Duncanville Independent School District

Acton Elementary School

2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: D

Board Approval Date: October 20, 2025
Public Presentation Date: October 8, 2025

Mission Statement

Duncanville ISD: We engage, equip, and empower all scholars to achieve their unique potential.

Vision

Duncanville ISD: Where dreams are inspired and excellence is achieved.

Value Statement

We are D'Ville...

P - Professionalism

A - Accountability and excellence

N - Nurturing, safe environments

T - Transparent communication

H - Honesty, integrity, and ethics

E - Everyone contributing to student success

R - Relationships, equity, and inclusion

S - Students as our top priority

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Needs Assessment Overview

Needs Assessment Overview Summary

Student attendance remains below the state target at 94–95%, with high chronic absence rates limiting consistent instructional access and hindering academic growth for at-risk students. Families may not fully understand how even a single missed day affects learning outcomes. Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students show slower growth and lower performance in reading and math due to limited teacher training in differentiation, small-group instruction, and trauma-informed practices. Math achievement trails reading, with only 41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations, reflecting gaps in conceptual understanding and problem-solving within Tier 1 instruction. Early literacy weaknesses in Grades 1–2 also contribute to ongoing comprehension challenges and achievement gaps in later grades. While 4th-grade reading scores are stronger than 3rd grade, significant disparities remain for Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and economically disadvantaged students due to inconsistent use of evidence-based comprehension strategies. Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently translating into improved classroom practices or student outcomes. Additionally, teacher turnover in certain grade levels leads to uneven instructional quality, further limiting progress. Finally, inconsistent alignment between instruction, engagement, and student needs contributes to low attendance and motivation, as families and students may not see the relevance of daily learning to long-term success.

Demographics

Demographics Summary

We are an elementary campus serving primarily Hispanic/Latino and African-American students. We have a majority identified as economically disadvantaged and one-third identified as Emergent Bilinguals. Special programs such as Bilingual/ESL, Special Education, Gifted/Talented, and Title I are in place and generally align with the needs of the student population. Over half of students are considered at-risk, reflecting mobility challenges and community economic factors, though dropout data is not applicable at the elementary level. Attendance averages around 94–95%, slightly below state goals, while discipline referrals and suspensions numbers continue to decrease. Staff size is comparable to the student body, with a blend of new and experienced educators, and retention is a key factor due to the school's size. Overall, the school demonstrates strong alignment between its programs and student needs, but challenges remain around attendance, mobility, and ensuring academic growth for all subgroups.

Demographics Strengths

- Strong alignment of special programs (Bilingual, Special Education, GT, Title I) with student demographics.

- Decreasing levels of discipline incidents, suspensions, and expulsions.

- School environment supports closer student-teacher relationships.

- Majority of DL students benefit from bilingual supports tailored to their needs.

- Staff diversity in experience provides a balance of new energy and veteran knowledge.

- High participation in Title I programs ensures additional academic and family support resources.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Student attendance (94-95%) is below the state target, and the chronic absence rates are high, limiting consistent access to instruction and impacting academic growth for at-risk students.
Root Cause: Perceptions of School Importance: Some families may not fully understand the cumulative impact of even "one day" missed on learning outcomes.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math.
Root Cause: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Overall, student performance is stronger in reading than in math, with Grade 4 students outperforming Grade 3 across both subjects. In Grade 3, about half of students met grade-level in reading, compared to just over 40% in math, while Grade 4 showed higher achievement with 74% meeting grade level in reading and 63% in math. Emergent Bilingual students benefited from bilingual programs and, in some cases, outperformed their peers, though they still trailed behind non-EB averages. Special education and economically disadvantaged students consistently demonstrated lower performance, highlighting persistent achievement gaps. Gifted/Talented students, on the other hand, achieved strong mastery across all tested subjects. These results suggest targeted interventions are working for some groups, but additional focus is needed to accelerate growth for at-risk and struggling learners.

