65%	75%
MAP Math students meeting growth projection	55%	n/a	60%	70%
MAP Reading students meeting growth projection	56%	n/a	65%	75%
Gr 3 Reading projected Did Not Meet	49%	60%	65%	Gr 4 cohort follow-up
CBA % average	**First data due Oct 23 PM**	**MFISD to determine target**	**MFISD to determine target**	**MFISD to determine target**
% of Math/RLA teachers in O/F Tier 1	38%	50%	75%	100%

School Improvement Strategy

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Essential question (Section II): Is the proposed strategy likely to move the campus to a C or better in two years or less, and does it align with critical improvement levers (tightly aligned instructional core and managed instruction, quality observation and feedback, strategic staffing, supported student intervention and data tracking)? Has the district realistically identified all resources needed? The strategy would reasonably improve student outcomes quickly enough that the campus is not escalated under TEC §39A.111. A team or organization with a track record of systems building and rapid improvement (ESC, SAPL vendor, program-vetted vendor) is dedicated to supporting implementation; or named district/campus staff have a turnaround track record and at least 50% of their role dedicated to the strategy (not the current principal or AP unless the role was added for school improvement). The plan lists all costs with funding sources, describes how the district prioritized and redistributed talent and resources to proportionately support the campus, includes a contingency plan if grant funds are not awarded, and differentiates or increases support for administrators and principal managers without a demonstrated track record. All plans must address intensive curriculum and instruction improvements.

The designated school improvement strategy is ***"Intensive Curriculum and Instruction Improvements"***, accomplished through strong Tier 1 implementation of Savvas Math (new in 2026–27) and HMH RLA in K–5, supported by LIFT coaching and the MFISD TSL Plan.

Why this strategy will move HLES to a C within two years. HLES' lowest measures are in Tier 1 planning and delivery (Questions & Tasks 2.09; Explicit Model 2.13; 21% of walkthroughs rated high quality; Reading at the 37th percentile), while its observation frequency is the highest in the district. Intensive Curriculum and Instruction Improvements targets that gap directly by combining HQIM unit and lesson internalization, tiered observation and feedback, and protected intervention. The student outcome goals, set with TEA's A–F Estimator Tool, show HLES earning a C or better by 2028, so HLES exits turnaround status before the escalations described in TEC §39A.111.

Integrated theory of action

If HLES leaders and teachers learn RBIS and the MFISD Instructional Playbook, internalize every Savvas and HMH lesson in weekly PLCs, and receive tiered, actionable observation and feedback on a common LIFT tool (weekly for the teachers who need the most support), and if district and campus leaders review that evidence monthly and adjust support, then every HLES classroom will deliver RBIS-aligned instruction grounded in HQIM. That will raise the rigor of what students do in each lesson so that achievement and growth rise on CBAs, MAP, and STAAR.
This restates the LIFT Theory of Action (Level 1) in campus terms and operationalizes MFISD's four TSL initiatives: KP 4.2.3 (materials), 4.2.5 (monitoring), 4.1.2 (instructional framework), and 5.2.3 (role-aligned training).

How the workstreams connect: RBIS, Playbook, Savvas, and HMH training → weekly PLCs that internalize and rehearse → Tier 1 delivery where students do the thinking → tiered observation and feedback plus CBA, MAP, and student work evidence → monthly LIFT PM and TSL monitoring → adjusted PLC focus, teacher tiers, and PD.

Organizations and people supporting school improvement

Partner	Role at HLES	Evidence of capacity
EDpact (LIFT Approved Provider)	Janelle Persall, HLES Campus Coach: 18 scheduled 2026–27 visits (twice monthly, about 3 hours each). Additional LIFT funding adds 12 campus visits for campus and Assistant Principal coaching. Coaching and campus support continue in 2027–28 at the same general cadence, with dates scheduled May–July 2027. Matt Pope, District Coach; Kat Molina, LIFT Lead.	TEA-approved LIFT provider; leads MFISD's Needs Assessment, Action Plan, and monthly PM routines. **Track-record statement**
ESC Region 13	Robert Garcia, School Improvement Specialist; Math RBIS training per TSL; TSL Plan facilitation.	**Track-record statement**
LASO 3 provider	Literacy RBIS and Literacy Instructional Framework. The TSL tracker references "E3" resources.	**E3 Alliance**
Savvas	Math product training (Summer 2026).	Publisher of the adopted HQIM.
MFISD C&I and Elementary Education	Yarda Leflet and Soor-el Puga: TSL owners, principal supervision, district learning walks.	**Track-record statement**
MFISD Special Services and Bilingual/ESL	Dr. Shana Fanchar and Dr. Pedro Garcia: Tier 1 access for SPED and EB students; Branching Minds MTSS.	**Track-record statement**

Capacity builder of record: EDpact. EDpact, a TEA-approved LIFT provider, is the organization dedicated to supporting HLES in systems building and strategy implementation (Success Criteria, Section II). ESC Region 13 provides supplemental school improvement support. MFISD district staff serve as implementation owners, not capacity builders. If MFISD

names district staff as capacity builders, the plan must document each person's school turnaround track record and that at least 50% of their role is dedicated to HLES; the HLES principal and AP may not be named unless their role was added specifically for school improvement.

Funding sources: LIFT (LASO Cycle 4) grant, Math Planning and RLA Planning, including additional LIFT funding the district has committed for 12 added campus and Assistant Principal coaching visits; Instructional Materials Allotment (Savvas); LASO 3 funds (Literacy RBIS). All costs with amounts and funding sources, the district's prioritization and redistribution of talent and resources, and the grant contingency plan are in Additional Resources.

Tiered Observation and Feedback

Observation time is concentrated where teachers need the most support: Tier 3 teachers are observed weekly, Tier 2 every two weeks with a follow-up check, and Tier 1 every two weeks. Every teacher still receives at least the biweekly observation and feedback round required by the TAP success criteria.

Tier	Who (proposed criteria)	Observation frequency	Feedback and follow-up	Coaching support
Tier 1: Proficient	LIFT-tool average of 3.0 or higher on two consecutive observations; not in first two years of teaching	Every two weeks (TAP minimum)	Written action step within 48 hours; next observation checks the step	Leader feedback; teacher may host peer observations and model lessons
Tier 2: Developing	LIFT-tool average from 2.5 to 2.99	Every two weeks, plus a 5–10 minute follow-up check on the action step in the off week	Written action step within 48 hours; rehearsal of the step at the debrief	Leader coaching; targeted PLC support on the step
Tier 3: Intensive	LIFT-tool average below 2.5; first- and second-year teachers; uncertified teachers; or teachers flagged by CBA data	Weekly	Feedback within 24 hours; action step rehearsed at the debrief and re-observed the same or next week	Coaching cycle with the instructional coach; priority for EDpact co-observation and modeling

How tiers are set and changed.

- Initial tiers are assigned from the August–October 2026 walkthrough and EDpact data (Milestone 1.2).

- The HLES ILT reviews tier placements monthly at the campus PM routine; a teacher moves up after two consecutive observations above the tier threshold and down after two below it.
- Formal tier resets happen at BOY, MOY (January), and EOY using calibrated data.
- Tier data are private coaching information, used to target support, not for evaluation.

Capacity check. HLES's September average was 2.35, so most Math and RLA teachers are likely to start in Tier 3. Before tiers launch, the principal assigns each observer a caseload and blocks observation time, so weekly Tier 3 observations are feasible. Two observers and 19 teachers.

Alignment with TEA criteria. The 2026–27 Success Criteria (Section III) require teachers who need more support to be observed at least weekly and teachers who need less support at least biweekly, by an instructional leader or coach based on their tier. HLES meets this standard: Tier 3 teachers are observed weekly, and Tier 1 and Tier 2 teachers at least every two weeks, with Tier 2 teachers receiving an added follow-up check. This also meets the Playbook's Quality Observation and Feedback expectation for the teachers with the greatest need.

Observation and Feedback Data System

MFISD commits to implementing the Instructional Insights App (IIA) through the Texas Exchange as the HLES observation and feedback data system beginning in January 2027, extending the platform EDpact already uses for LIFT observations. HLES leaders continue to record observations in Eduphoria with the LIFT Observation and Feedback Protocol through December 2026, while Exchange onboarding, role-based access, and leader training on the IIA dashboard are completed during the fall semester so HLES launches in the January 2027 implementation window. The system is aligned to the district's observation tool (the LIFT tool, which is the TSL walk-through form) and lets HLES and MFISD monitor:

- **Observation and feedback frequency:** observations per teacher by tier against the weekly and biweekly standards.
- **Action steps for teachers:** the next step assigned at each observation and whether it is observed again at the following visit.
- **Strong instructional delivery:** LIFT indicator averages and the percentage of walkthroughs rated 3.0 or higher.
- **Fidelity of HQIM implementation:** Pacing and Questions & Tasks ratings, and whether the observed lesson is the Savvas or HMH lesson of the day per the scope and sequence.
- **Teacher growth:** indicator trends by teacher and tier movement at BOY, MOY, and EOY.

How the IIA strengthens the HLES observation-and-feedback system. Beginning in January 2027, the IIA helps HLES leaders (1) capture observation evidence, ratings, and action steps consistently on the same LIFT form for every observer; (2) monitor observation and feedback frequency by teacher and tier using the dashboard's count of observations conducted and count of unique teachers observed; (3) identify trends in instructional practice using Metrics Over Time and Performance by Category (Instructional Delivery, Learning Environment, and Monitoring & Responding), filtered by teacher, grade level, and content area; (4) track follow-up and coaching over time by keeping each teacher's observations and action steps in one record, so leaders can confirm that prior steps are revisited at the next observation; and (5) strengthen the campus's overall observation-and-feedback system by giving campus leaders a full campus

view and district leaders an aggregated view of the same data. The IIA becomes the common source of observation and feedback data for EDpact visit planning (Strategy 1), PLC trend reviews (Strategy 2), tiered observation and feedback (Strategy 3), and campus and district PM (Strategy 7).