This year's current data is below to consider as we set goals and consider performance with our current enrolled population.

BOY i-Ready Math K-5th

Grade K		3%	7%	90%	0%	0%	72/72
Grade 1		0%	5%	77%	18%	0%	62/63
Grade 2		0%	5%	57%	38%	0%	76/76
Grade 3		0%	3%	61%	25%	12%	69/69
Grade 4		0%	5%	48%	27%	20%	79/81
Grade 5		5%	7%	38%	23%	27%	102/103

BOY i-Ready Math

BOY i-Ready Reading K-5th

Grade K		7%	21%	72%	0%	0%	72/72
Grade 1		8%	8%	67%	17%	0%	60/63
Grade 2		7%	21%	32%	41%	0%	76/76
Grade 3		1%	28%	29%	22%	20%	69/69
Grade 4		8%	0%	43%	18%	33%	80/81
Grade 5		6%	13%	23%	30%	28%	102/103

BOY i-Ready Reading

BOY MAP Science - 5th Grade

Class	Educator	Achievement Fall 2025-2026 Median and Distribution						Number of Students
All classes in this grade	All educators for this grade	44th	28%	19%	22%	26%	5%	98

Percentiles Key ● 1st - 20th ● 21st - 40th ● 41st - 60th ● 61st - 80th ● >80th

Rostered Fall 2025-2026
Tested Fall 2025-2026

BOY MAP Science

Student Learning Strengths

- **Early Reading Improvement**

- **Kindergarten Reading: 92% of students are reading at or above grade level by the end of year (EOY), a strong indicator of early literacy success.**
- **1st Grade Reading: 48% on grade level by EOY – a solid performance that shows continued support for foundational skills.**
- **This upward trend from BOY (14%) to EOY (50%) in reading overall demonstrates significant growth across the campus.**

- **Math Improvement in Upper Grades**

- **4th Grade Math: 57% on grade level by EOY – the highest among all tested grades, suggesting targeted support or effective instruction at this level.**
- **Campus-wide iReady Math progress rose from 8% (BOY) to 51% (EOY), showing tremendous gains throughout the year.**

- **DCA Mastery in Math**

- **4th Grade Math DCA: 85% of TEKS showed improved student performance – a major achievement across a broad set of standards.**
- **3rd Grade Math DCA: 78% of TEKS improved – also a strong indicator of curriculum alignment and effective instruction.**

- **MAP Growth and STAAR Projection Highlights**

- **MAP Reading EOY: Growth increased slightly from 44th percentile (MOY) to 46th percentile (EOY).**

- **2nd Grade Reading STAAR Projections: 45.3% projected to "Meets" level or higher.**

- **4th Grade Reading: 24.2% "Meets" and 12.6% "Masters" – a combined 36.8%, suggesting stronger upper-grade readiness.**

- **STAAR Performance Outcomes**

  - **Grade 4 Reading**: 74% of students met grade level, with strong EB and bilingual subgroup performance

    DEMO LAC

    .

  - **Bilingual Program Impact**: Students enrolled in bilingual education often exceeded non-participants in achievement.

  - **Gifted/Talented Success**: GT students consistently performed at high mastery levels across grades.

  - **Equity in Participation**: Nearly all students, across subgroups, are represented in STAAR testing with low absenteeism.

  - **Evidence of Growth**: Some subgroups (e.g., EB in math) showed strong upward trends, suggesting interventions are making a difference.

  - **Grade 4 Math Gains**: Over 60% of students met grade level, indicating positive momentum compared to Grade 3.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations.
Root Cause: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

Problem Statement 2: Students in Grades 1-2 show weak foundational literacy skills, which impacts long-term reading comprehension and contributes to achievement gaps in later grades.
Root Cause: Limited progress monitoring and use of formative data with systemic phonics and fluency routines across classrooms to drive interventions.

Problem Statement 3: Although Grade 4 Reading shows higher performance than Grade 3 (74% vs. 52% meeting grade level), both grades still have significant gaps among Emergent Bilingual, Special Education, and economically disadvantaged students, which prevents consistent on-grade-level achievement for all learners.
Root Cause: Inconsistent use of evidence-based comprehension strategies (e.g., inferencing, citing text evidence) with use of formative data in Tier 1 instruction.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

The campus demonstrates a structured process for recruiting and hiring educators, with attention to staff culture, retention, and instructional planning. Professional learning opportunities are provided, and stakeholders are engaged through surveys and listening tours to guide improvement efforts. Lesson planning is increasingly data-driven, and programs such as GT and bilingual education provide enrichment and access to state standards. However, alignment between teacher evaluations and student performance is inconsistent, and staff buy-in for continuous improvement varies. Subgroup inequities exist, particularly for English learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students, highlighting the need for more targeted supports. While systems exist for instructional time protection, teacher support, and student transitions, implementation gaps reduces their overall effectiveness.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- Clear recruitment and hiring processes are helping attract more high-quality educators.

- Professional learning opportunities are in place to grow teachers and build instructional leadership.

- Stakeholders (staff, families, students) are engaged through surveys and feedback loops to inform planning.

- Lesson planning is increasingly data-driven and tied to formative assessments and interventions.

- Enrichment programs (GT, bilingual) align with student needs and expand access to rigorous standards.

- Systems exist to support instructional time, teacher development, and student transitions between grades.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1: Student achievement gaps persist among English learners, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students despite available support programs.
Root Cause: Inconsistent alignment of teacher assignments and instructional strengths with specific student needs, coupled with uneven implementation of targeted interventions.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes.
Root Cause: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

The school is described by students and staff as a welcoming environment where safety and belonging are priorities. Teachers value the professional learning opportunities provided and appreciate mentoring supports, though consistency in implementation remains an area of growth. Student engagement is fostered through enrichment opportunities, yet attendance challenges persist for at-risk groups. Parents and community stakeholders generally feel welcomed, but deeper partnerships with external organizations are still developing. Communication systems are in place, but increasing a variety of ways to communicate and streamlining information across campus needs strengthening. While overall perceptions are positive, subgroup disparities highlight the need for more equitable support across all student populations.

Perceptions Strengths

- Students and staff report a strong sense of safety and belonging on campus.

- Professional learning opportunities are available to help teachers grow in practice and leadership.

- Mentoring systems exist to support new and struggling teachers.

- Enrichment opportunities provide students with engagement beyond core academics.

- Parents and community members feel welcomed into the school environment.

- Communication systems are in place to share student performance and activities with families.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Teacher turnover in certain grade-levels lead to uneven instructional quality that impacts the school's ability to sustain improvement and consistency in classroom learning.
Root Cause: PD may not always be data-driven or tailored to the real-time needs of students (e.g., reading comprehension gaps, math problem-solving, science vocabulary). This disconnect limits its impact on teacher practice and student learning outcomes.

Problem Statement 2: Student attendance and engagement are inconsistent, with at-risk groups showing lower daily attendance and less sustained academic engagement.
Root Cause: Families and students may not see daily attendance as essential because schoolwork is not always perceived as engaging, rigorous, or directly connected to their future goals.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Student attendance (94-95%) is below the state target, and the chronic absence rates are high, limiting consistent access to instruction and impacting academic growth for at-risk students.

Root Cause 1: Perceptions of School Importance: Some families may not fully understand the cumulative impact of even "one day" missed on learning outcomes.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math.

Root Cause 2: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations.

Root Cause 3: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes.

Root Cause 4: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: Teacher turnover in certain grade-levels lead to uneven instructional quality that impacts the school's ability to sustain improvement and consistency in classroom learning.