TSL Alignment Crosswalk

Every HLES strategy maps to one of MFISD's three TSL priorities and four TSL initiatives; LIFT supplies the coaching, calibration, and monitoring cadence the TSL Plan relies on. District vision: *"Marble Falls ISD has an unyielding commitment to love every child and inspire them to achieve their fullest potential."*

Code	TSL priority or initiative (district wording)
EDF 4.1 (priority)	Establish and communicate research-based strategy and approach for strong multi-tiered instruction and supports, inclusive of content and curriculum-aligned intervention, additional and personalized learning time, and special populations strategies.
KP 4.1.2 (initiative)	District builds and orients staff to an instructional framework rooted in research-based Tier 1 instructional strategies aligned to content, designed for memory formation and deeper learning and supportive of all learners.
EDF 4.2 (priority)	Establish a materials adoption process, including clear expectations for implementation and aligning key enabling systems.
KP 4.2.3 (initiative)	The district ensures teachers have access to and use instructional materials that fully cover state standards, are aligned to RBIS, and can be used to meet the needs of all students.
KP 4.2.5 (initiative)	The district establishes routine monitoring systems to ensure campuses implement district-adopted instructional materials, utilize internalization and instructional planning, and follow the required scope and sequence and aligned assessments.
EDF 5.2 (priority)	Establish role-aligned job-embedded capacity building supports for instructional leaders and teachers to internalize, prepare for, and deliver

Code	TSL priority or initiative (district wording)
	instruction in a strong classroom environment.
KP 5.2.3 (initiative)	The district provides training so teachers, instructional leaders, and coaches have a role-aligned understanding of executing strong instruction, inclusive of content-aligned classroom management, intervention, additional and personalized learning time, and special populations support.

TAP workstream	**TSL alignment**	**HLES operationalizes it by…**	**What LIFT adds**
1. LIFT Implementation and Coaching	KP 5.2.3 (school-based implementation team roles); KP 4.2.5 (hold principals accountable for Tier 1 structures)	Naming an HLES implementation team; using each EDpact visit for co-observation, PLC support, and leader practice	18 Campus Coach visits; District Coach stepbacks; LIFT action step guides
2. PLCs	KP 4.1.2 (PLC protocols, PLC Guide, master schedule time); KP 5.2.3 (internalization, rehearsal); KP 4.2.5 (monthly principal PLC checkpoints)	Weekly grade-level Math and RLA PLCs: internalize, rehearse, analyze student work	LIFT PLC non-negotiables; PLC calibration; 8 PLC support sessions per grade/content
3. Observation and Feedback	KP 4.2.5 (walk-through form, calibration, O/F calendar, walkthrough data); KP 5.2.3 (train leaders on O/F cycle)	Tiered LIFT-tool observations in Eduphoria (in the IIA beginning January 2027) for every Math and RLA teacher	LIFT tool (12 indicators), action step guides, leader snapshots, Waterfall Document, calibration walks
4. Instructional Framework	KP 4.1.2 (Instructional Playbook "Big Six"; Reading Framework; Math Framework; Playbook v1.0 and Tier 1 Non-Negotiables)	Using Playbook look-fors now; HLES representation on the Math Framework team	LIFT Framework process: plan by Oct 30, draft by Jan 31, final by late April 2027
5. RBIS	KP 5.2.3 (math and RLA RBIS; new-hire	Math RBIS Parts 1 and 2; Literacy RBIS	High-priority LIFT focus area

TAP workstream	TSL alignment	HLES operationalizes it by…	What LIFT adds
	RBIS)	follow-up in PLCs and O/F	
6. Curriculum and HQIM	KP 4.2.3 (Savvas adoption, approved-materials list, RLA HQIM review); KP 4.2.5 (monitor approved materials)	Savvas and HMH used daily as designed	Adoption and product-training support
7. Performance Management	KP 4.2.5 (walkthrough and internalization fidelity data); KP 4.2.3 and 4.1.2 (impact data)	Campus PM before each district PM	Monthly LIFT PM with BOY/MOY/EOY add-ons
8. Strategic Staffing	KP 5.2.3 (mentor teachers); EDF Lever 2 (Talent) has no TSL Academic Plan initiative	Data-driven placement, hiring, retention	Evaluation and incentive alignment (LIFT deeper implementation)
9. Intervention and Data Tracking	EDF 4.1 (Branching Minds MTSS; MTSS monitoring plan)	Protected intervention block; move-group tracking	LIFT SI assessment-calendar recommendations

Consolidated work (one action, not two): one observation tool (the TSL walk-through form is the LIFT tool in Eduphoria, captured in the IIA beginning January 2027); one calibration cycle (TSL calibration walks and LIFT calibration walks are the same event); one framework (the TSL Playbook and Frameworks are the LIFT Instructional Framework deliverables); one PLC check (principal PLC checkpoints and LIFT PLC observations use the same look-fors); one monitoring cadence (the LIFT monthly PM routine).

Curriculum and Instruction

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Strategy A criteria (Intensive Curriculum and Instruction Improvements): The campus implements high-quality instructional materials with fidelity; if it is not currently using HQIM, the plan describes how and when the transition will occur. The district allocates sufficient instructional time for HQIM, with a calendar of at least 165 instructional days, and the master schedule includes the minimum minutes needed to deliver the curriculum as intended. The assessment plan enables actionable, timely instructional decisions, and the plan describes how student growth is monitored throughout the year. The campus provides at least one 45-minute common planning/PLC period per week for all

Criteria for Success (TEA)
teachers, including special education, bilingual, and ESL staff. PLCs are facilitated by someone knowledgeable about the instructional materials. The PLC protocol includes lesson internalization, lesson rehearsal, module/unit internalization, and student work analysis, and regularly includes guidance and feedback from Special Education and Emergent Bilingual staff. The plan describes how interventions will be provided for special populations.

Instructional materials

- **Math K–5: Savvas Math**, new in 2026–27; selected March 2026, Board-approved April 2026, distributed for BOY
- **RLA K–5: HMH Into Reading**, continuing in 2026–27 with renewed fidelity expectations.
- **Spanish-language RLA:** at least 201 students tested in Spanish Reading K–5. HMH Arriba la Lectura. Dual Language one way and two way.
- **Year 2 RLA decision point.** The TSL Plan calls for selecting an HQIM RLA curriculum in Spring 2027 (decision expected January–February 2027). **Path A** continues HMH at deeper implementation; **Path B** launches a newly adopted RLA HQIM in Fall 2027.
- **Approved materials only.** Non-approved materials are collected by December 2026, with a second clean-out in Spring 2027.

Instructional minutes and days

The HLES master schedule provides at least the publisher-recommended minutes for Savvas Math and HMH RLA in every K–5 classroom, with intervention scheduled outside core instructional time.

Content	Publisher-recommended minutes per week	HLES scheduled minutes per week	Intervention minutes per week
Math K–5 (Savvas)	**45-60 minutes**	**100**	**Varies based on need**
RLA K–2 (HMH)	**60-120 minutes**	**120**	**Varies based on need**
RLA 3–5 (HMH)	**60-120 minutes**	**120**	**Varies based on need**

- 2026–27 calendar: **171 days**; last day of school May 27, 2027.
- 2027–28 calendar: **once approved; include board approval date**.
- Both the 2026–27 and 2027–28 calendars meet TEA's minimum of 165 instructional days.

Assessment Calendar

Window/Date	Assessment	Grade Levels
8/26-9/9	BOY Universal Screener	K-5

9/28-10/2	CBA/Edify #1	K-5
11/30-12/4	CBA/Edify #2	K-12
1/4-1/22	MOY Universal Screener	PK-5
2/22-26	CBA/Edify #3	K-5
2/15-3/26	TELPAS & TELPAS Alt	K-5
3/15-4/16	STAAR Alt Window	3-5
4/14-5/7	EOY Universal Screener	PK-1
4/13	ELAR 3-5/SLAR STAAR 3-5	3-5
4/21	Science STAAR 5	5
4/27	Math STAAR 3-5)	3-5
5/3-5/14	EOY Universal Screener	2-5

Campus assessment planMonitoring student growth. HLES monitors growth throughout the year using MAP (BOY, MOY, EOY) against fall-to-fall growth projections, CBA trends by unit, and Branching Minds progress monitoring every week. Growth is reviewed monthly at the campus PM routine and at each quarterly stepback, with interim targets in Student Outcome Goals.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

- **Weekly, at least 45 minutes, for all teachers.** Every HLES teacher, including special education, bilingual, ESL teachers, **and interventionists**, has at least one 45-minute common planning/PLC period each week for grade-level Math and RLA, protected in the master schedule; additional periods are added as scheduling allows. **[HLES PLC schedule to be provided: day and time by grade]**
- **Membership:** all core Math and RLA teachers, plus bilingual, ESL, and SPED teachers. [See master schedule for how SPED, bilingual, and ESL staff who serve several grades are scheduled, e.g., rotating attendance]
- **Knowledgeable facilitation:** In Year 1, PLCs are facilitated by **Dr. Pedro Garcia, Principal / Kathy Payson, Asst. Principal**, who completed Savvas and HMH product training, Math and Literacy RBIS, and MFISD PLC Guide training, and who co-facilitate with EDpact modeling. In Year 2, teacher-leader facilitators are selected from Tier 1 teachers, complete **facilitator training** before facilitating, and are observed and coached by campus leaders.
- **Protocols (MFISD PLC Guide):** (1) module/unit internalization before each new Savvas topic or HMH module (end-of-unit assessment, key understandings, pacing, and anticipated misconceptions); (2) weekly lesson internalization of the must-do task; (3) rehearsal of the hardest part of upcoming lessons (starting Year 1); (4) CBA data and student work analysis with reteach plans; (5) review of observation trends and tier-level action steps.
- **SPED and EB guidance:** Every PLC agenda includes a standing segment in which SPED and bilingual/ESL staff give guidance and feedback on accommodations, language supports, and scaffolds for upcoming lessons, and review work samples from students with disabilities and emergent bilingual **[See PLC Calendar for frequency].**
- **LIFT PLC support:** at least 8 PLC support sessions per grade level and content area per year (Playbook LIFT Addendum). **[See HLES session calendar]**

Academic Program Review and Restructuring

The Playbook requires a review of academic programs for efficacy, and TEC §39A.105 requires the TAP to describe restructuring and academic programs.