Root Cause 5: PD may not always be data-driven or tailored to the real-time needs of students (e.g., reading comprehension gaps, math problem-solving, science vocabulary). This disconnect limits its impact on teacher practice and student learning outcomes.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Effective Schools Framework data
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
- Federal Report Card and accountability data
- Local Accountability Systems (LAS) data

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Local diagnostic reading assessment data
- Local benchmark or common assessments data

Student Data: Student Groups

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

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data

- Discipline records
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio
- State certified and high quality staff data
- Professional development needs assessment data

Parent/Community Data

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

Support Systems and Other Data

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

Priorities

Revised/Approved: October 20, 2025

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 1: By June 2026, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Reading at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 27% to 37% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR performance reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (sentence stems, vocabulary supports, visual aids) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build comprehension.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level							
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins							
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	IC	October GLC				
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all reading classes.	Teachers	October through May				
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	admin, IC	October through May				
Problem Statements: Demographics 2							

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core reading instruction after the core lesson.	**Formative**			**Summative**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying comprehension skills (e.g., inferencing, summarizing, citing evidence) to STAAR-level texts.

At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Reading "Meets" standard will rise from 27% to 46% by June 2026.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teacher, Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius passages/questions to match. Select 1-2 Sirius passages per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May
2	After the core reading lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius passage/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teacher	weekly October through May
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use reading attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May

The Formative review columns are labeled: Oct, Jan, Apr. The Summative column is labeled: June.

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
 - **Targeted Support Strategy**
Problem Statements: Demographics 2

No Progress   Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 16% to 65% at the 50th percentile.

    Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** teachers				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October and ongoing
2	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, hands-on tool) will be used.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongoing
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	Watkins, teachers	October and ongoing

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Strategy 2 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** teachers				No Progress			

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using i-Ready teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October and ongong
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October and ongong
3	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongong

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
 - **Targeted Support Strategy**
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

No Progress	Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✖ Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes.   **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 38% to 55% at the 50th percentile

    Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** teachers				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October and ongoing
2	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, hands-on tool) will be used.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongoing
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	Watkins, teachers	October and ongoing

Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongong
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October and ongong
3	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using i-Ready teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October and ongong

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

○ No Progress   ◎ Accomplished   ➔ Continue/Modify   ✕ Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 4: :By June 2026, student achievement on the third-grade state assessment in Math at the "Meets" performance level or above will increase from 17% to 37% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (APScheck, vocabulary supports, visual aids - place value chart, number line) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build fluency, problem-solving stamina.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins							
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	Watkins	October GLC				
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all math classes.	Teachers	October through May				
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October through May				
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1							

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			**Summative**

Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core math instruction after the core lesson.

	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying problem solving and math fluency skills to STAAR-level problems.

At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Math "Meets" standard will rise from 17% to 46% by June 2026.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teacher, Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius word problems/questions to match. Select 1-2 Sirius problem sets per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May
2	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May
3	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use math attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May
4	After the core math lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius problem/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teacher	weekly October through May
5	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
 - **Targeted Support Strategy**
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

No Progress   Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations. **Root Cause**: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Math testing will increase from 5% to 70% at the 50th percentile.

Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** teachers				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October and ongoing
2	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, hands-on tool) will be used.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongoing
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	Watkins, teachers	October and ongoing

ESF Levers:
Lever 5: Effective Instruction
Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using i-Ready teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October and ongong
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October and ongong
3	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongong

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

○ No Progress ◯ Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✕ Discontinue

Goal 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations. **Root Cause**: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Math testing will increase from 5% to 55% at the 50th percentile.

    Evaluation Data Sources: i-Ready Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

    Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student

    Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers will analyze i-Ready diagnostic and growth data after each testing window and use the reports to group students by skill needs (e.g., phonics, comprehension, number sense).	teachers	October and ongoing
2	Instructional coach/administrator will provide templates for small-group plans so teachers consistently document which students are in each group, what skill is being addressed, and what resource (lesson, i-Ready activity, hands-on tool) will be used.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongoing
3	PLCs will include a standing agenda item where teachers share groupings and strategies based on i-Ready data.	Watkins, teachers	October and ongoing

ESF Levers:

Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - School Processes & Programs 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teachers

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	During WIN time, teachers will deliver targeted small-group lessons (15-20 minutes) using i-Ready teacher toolbox lessons, aligned to the specific gaps identified.	teachers	October and ongong
2	Students will have individualized instructional plans that include assigned i-Ready lessons tailored to their growth goals, monitored weekly by the teacher.	students, teachers	October and ongong
3	Admin/coach will conduct biweekly WIN walkthroughs with a feedback loop to ensure groups are intentional, instruction matches data, and students are progressing.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October and ongong

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

○ No Progress　　○ Accomplished　　➡ Continue/Modify　　✖ Discontinue

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations. **Root Cause**: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Reading will increase at approaches from 66% to 77%, meets from 32% to 37%, and masters from 7% to 10% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (sentence stems, vocabulary supports, visual aids) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build comprehension.				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins							
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	Watkins	October GLC				
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all reading classes.	Teachers	October through May				
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October through May				
Problem Statements: Demographics 2							

Strategy 2 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core reading instruction after the core lesson.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core reading instruction after the core lesson.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying comprehension skills (e.g., inferencing, summarizing, citing evidence) to STAAR-level texts.

At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Reading "Meets" standard will rise from 27% to 46% by June 2026.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teacher, Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius passages/questions to match. Select 1-2 Sirius passages per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May
2	After the core reading lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius passage/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teacher	weekly October through May
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use reading attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May

Problem Statements: Demographics 2
Funding Sources: Sirius - 199-30 SCE - 199.11.6399.00.107.30.000 - $4,700

No Progress   Accomplished   Continue/Modify   ✗ Discontinue

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Math will increase at approaches from 52% to 77%, meets from 27% to 37%, and masters from 7% to 10% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details					Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (APScheck, vocabulary supports, visual aids - place value chart, number line) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build fluency, problem-solving stamina.					**Formative**			**Summative**
					Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level								
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins								

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	Watkins	October GLC
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all math classes.	Teachers	October through May
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	October through May

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core math instruction after the core lesson.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying problem solving and math fluency skills to STAAR-level problems.

At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments.

Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Math "Meets" standard will rise from 17% to 46% by June 2026.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teacher, Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius word problems/questions to match. Select 1-2 Sirius problem sets per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May
2	After the core math lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius problem/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions.	teacher	weekly October through May
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use math attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	Linwood, Johnson, Watkins	weekly October through May

ESF Levers:
Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction
 - **Targeted Support Strategy**
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

No Progress   Accomplished   ➡ Continue/Modify   ✖ Discontinue

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations. **Root Cause**: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Science will increase at approaches from 41% to 75%, meets from 12% to 30%, and masters from 2% to 15% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use Tier 1 scaffolds (CER, vocabulary supports, visual aids -graphic organizers, flow charts) plus high-level engagement strategies for all students, especially EB and at-risk students to build fluency, problem-solving stamina.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students are expected to achieve growth toward grade-level **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins							

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1	Teachers will learn how to effectively use the strategies and supports.	IC	October GLC
2	Teachers will use the strategies in all math classes.	Teachers	October through May
3	IC and admin will observe for use of the strategies and provide feedback on use and implementation.	admin, IC	October through May

Problem Statements: Demographics 2

Strategy 2 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 2: Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core science instruction after the core lesson.				**Formative**			**Summative**
				Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will demonstrate increased proficiency in applying science reasoning and science understanding skills to STAAR-level problems. At-risk, EB, and SpEd students will show steady growth toward grade-level benchmarks as measured by formative checks, Sirius item analysis, and interim assessments. Overall, the percentage of 3rd graders meeting the STAAR Science "Meets" standard will rise from 17% to 46% by June 2026. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** teacher, Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson, Payton Watkins							