Program	Current use	Efficacy evidence	Decision
Savvas Math K–5	Year 1 Tier 1 core	Too new for outcome data	Keep; implement with fidelity
HMH RLA K–5	Tier 1 core	Reading mean 37th %ile; Gr 3 29th %ile at BOY 2026	Keep in 2026–27; Path A / Path B decision Feb 2027
Spanish-language RLA / bilingual program	One-way & Two-way Dual Language Model	Spanish Reading median 53rd vs. English 37th	**Biliteracy transitions**
Tier 2/3 intervention programs	ARC Rigby iXL Summit K-12	Minutes on task Observations Running Records	Move to Branching Minds process (Strategy 9)
Supplemental and teacher-purchased materials	Present districtwide	Overlaps HQIM	Stop; collected by December 2026
NWEA MAP Growth	Interim assessment	Used in PM	Keep
Other campus programs	**[List]**	**[needed]**	**[Keep / stop]**

Restructuring. No change in campus governance or management is proposed. However, due to staff resignation, restructuring is limited to campus leadership: a named school-based implementation team; a master schedule with protected weekly PLCs and a distinct intervention block; tiered allocation of observation time; data-driven 2027–28 staffing; and district-approved HQIM only.

Capacity Building

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Essential question (Section III): Does the plan demonstrate that administrators and teachers have the expertise, resources, and dedicated time to enact the improvement strategy effectively? Capacity building matches the current state of talent at the campus, which may include tiering teachers by experience or effectiveness, with differentiated or increased support for teachers, administrators, and principal managers new to their role (first two years); teachers without a demonstrated track record; and uncertified teachers. Observation instruments reflect capacity-building efforts (RBIS, student engagement, checks for understanding, coaching

Criteria for Success (TEA)
action steps). Teachers receive observation and feedback from an instructional leader or coach based on their tier: teachers requiring more support at least weekly, teachers needing less support at least biweekly. Capacity building addresses the specific needs of the campus student population (e.g., special education, bilingual/ESL).

Leadership capacity building

- **HLES Principal, Assistant Principal(s), and instructional coach(es): Dr. Pedro Garcia, Kathy Payson, Ellie Rios, Erika Villarreal and Shellye Purcell.**
- **Principal supervisor: Dr. Jeff Gasaway**
- **Completed Summer 2026:** "Leading with Impact" retreat with EDpact (June 22) on PLCs, the O/F cycle, and the Instructional Playbook; Administrator Workshop on the Playbook "Big Six"; walk-through form and O/F expectations training.
- **Ongoing 2026–27:** monthly Leadership Learning and principal meetings; Admin Meetings with EDpact (October 6, 2026; December 15, 2026; February 9, 2027; May 4, 2027); monthly district learning walks; EDpact visits every other week; monthly LIFT PM. These coaching, campus support, and Performance Management routines continue in 2027–28 at the same general cadence; specific 2027–28 dates are scheduled May–July 2027 as the district and campus finalize the 2027–28 calendar and implementation schedule.
- **Leader coaching focus:** preparing observations with LIFT leader snapshots; choosing one high-leverage action step; rehearsing steps with teachers; running the tiered caseload; leading internalization in PLCs.
- **Differentiated support for leaders:** Administrators and principal managers who are in their first two years in the role, or who do not have a demonstrated track record of improving student outcomes, receive increased support: **[**e.g., biweekly co-observation with the principal supervisor; EDpact leader coaching at every visit; monthly one-on-one data review with the DCSI]. The principal manager receives monthly stepbacks and co-observation with the EDpact District Coach and
- **Additional LIFT-funded campus and Assistant Principal coaching:** Based on HLES needs, the district has committed additional LIFT funding for 12 EDpact campus visits beyond the originally planned support. These visits increase coaching for campus leaders and the Assistant Principal, with an emphasis on leadership capacity, implementation fidelity, and observation and feedback: side-by-side classroom walks and real-time calibration; modeling, co-leading, and then handing off coaching conversations, feedback cycles, and PLCs; and support for schoolwide routines and progress on TAP priorities. They add to, and do not replace, the twice-monthly Campus Coach cadence (Strategy 1), and visit notes are reviewed at the campus PM routine.
- **Principal evaluation: [T-PESS dates]**

Teacher capacity building

- HLES teacher profile: 38 teachers, average 15 years experience, 11% uncertified; 9 TIA designated
- **Completed by Fall 2026:** Literacy RBIS; Savvas product training (June and August

2026); Playbook session at the August 2026 Teacher Conference; Math RBIS Part 1 (August 13, 2026); classroom management PD options (CHAMPS, SAMA).
- **Scheduled:** Math RBIS Part 2 (January 4, 2027); Tier 1 math training modules (Spring 2027).

Differentiated support by teacher tier

- **New teachers** (first two years) and **uncertified teachers** start in O/F Tier 3 with weekly observation, 24-hour feedback, and a coaching cycle. New Teacher Orientation (August 3–5, 2026) introduces the Playbook, HQIM, and PLC Guide; mentor pairing expands in Year 2 (TSL KP 5.2.3). **[Supports for uncertified teachers; mentors receive stipend and PREP Mentors receive stipends per allotment status]**
- **Uncertified teachers** start in Tier 3 (weekly observation, 24-hour feedback, and a coaching cycle), are paired with a certified mentor, and receive **[certification pathway support]**. The principal reviews their certification progress each semester. **[See list of number of uncertified teachers and their certification pathways needed]**

- **Teachers without a demonstrated track record** at HLES are placed by LIFT-tool data (Tier 2 or 3) and move tiers as ratings change.
- **Proficient teachers** (Tier 1) receive biweekly feedback and are invited to host peer observations and model lessons, which builds Year 2 teacher-leader capacity.

Capacity building tied to instruction

- **Observation tool.** The LIFT observation tool (content-agnostic, Math, and RLA forms) in Eduphoria, moving to the IIA in January 2027. Its 12 indicators include RBIS look-fors (explicit model, frequent practice, checks for understanding) and HQIM look-fors (pacing, questions and tasks, depth of practice). . Its indicators and the required next step capture RBIS use, checks for understanding, the depth of student practice (student engagement in the thinking work), and a coaching action step at every observation.
- **Frequency.** Tiered, as described in Tiered Observation and Feedback: weekly for Tier 3, every two weeks for Tiers 1 and 2.
- **Monthly look-for.** One district look-for per month (October 2026: Depth and Breadth of Practice), with next steps drawn from three aligned LIFT action steps.
- **Formal appraisal.** T-TESS continues; the district's "TTESS and LIFT Overview" aligns appraisal with LIFT look-fors. **[T-TESS calendar]**

Special programs

- **Emergent bilingual students:** Bilingual/ESL department supports Tier 1 access within Savvas and HMH; bilingual teachers attend grade-level PLCs. [Gomez & Gomez program model]
- **Special education:** Special Services supports SPED teachers in PLCs and co-planning; TSL adds accommodations, co-teaching, and UDL PD in Summer 2028. Because the TSL SPED PD falls after the TAP's second instructional year, HLES adds Year 1 and Year 2 training on accommodations, co-teaching, and ELPS-aligned language supports: [See 2026–27 and 2027–28 training titles, dates, and providers].

- **MTSS:** Branching Minds launched Fall 2026; districtwide MTSS process by Summer 2028 (TSL).
- **Interventions for special populations:** Students with disabilities receive **[service model, e.g., inclusion or co-teach, resource]** and intervention aligned to IEP goals using. Emergent bilingual students receive a one-way and two-way dual language model Gomez & Gomez model, with language goals informed by TELPAS. Both groups are included in Branching Minds rosters and move-group tracking (Strategy 9).

Integrated Strategy Matrix

Nine strategies carry the plan, organized under TEA's four critical focus areas. Each strategy's timeline lives in the Key Milestones section (milestone numbers are listed in each table).

Four Critical Focus Areas crosswalk (TEA School Improvement Playbook)

Critical focus area	ESF indicator	TAP strategies	Key milestones
Strategic Staffing and Instructional Leadership	ESF 2.1	8, 1	1.9, 2.3, 2.9
Tightly Aligned Tier 1 Instruction with HQIM and Managed Instruction	ESF 4.1 / 4.2	6, 2, 4, 5	1.1, 1.3, 1.7, 1.9, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5
Quality Observation and Feedback	ESF 4.2 / 5.2	3, 1	1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 2.3, 2.8
Supported Student Intervention and Data Tracking	ESF 4.1 / 5.3	9, 7	1.5, 1.6, 1.8, 2.5, 2.7

Strategy 1: LIFT Implementation and Instructional Leadership Coaching

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	HLES leaders observe more than any MFISD campus (43 walkthroughs in one month; 100% with a next step), yet the campus has the lowest ratings (2.35 average; 21% high quality).
Root cause	Hypothesis: leader coaching has focused on observation volume more than on preparing teachers before lessons and following up on one high-leverage step. **[HLES root cause]**