Action #	Actions for Implementation	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline				
1	Teachers collaborate in PLCs to identify weekly TEKS/skills and align Sirius science questions/situations to match. Select 1-2 Sirius problem sets per week to spiral review skills taught in the current and prior weeks.	teachers	weekly October through May				
2	After the core math lesson, use Sirius as a spiraled practice activity (independent, partner, or small group). Model one Sirius problem/think-aloud per week, highlighting strategies to tackle STAAR-like questions including vocabulary defining.	teacher	weekly October through May				
3	Collect and analyze Sirius item results weekly to identify common misconceptions. Reteach in small groups using Sirius reteach lessons.	teachers, admin, IC	weekly October through May				
4	Ensure required and allowable supports are turned on for all students. Ensure student use science attack strategies daily.	teachers	weekly October through May				
5	Administrators and instructional coaches conduct walkthroughs to ensure Sirius is embedded into the lesson cycle. Provide feedback to teachers on alignment, spiraling, and use of data for reteach,	admin and IC	weekly October through May				

ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction
 - **Targeted Support Strategy**
Problem Statements: Student Learning 1

⭕ No Progress   ⭕ Accomplished   ➡️ Continue/Modify   ❌ Discontinue

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Math achievement lags behind reading across all grade levels, with only ~41% of 3rd graders and 63% of 4th graders meeting grade-level expectations. **Root Cause**: Insufficient conceptual understanding and problem-solving in Tier 1 instruction.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 1: By June 2026, stakeholder's beliefs as measured on the Spring Climate Survey "in our commitment to prepare our students for college career readiness" will increase from 70% to 80%.

   Evaluation Data Sources: Climate Survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Include in the newsletter monthly CCR News & Social Media Highlights that share classroom projects, student success stories, and/or readiness initiatives with families and community stakeholders.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Families and community stakeholders will have a stronger awareness of the school's college and career readiness initiatives, leading to increased confidence in the school's commitment. This will be reflected in higher levels of stakeholder participation in readiness events and an improvement in the Spring Climate Survey results, moving toward the 80% target. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Maricela Silva, Nabria Johnson **ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1				
○ No Progress ◯ Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✗ Discontinue				

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Student attendance (94-95%) is below the state target, and the chronic absence rates are high, limiting consistent access to instruction and impacting academic growth for at-risk students.   **Root Cause**: Perceptions of School Importance: Some families may not fully understand the cumulative impact of even "one day" missed on learning outcomes.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 2: The average student attendance will increase from 91.8% to 96% by June 2026.

> **High Priority**

> **Evaluation Data Sources:** PEIMS Report

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Launch an attendance awareness campaign				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strengthen Student & Family Engagement in Attendance **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Kristina Johnson, Brandy Williams				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Launch a monthly attendance recognition program (certificates, shout-outs, incentives for students/classes with highest attendance).	N. Johnson, K. Johnson	October and monthly				
Problem Statements: Demographics 1							

Strategy 2 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 2: Early Identification & Intervention				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: provide targeted support for at-risk student **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Nabria Johnson, teacher				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**	No Progress			
1	Use attendance data to flag students with 3+ absences per month and assign them a mentor (teacher, counselor, or administrator) for weekly check-ins.	K. Johnson, teacher, N. Johnson					
ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1							

No Progress   Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Student attendance (94-95%) is below the state target, and the chronic absence rates are high, limiting consistent access to instruction and impacting academic growth for at-risk students.   **Root Cause**: Perceptions of School Importance: Some families may not fully understand the cumulative impact of even "one day" missed on learning outcomes.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 3: By June 2026, student beliefs as measured on the Spring Leader In Me MRA in Student Leadership, Supportive Environment for Students, and Empowered Learners will increase from a 78% to 85+% average indicating - Effective. This is an area of strength that should be continued to be built up and strengthened so it can be a highly-effective outcome for your school.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Leader In Me MRA survey BOY, MOY, EOY