Field	HLES plan
Strategy	Use every LIFT touchpoint to build HLES leaders' skill in the full cycle: prepare, observe, give one action step, rehearse it, follow up.
Key actions	Name an HLES implementation team with defined roles. Plan each EDpact visit (co-observe Tier 3 classrooms, co-facilitate one PLC, coach one leader move). Use LIFT leader snapshots, action step guides, and the Waterfall Document. Principal supervisor joins at least one EDpact visit per month. Use the 12 additional LIFT-funded visits for side-by-side observation, calibration, and feedback coaching with the Assistant Principal and campus leaders. Beginning January 2027, plan each visit from IIA dashboard data (observation frequency, action steps, and category trends).
Key milestones	1.2, 1.6, 1.7, 2.3, 2.8
Owner(s)	Dr. Pedro Garcia (HLES Principal); Soor-el Puga (Director of Elementary Education); Janelle Persall (EDpact); Matt Pope (EDpact)
LIFT support	Campus Coach: twice-monthly visits (Aug 24; Sep 9, 25; Oct 8, 22; Nov 11, 19; Dec 9, 17; Jan 13, 28; Feb 10, 25; Mar 10, 25; Apr 7, 22; May 5). District Coach: monthly stepbacks and co-observation with principal supervisors. Additional LIFT-funded support: 12 campus visits for campus and Assistant Principal coaching, beyond the 18 scheduled visits. 2027–28: Campus Coach visits and District Coach stepbacks continue at the same general cadence; dates scheduled May–July 2027.
TSL alignment	KP 5.2.3 (school-based implementation team roles and calibration); KP 4.2.5 (principal accountability for Tier 1 structures).
Evidence	Visit planning forms and summaries in the LIFT Tracking Tool (including the 12 additional coaching visits); implementation team roster; co-observation log; leader action-step log.
Leading indicators	EDpact visits completed (target 18 of 18 scheduled visits and 12 of 12 additional

Field	HLES plan
	campus and AP coaching visits); % of prior action steps observed again at next visit **[baseline Oct 2026]**; EDpact vs. HLES rating gap (target within ±0.25).
Student outcomes	STAAR Meets+; Domain 1–3 goals.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: leaders practice the cycle with EDpact modeling. Year 2: HLES leaders lead and calibrate with EDpact coaching continuing at the 2026–27 cadence in a gradual-release role; implementation team written into the CIP.

Strategy 2: Professional Learning Communities (Internalization, Rehearsal, Student Work Analysis)

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	Questions & Tasks (2.09), Explicit Model (2.13), Depth (2.19), and Breadth (2.20) are HLES's lowest indicators.
Root cause	Hypothesis: teachers do not consistently internalize the must-do task and plan how every student will engage. **[Confirm after Oct 2026 PLC observations]**
Strategy	Weekly Math and RLA PLCs where teachers internalize the next lesson, rehearse its hardest part, and analyze student work after each CBA.
Key actions	Protect weekly PLC time; use the MFISD PLC Guide and LIFT non-negotiables; publish a semester PLC scope and sequence; rehearse one lesson segment weekly; analyze student work samples (high, medium, low; EB and SWD) after each CBA; bring tier-level action-step trends into PLC; include bilingual and SPED teachers. Internalize each new Savvas topic or HMH module before it begins; hold at least 45 minutes weekly for all teachers; SPED and EB staff give guidance and feedback on scaffolds in every PLC.
Key milestones	1.3, 1.7, 2.2, 2.5

Field	HLES plan
Owner(s)	Dr. Pedro Garcia (HLES Principal); Soor-el Puga (Director of Elementary Education); Janelle Persall (EDpact); Matt Pope (EDpact); Yarda Leflet (DCSI)
LIFT support	At least 8 PLC support sessions per grade/content per year; EDpact models internalization; PLC observation calibration. MFISD is a LIFT Planning district, so TEA PLC observation submissions are not required; HLES observes PLCs locally.
TSL alignment	KP 4.1.2 (PLC protocols, PLC Guide, master schedule); KP 5.2.3 (internalization, rehearsal); KP 4.2.5 (principal PLC checkpoints; internalization fidelity data).
Evidence	PLC calendar and scope and sequence; agendas and minutes; annotated lessons; rehearsal notes; student-work-analysis protocols; PLC observation forms.
Leading indicators	% of weekly PLCs held (target 100%); % of PLCs meeting PLC Guide look-fors **[baseline Oct 2026]**; Q&T and Depth averages (Sept 2.09 and 2.19).
Student outcomes	CBA % averages; MAP projected Approaches+; STAAR Meets+.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: leaders facilitate weekly internalization and rehearsal. Year 2: teacher leaders facilitate; student work analysis and scaffolds for diverse learners deepen.

Strategy 3: Tiered Observation and Feedback

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	Feedback reaches teachers (100% next step; 88% viewed) but is not yet moving ratings, and observation time is spread evenly rather than concentrated where it is most needed.
Root cause	Hypothesis: feedback is not focused enough, and action steps are rarely rehearsed or re-observed within days. **[HLES root cause]**
Strategy	Tier every Math and RLA teacher and match observation frequency to need: weekly for Tier

Field	HLES plan
	3, every two weeks with a follow-up check for Tier 2, every two weeks for Tier 1. Each observation yields one action step tied to the monthly look-for.
Key actions	Assign initial tiers from Aug–Oct 2026 data; build observer caseloads and block time; observe with LIFT forms in Eduphoria (in the IIA beginning January 2027); feedback within 24 hours (Tier 3) or 48 hours (Tiers 1–2); rehearse the step at the debrief; review tiers monthly and reset at BOY/MOY/EOY; calibrate with EDpact and at district learning walks.
Key milestones	1.2, 1.7, 1.8, 2.3, 2.8
Owner(s)	HLES Principal, AP(s); Asst. Supt. C&I (walkthrough data); Director of Elementary Education (monthly look-for); Janelle Persall (EDpact)
LIFT support	Monthly classroom observations in the Instructional Insights App; co-observation of Tier 3 classrooms; coaching on leader snapshots, action step selection, and real-time coaching. Additional LIFT-funded visits add side-by-side observation and real-time calibration with the Assistant Principal and campus leaders.
TSL alignment	KP 4.2.5 (walk-through form, calibration, O/F calendar, walkthrough data); KP 5.2.3 (O/F training; coaching and peer observation cycles, 2027).
Evidence	Eduphoria export (through December 2026) and IIA dashboard reports (from January 2027) by teacher and tier; tier roster and caseloads; co-observation log; action-step follow-up log.
Leading indicators	% of teachers observed at their tier's frequency (target 100%); % of walkthroughs with a next step (hold at least 90%); % of feedback viewed (hold at least 88%); % of next steps aligned to the monthly look-for; % of teachers in Tier 1 **[baseline Oct 2026]**; % of HLES walkthroughs rated high quality (Sept 21%).

Field	HLES plan
Student outcomes	CBA results; MAP growth; STAAR Meets+.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: tiered cycle runs for every Math and RLA teacher; ratings calibrated to EDpact. Year 2: HLES leaders set tiers and look-fors from their own data; Tier 1 teachers host peer observations.

Strategy 4: MFISD Instructional Framework and Playbook Implementation

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	HLES needs one shared picture of excellent Math and RLA instruction that leaders observe, teachers plan toward, and PLCs reinforce.
Strategy	Implement the Instructional Playbook ("Big Six") and Reading Framework now; adopt the Math Framework as it is finalized, with HLES representing SI campuses in its development.
Key actions	Playbook training for all staff (August 2026); Reading Framework implementation; HLES representative on the Math Framework team; feedback on the draft by Jan 31, 2027; Playbook look-fors in walkthroughs and PLCs; Year 2 Math Framework and Playbook v1.0 with Tier 1 Non-Negotiables.
Key milestones	1.1, 1.9, 2.1, 2.4
Owner(s)	Asst. Supt. C&I and C&I Committee; HLES Principal; HLES Math Framework representative [to be identified]; Matt Pope (EDpact)
TSL alignment	KP 4.1.2 (Playbook phases 1 and 2; Reading and Math Frameworks; v1.0 and Tier 1 Non-Negotiables; Tier 1 expectations in all CIPs, Fall 2027).
Leading indicators	% of staff trained (target 100%); Playbook-aligned indicator averages; % of PLC agendas referencing the monthly look-for.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: staff use Playbook and Reading Framework look-fors; HLES contributes to the Math Framework. Year 2: Math Framework

Field	HLES plan
	and Playbook v1.0 implemented and written into the CIP.

Strategy 5: Research-Based Instructional Strategies (Literacy and Math RBIS)

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	RBIS-linked indicators are low: Explicit Model 2.13, Frequent Practice 2.26, Checks for Understanding 2.38, Responding 2.31.
Strategy	Train every teacher and leader in Literacy and Math RBIS, then carry each strategy into PLC internalization, look-fors, and action steps within weeks.
Key actions	Literacy RBIS by Aug 15, 2026; Math RBIS Part 1 (Aug 13, 2026); Math RBIS Part 2 (Jan 4, 2027); next two PLCs after each session plan the strategy into upcoming lessons; RBIS for new hires each summer; RLA RBIS refresher Summer 2027.
Key milestones	1.1, 1.7, 2.1
Owner(s)	Asst. Supt. C&I; ESC Region 13; LASO 3 provider; HLES Principal
TSL alignment	KP 5.2.3 (math and RLA RBIS; new-hire RBIS, Summer 2027).
Leading indicators	% completing each module (target 100%); Explicit Model, Frequent Practice, CFU, Responding averages.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: 100% trained; RBIS visible in PLC plans and look-fors. Year 2: new staff onboarded; HLES leaders deliver refreshers.

Strategy 6: Curriculum and HQIM Implementation (Savvas Math and HMH RLA)

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	2026–27 is Year 1 of Savvas Math; HMH RLA is not yet producing grade-level reading results (Reading 37th %ile; Grade 3 at 29th).
Strategy	Use Savvas and HMH as designed, every day,

Field	HLES plan
	within pacing, with only district-approved supplements; fidelity data are the first check in every PLC and PM routine.
Key actions	Savvas training for all Math teachers and new hires; confirm complete materials in every classroom; follow scope and sequence and assessment calendar; remove non-approved materials by December 2026; communicate with families; monitor fidelity and pacing; take part in the RLA HQIM review and prepare Path A or Path B.
Key milestones	1.1, 1.9, 2.1
Owner(s)	Asst. Supt. C&I and C&I Committee; District IM Coordinator; HLES Principal and campus IM coordinator (AP)
TSL alignment	KP 4.2.3 (HQIM math adoption, approved-materials list, removal of non-approved materials, RLA HQIM selection); KP 4.2.5 (monitor approved materials).
Leading indicators	% of classrooms with complete materials (target 100%); % of observed lessons using the HQIM lesson of the day **[baseline data]**; Pacing average (Sept 2.45).
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: Savvas fully implemented; HMH used with fidelity. Year 2: Savvas deeper implementation; RLA Path A or Path B.