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Expand student leadership opportunities across campus				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improve and increase leadership roles				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: teacher, action team leader							
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**	No Progress			
1	Implement campus-wide leadership roles (classroom greeters, tech helpers, peer mentors, event planners) so every student holds a responsibility.	Action Team Leader, teacher	October monthly				
2	Create quarterly student-led assemblies or showcases where students present projects, lead discussions, or highlight leadership habits.	Teach Students to Lead action tea,					
ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1							

No Progress   Accomplished   Continue/Modify   Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Student attendance (94-95%) is below the state target, and the chronic absence rates are high, limiting consistent access to instruction and impacting academic growth for at-risk students. **Root Cause**: Perceptions of School Importance: Some families may not fully understand the cumulative impact of even "one day" missed on learning outcomes.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2026, the number of teachers meeting "accomplished" or higher on T-TESS will increase from 20% to 40% by June 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: Edugence Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Targeted Professional Development Aligned to T-TESS Dimensions				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: improve teacher dap **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood, Payton Watkins				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Provide ongoing PD sessions and coaching cycles focused on key T-TESS areas where teachers score lowest (e.g., differentiation, data-driven instruction, classroom culture).	Watkins, Linwood	October and monthly				
2	Establish a peer observation program where teachers visit classrooms of high-performing colleagues, use T-TESS "look-for" rubrics, and debrief in PLCs to strengthen instructional practices.	teacher,Watkins	October, month				
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2							
○ No Progress　　◯ Accomplished　　➡ Continue/Modify　　✖ Discontinue							

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 2: The percentage of teachers holding a valid Texas Certification will increase from 85% to 88% by 2028.

    Evaluation Data Sources: HR & TEAL Reports

Strategy 1 Details				Reviews			
Strategy 1: Strengthen Certification Support & Accountability Systems				**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: More certified teachers in every classroom				**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Maintain a quarterly certification audit of all teaching staff to identify those with expiring, pending, or alternative certifications, and provide individualized support for renewal or completion.	Linwood, HR	October and throughout				
2	Offer district-supported test prep workshops and explore stipends or reimbursements for teachers pursuing certification exams or renewal requirements.	HR	October and throughout				
Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 2							

⬤ No Progress   ⬤ Accomplished   ➡ Continue/Modify   ✖ Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Teacher evaluations and professional development are not consistently leading to measurable improvements in student outcomes. **Root Cause**: Professional learning opportunities and evaluation feedback are not fully connected to classroom practice, reducing the impact of teacher growth systems on student performance.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 3: The retention rate of "certified teachers" will increase from 79% to 82% by 2028.

Strategy 1 Details					Reviews			
Strategy 1: Mentoring & Coaching for Teacher Growth					**Formative**			**Summative**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Strengthen teacher support and recognition systems. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood, Payton Watkins					**Oct**	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Action #	**Actions for Implementation**		**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**				
1	Pair new and struggling teachers with trained mentor teachers and provide monthly coaching cycles focused on instructional needs and classroom management.		Watkins, K. Johnson	October and monthly				
2	Implement a teacher recognition program (monthly shout-outs, teacher of the month, wellness check-ins, small incentives) to boost morale and acknowledge contributions.		Linwood, Action Team	October and monthly				
Problem Statements: Perceptions 1								
○ No Progress ○ Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✗ Discontinue								

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Teacher turnover in certain grade-levels lead to uneven instructional quality that impacts the school's ability to sustain improvement and consistency in classroom learning.   **Root Cause**: PD may not always be data-driven or tailored to the real-time needs of students (e.g., reading comprehension gaps, math problem-solving, science vocabulary). This disconnect limits its impact on teacher practice and student learning outcomes.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 1: The amount of funds spent on "instructional expenditures (Function 11)" will increase from 52.74% to 60% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: Financial Reports from District

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Balanced Budget **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 2				
◯ No Progress ◯ Accomplished → Continue/Modify ✕ Discontinue				