Strategy 7: Performance Management

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	Before 2026–27, MFISD had no routine bringing student and instructional data together monthly with owners and deadlines.
Strategy	HLES participates in the monthly MFISD LIFT PM routine as an SI campus and runs its own campus PM routine one week earlier.
Key actions	Prepare HLES data (CBA %, walkthroughs by tier, PLC artifacts, intervention rosters), with observation and feedback data drawn from the IIA dashboard beginning January 2027; follow the six-step PM cycle; adopt 1–2 HLES

Field	HLES plan
	actions each month; review TAP milestone status each month; adjust milestones at MOY.
Key milestones	1.6, 1.8, 1.10, 2.7, 2.10
Owner(s)	Superintendent; DCSI [Yarda Leflet]; Asst. Supt. C&I; Dr. Melissa Fields; HLES Principal [Dr. Pedro Garcia]; Robert Garcia (ESC 13); Matt Pope (EDpact)
TSL alignment	KP 4.2.5 (walkthrough and internalization fidelity data; principal reviews, Fall 2027); KP 4.2.3 and 4.1.2 (impact data each spring).
Leading indicators	% of routines held on schedule; % of HLES action items completed on time **[target MFISD to set]**.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: every routine ends with owned HLES actions. Year 2: HLES runs its campus routine independently. District LIFT PM routines continue monthly in 2027–28 at the 2026–27 cadence, with dates scheduled May–July 2027.

Strategy 8: Strategic Staffing and Instructional Leadership

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	HLES serves the district's lowest-performing elementary students and needs its most effective teachers and leaders where the gaps are largest.
Root cause	**[HLES root cause; staffing, vacancy, and retention data]**
Strategy	Assess leadership and teacher effectiveness each semester and make hiring, placement, and retention decisions from student outcome and observation data.
Key actions	Semester leadership-capacity review by principal supervisor and DCSI; 2027–28 staffing plan by March 2027 placing the strongest teachers in Grades 2–5; hiring priority for HLES vacancies; retention tracking; TIA review; mentor pairing (Fall 2027). District

Field	HLES plan
	prioritization and redistribution of talent and resources for HLES are documented in Additional Resources.
Key milestones	1.9, 2.3, 2.9
Owner(s)	Superintendent; DCSI; Stan White; HLES Principal
TSL alignment	KP 5.2.3 (mentor teachers). EDF Lever 2 (Talent) has no TSL Academic Plan initiative.
Leading indicators	% of positions filled by the first day **[baseline]**; % of Grade 2–5 Math/RLA teachers in O/F Tier 1; retention of effective teachers **[baseline]**.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: baseline and 2027–28 placements from data. Year 2: data-driven placement routine; teacher leaders grown from Tier 1.

Strategy 9: Supported Student Intervention and Data Tracking

Field	HLES plan
Problem / need	49% of Grade 3 readers are projected Did Not Meet; Grade 2–3 Math at the 41st–42nd %ile; large English-vs.-Spanish reading gap.
Root cause	**HLES root cause; intervention schedule and progress data**
Strategy	Use CBAs, MAP, and Branching Minds progress monitoring to place students in intervention delivered in a protected block distinct from Tier 1, and track move groups near the Approaches and Meets cuts.
Key actions	Daily intervention block **[minutes needed]**; Tier 2/3 rosters updated after each CBA and MAP window; move-group goals shared with students and families *(adapted from Example TAP)*; campus data tracker; progress monitoring **[frequency needed]**; monthly effectiveness review; summer acceleration plans in May.
Key milestones	1.5, 1.8, 2.5, 2.7
Owner(s)	HLES Principal and MTSS lead; Dr. Shana Fanchar; Dr. Pedro Garcia; Dr. Melissa Fields

Field	HLES plan
TSL alignment	EDF 4.1 (multi-tiered supports); KP 4.1.2 (MTSS tool audit and monitoring plan; Branching Minds).
Leading indicators	% of identified students with a current plan (target 100%); % of intervention sessions delivered **[baseline needed]**; progress-monitoring completion **[baseline needed]**.
Year 1 / Year 2	Year 1: protected block and data-driven rosters. Year 2: PLCs own reteach and intervention decisions.

Key Milestones

The two-year plan is built on **10 milestones per year**. Each has specific tasks, a responsible owner, the touchpoints used to monitor it, and a "done when" check. The DCSI keeps the milestone tracker, and every monthly PM routine opens with milestone status. Per the 2026–27 Success Criteria, each milestone also lists its Evidence of Completion (the artifact, data, or observable action that verifies completion) and the Support Needed to complete it.

Recurring touchpoints used below

Touchpoint	Frequency	Who
EDpact campus visit	Twice monthly (18 in 2026–27); same general cadence continues in 2027–28, with dates scheduled May–July 2027	Janelle Persall with HLES leaders
Additional LIFT-funded campus and AP coaching visit	12 visits in 2026–27, in addition to the twice-monthly Campus Coach visits	EDpact with the HLES Principal, Assistant Principal, and campus leaders
HLES campus PM routine	Monthly, about one week before district PM	HLES ILT
District LIFT PM routine	Monthly (2026–27: Sep 28, Oct 23, Nov 20, Jan 29, Feb 26, Mar 25, Apr 23, June TBD); 2027–28 dates scheduled May–July 2027 at the same monthly cadence	Superintendent, DCSI, district leaders, EDpact, ESC 13
DCSI district milestone review (months without a LIFT PM routine)	December 2026 and May 2027 [12/15/26, 5/15/27]; Year 2 equivalents	DCSI, district leaders, HLES Principal
Quarterly stepback	BOY (Oct 23), MOY (Jan 29),	Same as district PM

Touchpoint	Frequency	Who
	EOY (Apr 23), June STAAR reflection	
Principal PLC checkpoint	Monthly	Principal with Director of Elementary Education
TEA CSS / ESC 13 site visits and touchpoints	Sep 14, 2026–Jun 30, 2027 **[dates needed once confirmed]**	DCSI, principal, ESC 13, TEA CSS
Principal supervisor meeting	Quarterly	Principal supervisor and principal

Year 1 (August 2026 – August 2027) at a glance

#	Milestone	Target date	Lead
1.1	Upfront PD and HQIM readiness complete	Aug 31, 2026	Asst. Supt. C&I
1.2	Tiered observation and feedback system launched and calibrated	Oct 23, 2026	HLES Principal
1.3	Weekly internalization and rehearsal PLCs running	Oct 16, 2026	HLES Principal
1.4	Board-approved TAP submitted	Nov 20, 2026	DCSI
1.5	Protected intervention block and BOY intervention rosters in place	Oct 30, 2026	HLES Principal and MTSS lead
1.6	Campus and district PM routines operating; BOY stepback held	Oct 23, 2026	DCSI
1.7	Advanced O/F and Math RBIS Part 2 carried into PLCs and look-fors	Jan 31, 2027	HLES Principal
1.8	MOY stepback: TAP milestones adjusted and teacher tiers reset	Jan 29, 2027	DCSI
1.9	Year 2 decisions: RLA path, Math	Mar 31, 2027	Asst. Supt. C&I and DCSI

#	Milestone	Target date	Lead
	Framework, and 2027–28 staffing		
1.10	EOY review and June Improvement Reflection submitted	Jun 30, 2027 (summer follow-through to Aug 2027)	DCSI

Milestone 1.1: Upfront PD and HQIM readiness complete (by August 31, 2026)

Tasks and actions

- Deliver Literacy RBIS to all teachers and leaders (by Aug 15) and Math RBIS Part 1 (Aug 13).
- Complete Savvas product training (June and August) and the Playbook session at the Teacher Conference.
- Confirm every Math and RLA classroom has complete Savvas and HMH teacher and student materials.
- Set weekly PLC time and a daily intervention block in the HLES master schedule.
- Hold New Teacher Orientation (Aug 3–5) and place new and uncertified teachers in O/F Tier 3.

Responsible: Asst. Supt. C&I (lead); District IM Coordinator; HLES Principal; LASO 3 provider; ESC 13
Touchpoints and checkpoints: June 22 Leadership Retreat; first EDpact visit (Aug 24); Sept 1 principal meeting; September 28 district PM (baselines).
Done when: 100% of HLES Math and RLA staff complete RBIS and product training; materials inventory shows 100% of classrooms complete; master schedule posted. **[HLES completion records]**

Evidence of Completion: Training sign-in and completion records (Literacy RBIS, Math RBIS Part 1, Savvas, Playbook); classroom materials inventory; posted master schedule showing the PLC and intervention blocks.
Support Needed: Completion records from ESC 13, the LASO 3 & 4 providers, and Savvas; materials inventory by the District IM Coordinator.

Milestone 1.2: Tiered observation and feedback system launched and calibrated (by October 23, 2026)

Tasks and actions

- Confirm tier criteria and assign initial tiers from August–October walkthrough and EDpact data. **[HLES to confirm tier criteria]**
- Assign observer caseloads and block weekly observation time for Tier 3 teachers. **[Observers and caseloads noted]**
- Launch the October look-for (Depth and Breadth of Practice) and the three aligned LIFT action steps.
- Set Eduphoria release settings so teachers can view feedback; set 24-hour (Tier 3) and 48-hour (Tiers 1–2) feedback windows.

- Complete at least one co-observation with EDpact for each HLES observer.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); AP(s) and instructional coach; Janelle Persall (EDpact); Director of Elementary Education
Touchpoints and checkpoints: EDpact visits Oct 8 and 22 (co-observation of Tier 3 classrooms); HLES campus PM (mid-October); October 23 district PM with BOY add-on.
Done when: every Math and RLA teacher has an assigned tier and observer; 100% of Tier 3 teachers observed weekly for three consecutive weeks; HLES–EDpact same-day ratings within ±0.25.

Evidence of Completion: Tier roster and observer caseloads; observation-system export showing weekly Tier 3 observations for three consecutive weeks; calibration log showing HLES–EDpact ratings within ±0.25.
Support Needed: EDpact co-observation (Oct 8 and 22); feedback-release settings in the observation system; protected observation time in leader calendars.

Milestone 1.3: Weekly internalization and rehearsal PLCs running (by October 16, 2026)

Tasks and actions

- Publish the fall PLC scope and sequence and PLC norms (MFISD PLC Guide).
- Run the internalization protocol on the next lesson's must-do task in every Math and RLA PLC (weeks of Oct 5 and Oct 12, then weekly).
- Rehearse one lesson segment each week.
- Schedule EDpact PLC support sessions toward the 8-per-grade-and-content minimum. **[Session calendar]**
- Confirm bilingual and SPED teachers attend.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); instructional coach; grade-level PLC leads; Janelle Persall (EDpact)
Touchpoints and checkpoints: EDpact visits (one modeled PLC per visit); monthly principal PLC checkpoint; October Leadership Learning PLC review.
Done when: 100% of scheduled PLCs held for four consecutive weeks with internalization artifacts on file; PLC observation baseline recorded.

Evidence of Completion: PLC calendar and scope and sequence; agendas and sign-ins including SPED and EB staff; unit and lesson internalization artifacts; PLC observation baseline.
Support Needed: EDpact modeled PLCs; MFISD PLC Guide; master schedule protecting at least 45 minutes weekly for all teachers.

Milestone 1.4: Board-approved TAP submitted (by November 20, 2026)

Tasks and actions

- Name the DCSI in AskTED and confirm the CIT. **[DCSI and CIT]**
- Post community notice and hold stakeholder input sessions (TEC §39A.103); keep documentation. **[Dates]**
- Confirm root causes and the academic program efficacy review with the ILT and CIT.
- Obtain ESC 13 and TEA CSS feedback on the draft.
- Post the draft at least 30 days before board action and collect written comments.

- Hold the public hearing and board vote; submit the TAP and begin implementation.

Responsible: DCSI (lead); Superintendent; HLES Principal; CIT; Robert Garcia (ESC 13)
Touchpoints and checkpoints: TAP Consultation with TEA CSS and ESC 13; October 23 district PM (status check); board meeting **[10/19/26 & 11/16/26]**.
Done when: board approval recorded and TAP submitted on the TEA platform by November 20, 2026, with written comments attached.

Evidence of Completion: CIT roster and AskTED record; parent and student notices and campus website screenshot (date, time, place); CIT public meeting sign-in and minutes; MFISD website posting record; written comments or the no-comments explanation; board hearing and approval minutes; TEA submission confirmation.
Support Needed: ESC 13 and TEA CSS feedback on the draft; board calendar; district communications support.

Milestone 1.5: Protected intervention block and BOY intervention rosters in place (by October 30, 2026)

Tasks and actions

- Confirm the daily intervention block is separate from Savvas and HMH core time. **[Master Schedule]**
- Build Tier 2 and Tier 3 rosters in Branching Minds from BOY MAP and first CBAs.
- Identify move-group students near the Approaches and Meets cuts and set goals shared with students and families.
- Set the progress-monitoring cadence and campus data tracker. **[Frequency]**

Responsible: HLES Principal and MTSS lead (lead); Dr. Melissa Fields; Special Services and Bilingual/ESL
Touchpoints and checkpoints: HLES campus PM (October); October 23 district PM (BOY add-on); monthly intervention review.
Done when: 100% of identified students have a current intervention plan; move-group tracker in use.

Evidence of Completion: Branching Minds Tier 2/3 rosters; intervention schedule; move-group tracker; progress-monitoring calendar.
Support Needed: Special Services and Bilingual/ESL guidance; Branching Minds training; [interventionist staffing].

Milestone 1.6: Campus and district PM routines operating; BOY stepback held (by October 23, 2026)

Tasks and actions

- Hold the first district PM routine (Sept 28) and set HLES baselines.
- Launch the monthly HLES campus PM routine with a standard data packet (CBA %, walkthroughs by tier, PLC artifacts, intervention rosters, milestone status). **[Day, time, and members need notated as happens]**
- Complete the Sept 28 action items, including the HLES SI plan update with look-for data

(due Oct 23, with ESC 13).
- Hold the BOY stepback on October 23.

Responsible: DCSI (lead); Matt Pope (EDpact, PM facilitator); Dr. Melissa Fields (data); MFISD Cabinet; HLES Principal
Touchpoints and checkpoints: September 28 and October 23 district PM routines; HLES campus PM (October).
Done when: HLES data packet delivered on time for both routines; Sept 28 action items closed or carried with new dates.
Evidence of Completion: PM agendas, HLES data packets, and action logs (Sep 28 and Oct 23); campus PM calendar; BOY stepback notes.
Support Needed: EDpact PM facilitation; data preparation by Dr. Melissa Fields.

Milestone 1.7: Advanced O/F and Math RBIS Part 2 carried into PLCs and look-fors (by January 31, 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Deliver advanced O/F coaching with the Waterfall Document (Nov–Jan).
- Deliver Math RBIS Part 2 (Jan 4) and plan its strategies into the next two PLCs.
- Add an RBIS Part 2 strategy to a monthly look-for.
- Complete Admin Meetings #1–#2 with EDpact; hold the December materials clean-out.
- Complete IIA onboarding during the fall semester (Exchange accounts, role-based access for HLES and district leaders, and dashboard training) and launch the IIA for all HLES observations and feedback in January 2027.
- Use the additional LIFT-funded visits to co-observe and calibrate with the Assistant Principal as advanced O/F practices and the IIA launch take hold.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); EDpact (advanced O/F coaching); Math RBIS Part 2 delivered b**y (EDpact);** Asst. Supt. C&I
Touchpoints and checkpoints: EDpact visits (Nov 11, 19; Dec 9, 17; Jan 13, 28); November 20 district PM; Admin Meetings (Oct 6; December 8).
Done when: 100% Math RBIS Part 2 completion; PLC agendas show RBIS planning; non-approved materials collected; all HLES observers recording observations and feedback in the IIA.
Evidence of Completion: Math RBIS Part 2 sign-ins; PLC agendas showing RBIS planning; monthly look-for calendar; materials clean-out log; IIA access roster and first IIA dashboard report.
Support Needed: RBIS trainer (EDpact); EDpact advanced O/F coaching with the Waterfall Document; IIA onboarding and Exchange setup; additional LIFT-funded campus and AP coaching visits.

Milestone 1.8: MOY stepback — TAP milestones adjusted and teacher tiers reset (by January 29, 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Prepare MOY evidence: HQIM fidelity, PLC execution, O/F frequency by tier (Eduphoria and IIA data), tier movement, data trackers, intervention rosters, MOY MAP, and TAP milestone status.
- Review with the ESC 13 SI case manager before the stepback.

- Reset teacher tiers from calibrated data; adjust caseloads.
- Adjust TAP milestones and spring actions; revise intervention rosters after MOY MAP.

Responsible: DCSI (lead); HLES Principal; Dr. Melissa Fields; Robert Garcia (ESC 13); Matt Pope (EDpact)
Touchpoints and checkpoints: January 29 district PM with MOY add-on; HLES campus PM (January); principal supervisor mid-year review.
Done when: MOY stepback documented with owned actions; tier reset complete; TAP milestone adjustments recorded (resubmission by Feb 26, 2027 only if TEA requests it).

Evidence of Completion: MOY stepback deck and action log; MOY MAP report; revised tier roster and caseloads; milestone tracker showing adjustments.
Support Needed: ESC 13 SI case manager pre-review; timely MOY MAP data release.

Milestone 1.9: Year 2 decisions — RLA path, Math Framework, and 2027–28 staffing (by March 31, 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Complete the district RLA HQIM decision (Feb 2027) and confirm Path A or Path B for HLES. **[MFISD decision needed]**
- Submit HLES feedback on the Math Framework draft (by Jan 31) and support Framework adoption decisions (end of Feb).
- Build the 2027–28 HLES staffing plan, placing the strongest Math and RLA teachers in Grades 2–5 from observation, CBA, and MAP data.
- Post HLES vacancies early with hiring priority.

Responsible: Asst. Supt. C&I (RLA and Framework); DCSI and HLES Principal (staffing); Stan White [confirm HR owner]
Touchpoints and checkpoints: February 26 PM stepback; March 25 district PM; Admin Meeting #3 (Feb 9); Board meetings (RLA first read Feb–Mar).
Done when: RLA path confirmed in writing; 2027–28 HLES staffing plan approved.

Evidence of Completion: Written RLA path decision and board minutes; HLES Math Framework feedback; approved 2027–28 staffing plan; early vacancy postings.
Support Needed: HR access to teacher effectiveness data; board agenda time.

Milestone 1.10: EOY review and June Improvement Reflection submitted (by June 30, 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Complete EOY MAP and STAAR; hold the April 23 EOY stepback.
- Conduct Year 1 PLC evaluation and teacher HQIM survey; set EOY teacher tiers.
- Compile TAP evidence and data trackers; finalize summer acceleration plans (May).
- Hold the June STAAR/System Reflection routine and submit it as the June Improvement Reflection.
- Review Year 1 with the CIT; submit LIFT continuation funding application. [Application date TBD]

- Schedule 2027–28 EDpact coaching visits, campus support, and district and campus PM routines at the same general cadence as 2026–27 (May–July 2027), as the district and campus finalize the 2027–28 calendar and implementation schedule.
- Deliver summer acceleration (June–July 2027) and hand off to Milestone 2.1 by August 2027 so Year 1 spans August 2026 – August 2027.