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Problem: Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students demonstrate lower performance and slower growth compared to peers, particularly in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Not all teachers have deep training in differentiation, small-group interventions, or trauma-informed practices.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 2: The district will improve the School FIRST rating from an A-90 to A-94 by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: TEA Reports

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: The principal will build staff awareness of fiscal compliance through campus training on purchasing and budget procedures twice a year.		**Formative**			**Summative**
		Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Balanced budget **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood; Kristina Johnson **TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1					
○ No Progress ◯ Accomplished ➡ Continue/Modify ✕ Discontinue					

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Student attendance (94-95%) is below the state target, and the chronic absence rates are high, limiting consistent access to instruction and impacting academic growth for at-risk students. **Root Cause**: Perceptions of School Importance: Some families may not fully understand the cumulative impact of even "one day" missed on learning outcomes.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 3: The district will reduce payroll expenditures by 5% from 85.36% to 80.36% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: The principal will work with Human Resources to prioritize campus staffing based on student needs and instructional priorities to reduce expenditures at campus leveling and the district budgeting at district level and the district annual budget review.	**Formative**			**Summative**
	Oct	**Jan**	**Apr**	**June**
Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase staff retention **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Jessica Linwood, Kristina Johnson **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 2: Strategic Staffing **Problem Statements:** Perceptions 1				
No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue				

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Teacher turnover in certain grade-levels lead to uneven instructional quality that impacts the school's ability to sustain improvement and consistency in classroom learning.   **Root Cause**: PD may not always be data-driven or tailored to the real-time needs of students (e.g., reading comprehension gaps, math problem-solving, science vocabulary). This disconnect limits its impact on teacher practice and student learning outcomes.

RDA Strategies

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
4	1	1	The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month.

Targeted Support Strategies

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	1	2	Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core reading instruction after the core lesson.
1	2	2	Teachers will deliver targeted instruction including having students justify their thinking when responding while other students work on individual pathways.
1	4	2	Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core math instruction after the core lesson.
1	8	2	Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core math instruction after the core lesson.
1	9	2	Incorporate Sirius as part of aligned, spiraled practice, to connect practice to core science instruction after the core lesson.
4	1	1	The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month.

Additional Targeted Support Strategies

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
4	1	1	The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month.

State Compensatory

Budget for Acton Elementary School

Total SCE Funds: $10,610.00
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

State Compensatory Education funds will supplement for tutoring, the core program by (1) purchasing SIRIUS intervention software to provide TEKS-aligned, data-driven practice for 3-5th grade students , and (2) provide additional technology to support targeted instructional support and growth for low performing students.

Title I

1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) ESSA Section 1114(b)(6)

1.1: Description of CNA Process

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

1.2: Location for Evidence of Multiple Meetings Held

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

2. Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) ESSA Section 1114(b)

2.1: Timeline for Schoolwide Program/CIP Development 1114(b)(1)(A)

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

2.2: Stakeholders 1114(b)(2)

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

2.3: Description of Plan Availability, Format, and Language 1114(b)(4)

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

2.4: Description of Plan Coordination (if Applicable) 1114(b)(5)

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

2.5: Statutorily Required Descriptions 1114(b)(7)(A)

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

3. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness ESSA Section 1114(b)(3)

3.1: Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation

Please see Title1Crate for the following documentation.

Title I Personnel

Name	Position	Program	FTE
Christy Lake	Aide physical education	Title 1	1
Johnicia Anderson	Intervention (federal)	Title 1	1
Kimetri Kirk	Intervention (federal)	Title 1	1
Payton Watkins	Instructional Coach	Title 1	1
Rubye Adaway	aide instructional	Title 1	1

Campus Funding Summary

199-30 SCE					
Priority	**Goal**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	7	2	Sirius	199.11.6399.00.107.30.000	$4,700.00
				Sub-Total	$4,700.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$10,610.00
				+/- Difference	$5,910.00
				Grand Total Budgeted	$10,610.00
				Grand Total Spent	$4,700.00
				+/- Difference	$5,910.00