Responsible: DCSI (lead); Matt Pope (EDpact, PM facilitator); MFISD Cabinet; Dr. Melissa Fields (data); HLES Principal
Touchpoints and checkpoints: April 23 district PM with EOY add-on; final EDpact visit (May 5); June STAAR reflection [date]; ESC 13 and TEA CSS review of June data.
Done when: June Improvement Reflection submitted by June 30, 2027 and Year 2 targets set; 2027–28 coaching and PM dates scheduled by July 2027.
Evidence of Completion: June Improvement Reflection submission confirmation; EOY stepback notes; PLC evaluation and HQIM survey results; summer acceleration plans and attendance; Year 2 targets; 2027–28 coaching and PM calendar.
Support Needed: STAAR release; ESC 13 and TEA CSS review of June data.

Year 2 (August 2027 – August 2028) at a glance

Year 2 shifts ownership from EDpact and district leaders to HLES leaders and teacher leaders, while coaching, campus support, and Performance Management routines continue at the same general cadence established in 2026–27. These supports continue into Year 2 and do not end with the 2026–27 school year. Specific 2027–28 dates for EDpact visits and PM routines will be scheduled May–July 2027 as the district and campus finalize the 2027–28 calendar and implementation schedule; TEA submission dates are added from the 2027–28 Playbook.

#	Milestone	Target date	Lead
2.1	Summer readiness: Playbook v1.0, new-hire onboarding, and RLA path launched	Aug 2027	Asst. Supt. C&I
2.2	Teacher-leader PLC facilitation launched	Sep 2027	HLES Principal
2.3	Tiers reset from EOY data; HLES-led calibration and mentor pairing	Sep 2027	HLES Principal
2.4	Math Framework and Tier 1 expectations written into the HLES CIP	Sep 2027	HLES Principal

#	Milestone	Target date	Lead
2.5	Student-work-analysis PLCs driving reteach and intervention	Nov 2027	Grade-level PLC leads
2.6	Year 2 SI requirements met and stakeholders updated	Oct 2027 [confirm with 2027–28 Playbook]	DCSI
2.7	HLES-run campus PM and MOY stepback	Jan 2028	HLES Principal
2.8	Peer observation and independent calibration	Mar 2028	HLES Principal
2.9	2028–29 staffing and sustainability plan	Apr 2028	DCSI and HLES Principal
2.10	EOY outcomes review and TAP transition	Jun 2028 (summer readiness by Aug 2028)	DCSI

Milestone 2.1: Summer readiness — Playbook v1.0, new-hire onboarding, and RLA path launched (by August 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Adopt Playbook v1.0 and the Tier 1 Non-Negotiables one-pager (TSL, Summer 2027).
- Revise walk-through look-fors for Playbook v1.0 and both HQIM.
- Train new hires on RBIS, Savvas, HMH or the new RLA HQIM, the Playbook, and the PLC Guide.
- **Path B only:** deliver RLA product training, distribute materials, and plan first-year RLA internalization.

Responsible: Asst. Supt. C&I (lead); District IM Coordinator; HLES Principal
Touchpoints and checkpoints: June STAAR reflection; Summer 2027 Principal Retreat; first Year 2 EDpact visit.
Done when: 100% of new hires trained before the first day; revised look-fors loaded in the Eduphoria and IIA.

Evidence of Completion: Playbook v1.0 and Tier 1 Non-Negotiables; new-hire training records; revised look-fors loaded in the observation system; (Path B) materials distribution log.
Support Needed: Publisher training (Path B); Instructional Materials Allotment funding.

Milestone 2.2: Teacher-leader PLC facilitation launched (by September 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Select PLC facilitators from Tier 1 teachers and train them before school starts. **[Facilitators to be identified; stipend source needed]**

- Shift facilitation to teacher leaders; leaders observe and coach facilitators.
- Add scaffolds for diverse learners to the internalization protocol.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); instructional coach; Janelle Persall (EDpact)
Touchpoints and checkpoints: monthly principal PLC checkpoint; EDpact visits (facilitator coaching).
Done when: every Math and RLA PLC is led by a trained teacher leader and meets PLC Guide look-fors on observation.

Evidence of Completion: Facilitator roster, training records, and stipend agreements; PLC observation forms.
Support Needed: [Stipend funding source]; EDpact facilitator coaching.

Milestone 2.3: Tiers reset from EOY data; HLES-led calibration and mentor pairing (by September 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Assign Year 2 tiers from EOY 2027 data; place all new teachers in Tier 3.
- HLES leaders run the BOY calibration walk without EDpact pre-calibration.
- Pair new hires with trained mentors (TSL, Fall 2027).
- Choose monthly look-fors from HLES data.

Responsible: HLES Principal; Asst Principal; Director of Elementary Education; Janelle Persall (EDpact, calibration check); Campus Mentor Coordinators (Asst Principal & Math Interventionist)
Touchpoints and checkpo**ints:** first Year 2 campus and district PM routines; EDpact visit (calibration check).
Done when: tiers and caseloads published; HLES–EDpact ratings within ±0.25; every new hire has a mentor.
Evidence of Completion: Year 2 tier roster and caseloads; calibration walk results; mentor assignment list.
Support Needed: EOY 2027 data; mentor training; EDpact calibration check.

Milestone 2.4: Math Framework and Tier 1 expectations written into the HLES CIP (by September 2027)

Tasks and actions

- Implement the finalized Math Framework and Playbook v1.0 in all classrooms.
- Integrate Tier 1 expectations for HQIM, the Playbook, and PLCs into the HLES Campus Improvement Plan (TSL 4.1.2).
- Name the HLES implementation team in the CIP.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); Asst. Supt. C&I
Touchpoints and checkpoints: CIP approval process **[date]**; October Year 2 PM routine.
Done when: CIP approved with Tier 1 expectations and implementation team included.
Evidence of Completion: Approved CIP pages with Tier 1 expectations; implementation team roster.
Support Needed: Final Math Framework from C&I.

Milestone 2.5: Student-work-analysis PLCs driving reteach and intervention (by November 2027)

Tasks and actions

- After each CBA, PLCs analyze student work samples and decide reteach moves (TSL, Fall 2027).
- PLCs update intervention rosters and move-group goals from their own analysis.
- Deliver training on data analysis to drive reteach (TSL 5.2.3).
- Begin the LIFT assessment audit.

Responsible: Grade-level PLC leads (lead); HLES Principal and MTSS lead
Touchpoints and checkpoints: HLES campus PM; BOY stepback; monthly intervention review.
Done when: every CBA has a documented student-work analysis and reteach plan; rosters updated by PLCs.

Evidence of Completion: Student work analysis protocol and reteach plan for each CBA; PLC-updated intervention rosters; data-analysis training records; assessment audit plan.
Support Needed: TSL 5.2.3 data-analysis training; district assessment calendar.

Milestone 2.6: Year 2 SI requirements met and stakeholders updated (by October 2027; confirm per the 2027–28 Playbook)

Tasks and actions

- Complete 2027–28 SI requirements (TAP updates, reflections, and site visits) per the 2027–28 Playbook.
- Hold a fall stakeholder update on accountability and the TAP.
- Report TAP progress to the Board.

Responsible: DCSI (lead); Superintendent; HLES Principal
Touchpoints and checkpoints: TEA CSS and ESC 13 touchpoints; Board meeting **[date]**.
Done when: all 2027–28 SI submissions on time; stakeholder meeting documented. **[Update with 2027–28 Playbook dates]**
Evidence of Completion: TEA submission confirmations; stakeholder meeting notice, sign-in, and minutes; board presentation.
Support Needed: 2027–28 Playbook requirements and dates.

Milestone 2.7: HLES-run campus PM and MOY stepback (by January 2028)

Tasks and actions

- HLES ILT runs its campus PM routine without EDpact facilitation and brings its own analysis to district PM.
- Prepare MOY evidence (fidelity, PLC strength, tier movement, intervention results, milestones).
- Reset tiers and adjust Year 2 milestones.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); HLES ILT; DCSI; Dr. Melissa Fields (data); Janelle Persall (EDpact, support only)
Touchpoints and checkpoints: MOY district PM routine; principal supervisor mid-year review.
Done when: the HLES ILT presents its own MOY analysis and owns actions at district PM without EDpact facilitation.
Evidence of Completion: HLES-led campus PM agendas and data decks; MOY stepback notes; tier reset roster.
Support Needed: EDpact gradual-release plan.

Milestone 2.8: Peer observation and independent calibration (by March 2028)

Tasks and actions

- Tier 1 teachers host peer observations; share-outs on PLC and classroom practice (TSL 5.2.3).
- HLES leaders coach new leaders and teacher leaders in the O/F cycle.
- Run a calibration check against EDpact without pre-calibration.

Responsible: HLES Principal (lead); AP(s) and coach; Tier 1 teacher leaders
Touchpoints and checkpoints: EDpact visits; monthly PM.
Done when: peer-observation calendar completed; HLES EDpact ratings within ±0.25.

Evidence of Completion: Peer observation calendar and logs; independent calibration results.
Support Needed: Coverage for peer observations **[funding source]**.

Milestone 2.9: 2028–29 staffing and sustainability plan (by April 2028)

Tasks and actions

- Make 2028–29 placements from Year 2 data.
- Write the sustainability plan: onboarding, mentoring, PLC facilitation, tiered O/F, and calibration without LIFT.
- Identify Year 3 teacher leaders and leadership pipeline candidates.

Responsible: DCSI and HLES Principal; Stan White, Asst. Superintendent of Administration
Touchpoints and checkpoints: EOY stepback; principal supervisor meeting.
Done when: staffing plan and sustainability plan approved by the Superintendent.

Evidence of Completion: Approved 2028–29 staffing plan and sustainability plan;

teacher-leader list.
Support Needed: HR data; sustainability budget.

Milestone 2.10: EOY outcomes review and TAP transition (by June 2028; summer readiness by August 2028)

Tasks and actions

- Complete EOY MAP and STAAR; hold the EOY stepback and June STAAR reflection.
- Review outcomes against every goal and milestone with the CIT and Board.
- Set the 2028–29 plan (TSL Summer 2028 actions; LIFT Year 3 sustainability focus).
- Complete Summer 2028 readiness (new-hire onboarding, 2028–29 tiers, SPED/EB training) by August 2028 so Year 2 spans August 2027 – August 2028.

Responsible: DCSI (lead); Superintendent; MFISD Cabinet; Dr. Melissa Fields (data); HLES Principal; Matt Pope (EDpact)
Touchpoints and checkpoints: EOY district PM; June STAAR reflection; Board meeting **[date]**.
Done when: June reflection submitted and TAP completion review held **[per 2027–28 Playbook]**.
Evidence of Completion: June reflection; CIT and board presentation; 2028–29 plan; summer readiness records.
Support Needed: STAAR and A–F results.

School improvement compliance calendar, 2026–27

These TEA requirements are built into the Year 1 milestones.

Window / due date	Requirement	Milestone
Aug 15–Sep 30, 2026	SI Orientation; TAP Consultation	1.4
Sep 4, 2026	AskTED DCSI and campus contact update	1.4
Aug 18–Oct 31, 2026	ESF Diagnostic window (if required)	1.4
Aug 2026–Jun 2027	LIFT monthly PM routines (serve as SI PM stepbacks)	1.6, 1.8, 1.10
Sep 14, 2026–Jun 30, 2027	TEA CSS and ESC 13 site visits and touchpoints	All
Oct 1–Dec 1, 2026	LASO application window	1.4
Nov 20, 2026	Board-approved TAP submitted	1.4
Jan 2027	MOY stepback prep; adjust TAP milestones	1.8

Window / due date	Requirement	Milestone
Feb 26, 2027	TAP resubmission (only if requested)	1.8
Jun 30, 2027	June Improvement Reflection	1.10

Performance Management

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Essential question (Section V): Has the district outlined a performance management plan that ensures the improvement strategy will be implemented with fidelity? There is a plan to monitor performance of milestones aligned with the improvement strategy and progress toward student outcome goals on a regular basis. The response describes who reviews progress toward milestones; how frequently progress is reviewed (at least quarterly for the superintendent; at least monthly for district leaders and other relevant stakeholders); and how progress data are collected and shared.

Progress is reviewed weekly by teachers and HLES leaders, monthly at the HLES campus PM and the MFISD LIFT PM routine with the Superintendent, and each semester by the Board. Every monthly routine opens with the status of the current milestones. **Review frequency:** The Superintendent reviews milestone status and student outcome data at least monthly through the district LIFT PM routine, exceeding TEA's quarterly minimum. District leaders, the DCSI, and the HLES Principal review progress at least monthly. In months without a scheduled LIFT PM routine (December 2026 and May 2027, and any Year 2 equivalents), the DCSI convenes a district milestone review on **[dates]** with **[participants]**. Monthly PM routines continue in 2027–28 at the same general cadence established for 2026–27; specific 2027–28 dates will be scheduled May–July 2027 as the district and campus finalize the 2027–28 calendar.
District PM participants: Dr. Jeff Gasaway; Yarda Leflet; Dr. Shana Fanchar; Stan White; Soor-el Puga; Dr. Melissa Fields; Dr. Pedro Garcia; EDpact (Matt Pope, Kat Molina, Janelle Persall, Tim Persall); Robert Garcia (ESC 13). DCSI Yarda Leflet; HLES Principal Dr. Pedro Garcia.
Six-step PM cycle: prepare the data; review and analyze; decide moves; assign owners and timelines; track follow-through; revisit decision impact.

Data	Collected by / platform	Frequency	Reviewed by	Shared with
Milestone tracker	DCSI Yarda Leflet	Monthly	Campus and district PM	Superintendent; Board each semester
CBA completion and % average	Teachers; Eduphoria; Dr. Fields	After each CBA; monthly	PLCs; ILT; district PM	Asst. Supt. C&I; Superintendent
MAP Growth, Math, Reading,	NWEA; Dr. Fields	BOY, MOY, EOY	PLCs; stepbacks	Superintendent; Board

Data	Collected by / platform	Frequency	Reviewed by	Shared with
Spanish Reading				
LIFT-tool walkthroughs by tier (frequency, ratings, next step, viewed)	HLES leaders; Eduphoria	Per tier; monthly export	ILT; district PM	Asst. Supt. C&I; Superintendent
Teacher tier movement	HLES Principal	Monthly; reset at BOY/MOY/EOY	ILT; principal supervisor	DCSI
EDpact LIFT observations and co-observation pairs	EDpact	Each visit	District PM	TEA (monthly submission)
PLC artifacts and observations	HLES leaders	Weekly; monthly checkpoint	Dir. Elementary Education	Asst. Supt. C&I
Intervention rosters and progress monitoring	Branching Minds; MTSS lead	After each CBA and MAP window	HLES campus PM	DCSI
STAAR and TELPAS	TEA; Dr. Fields	Annually	June STAAR reflection	Board; community

Playbook requirements: LIFT monthly PM routines count as SI performance management; the DCSI attends each one; the January MOY routine formally adjusts TAP milestones; TEA CSS and ESC 13 site visit findings are reviewed at the next PM routine; the EOY and June STAAR PM routine documents are submitted as the June Improvement Reflection (due June 30, 2027). FLIPS does not apply to LIFT-engaged HLES; its five key practices are met through Strategies 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 9.
Principal supervision: the principal supervisor meets the HLES principal at least quarterly to review data, tier movement, and milestones and to walk classrooms together *(adapted from Example TAP)*.

Additional Resources

Criteria for Success (TEA)
Section II resource criteria: The description lists all costs associated with implementing the school improvement strategy (e.g., stipends, instructional materials, training and professional development, additional staff positions), and each cost includes its source of funds (e.g., general fund, IMTA, grants). The description indicates how the district prioritized and redistributed talent and resources to proportionately support the campus (e.g., adding FTEs, hiring a turnaround principal) and includes a contingency plan if grant funds (e.g., LASO) are not awarded.

No dollar amounts were in the source documents; every line needs an amount and confirmed source before board posting (TEC §39A.105 requires a budget description).

Resource	Purpose	Funding source	Amount
Savvas Math K–5 materials	Tier 1 HQIM	Instructional Materials Allotment	246,463.50
HMH RLA materials, or new RLA HQIM	Tier 1 HQIM	Instructional Materials Allotment	367,109.25
EDpact LIFT coaching	Coaching, O/F, PLCs, PM; includes 12 additional campus and AP coaching visits	LIFT (LASO Cycle 4) grant	363,800.00
Literacy RBIS and Literacy Framework	Upfront training	LASO 3	Included in E3 Alliance contract
Math RBIS Parts 1 and 2	Upfront training	LIFT (LASO Cycle 4) grant	Included in EDpact contract
Savvas product training	Upfront training	Instructional Materials Allotment	3,500.00
Substitutes or extra-duty pay	PD and PLC release time	Local Budget	TBD as needed
PLC teacher-leader stipends (Year 2)	Facilitation capacity	Local Budget	TBD as needed
Mentor stipends	New-teacher onboarding	PREP Mentor allotment & local	$1000 & $200
Branching Minds MTSS platform	Intervention monitoring	Title I	33,000.00
NWEA MAP Growth	Interim assessment	Title I	57,000.000
Title I school improvement funds (ATS)	Campus SI supports	TBD	TBD
Positions added or reassigned to HLES [e.g., 4th grade para]	Capacity for tiered O/F, PLC facilitation, intervention	Local Budget	TBD as needed
Tier 2/3 intervention materials	Supported student intervention	Title I	TBD as needed
Spanish-language RLA materials	Tier 1 HQIM for bilingual classrooms	TBD	TBD
EDpact LIFT coaching, Year 2 (2027–28)	Continued coaching and PM facilitation	[LIFT continuation; see contingency plan]	TBD

Resource	Purpose	Funding source	Amount
Coverage for peer observation (Year 2)	Milestone 2.8	Local Budget	TBD as needed
SPED and EB professional development (Years 1–2)	Capacity building for student populations	Local Budget, Title II, Title III	TBD as needed
Observation and feedback data system (Instructional Insights App from January 2027; Eduphoria through December 2026/January 2027)	O/F data tracking	Local Budget	TBD

District Prioritization and Redistribution of Talent and Resources

HLES is MFISD's lowest-performing elementary campus. The district prioritizes it for talent and resources as follows:

- **Staffing: [FTEs added or reassigned to HLES for 2026–27 and 2027–28, with role, amount, and funding source; state "none" if none]**.
- **Hiring and placement:** HLES vacancies are posted early and receive hiring priority (Strategy 8), and the 2027–28 staffing plan places the strongest Math and RLA teachers in Grades 2–5 (Milestone 1.9). **[Confirm hiring-priority practice and any incentives, e.g., TIA or retention stipends]**
- **Leadership:** 2026-2027 Interim Principal announced September 23, 2026 [Whether principal or AP assignments were changed or reviewed for HLES; principal supervisor time allocated to HLES].
- **Coaching and district time:** HLES receives 18 EDpact campus visits in 2026–27, plus 12 additional LIFT-funded campus and Assistant Principal coaching visits committed by the district based on campus needs, the principal supervisor joins at least one EDpact visit per month, and HLES is reviewed at every monthly district PM routine.
- **Funds:** Title I, Title II, Title III, LASO Cycle 4, Compensatory Education, Local Funds **[Title I school improvement, LASO, or other funds directed to HLES rather than distributed evenly across campuses]**.

Contingency Plan for Grant Funds

If a pending grant is not awarded, MFISD may fund the activity from the source listed below. MFISD protects the plan's non-negotiables first: weekly PLCs, tiered observation and feedback, the intervention block, and monthly performance management. The current budget situation will be analyzed and local funds will be used for priorities set.

Pending funds	Pays for	Award decision expected	If not awarded, funded by	Amount
LASO application	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Pending funds	Pays for	Award decision expected	If not awarded, funded by	Amount
(Oct 1–Dec 1, 2026 window)				
LIFT continuation, 2027–28	Year 2 EDpact coaching and PM facilitation	TBD	TBD	TBD
SI CISG / LIFT SI PLC Add-On	Added PLC coaching	TBD	[needed, or “activity scaled back to…”]	TBD
Title I school improvement (ATS)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD