

Ector County Independent School District

Milam Elementary

2025-2026 Board Goals/Performance Objectives/Strategies



Mission Statement

The mission of Milam Elementary School is to cultivate successful and productive students who are collaborators, critical thinkers, problem solvers, risk takers, and scholars who understand the value of artistic expression and the arts. The school aims to foster emotionally mature individuals who are well-equipped to navigate a changing world.

Vision

Our vision is a community where all staff and scholars feel safe, supported, loved, respected, and encouraged to be lifelong learners who positively contribute to our world. They will take the wonderful elements of Milam with them everywhere they go!!

Value Statement

#ItsOURtimetoSHINE

Milam Core Values: Respect, Positivity, Integrity, Trustworthiness, Problem-Solver, Critical-Thinker, Creative-Mind, Perserverance, Leadership

Table of Contents

Board Goals 4

Board Goal 1: The percentage of students achieving or exceeding the meets standard on state assessments will increase from 35% to 48% by May 2029 across all tested content areas. 4

Board Goal 2: The percentage of 3rd grade students reading at or above grade level will increase from 34% to 48% by May 2029. 14

Board Goal 3: The percentage of high school graduates considered College, Career or Military Ready will increase from 88% to 93% by May 2029. 21

Board Goal 4: Classroom Excellence 25

Board Goal 5: Culture of Excellence 31

Board Goals

Board Goal 1: The percentage of students achieving or exceeding the meets standard on state assessments will increase from 35% to 48% by May 2029 across all tested content areas.

Performance Objective 1: By May 2026, the percentage of students achieving or exceeding their Math RIT growth goal in grades Kindergarten through 5th grade will increase from 59% to 70% on the NWEA MAP assessment.





HB3 Board Goal

Indicators of Success:

Growth (MAP) - % student end of year RIT score met or exceeded individual growth projections based upon MAP - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: District checkpoints, NWEA MAP administered for K-2 three times a year and 3-5 twice a year.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Small group instruction, interventions, and tutoring will be offered in math. Targeted at risk populations will include small group instruction for special education students, dyslexia students, 504 students, low-socio economic, and LPAC students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: An increase in students achieving and/or exceeding their growth goal in Math. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Grade-level teacher and the instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 Funding Sources: After school tutoring stipend/pay - Local - \$3,000	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Differentiated weekly instruction through iReady Math (3-5) and My Math Academy (K-2). Students will complete a minimum of two lessons per week. Teachers and students will track the number of lessons completed each week. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Academic gaps in individual student needs will be addressed. High-performing students will grow academically. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Achievement 1 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1 - Technology 1 Funding Sources: Learning platforms - iReady and My Math Academy - Local	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Campus-wide, teachers will provide personalized instruction in math in order to meet individualized needs and promote individual growth. Workstations and small groups will be targeted instruction based upon student academic standard needs. Utilizing blended learning furniture and district models for student ownership and choice of seating during workstations and small groups Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Individual student growth in NWEA math MAP. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Funding Sources: Blended learning furniture, materials, etc. - State Blended Learning Grant	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Milam's at-risk population is not meeting state assessment standards with rigorous technology not consistently being leveraged across classrooms to enhance Tier I instruction. **Root Cause:** Inconsistent knowledge of TEKS implementation with blended learning.

Student Achievement

Problem Statement 1: In 24 -25, only 39% of third graders were performing on grade level for math. 49% of fourth graders were performing on grade level, and 48% of fifth graders were performing on grade level scoring meets on the math STAAR. **Root Cause:** There is not strong sense of understanding in how to effectively leverage technology to supplement Tier I instruction to successfully schedule targeted instructional time for enrichment and intervention.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, only 37% of students met their projected growth goals in math on the NWEA MAP test. **Root Cause:** Lack concrete application leveraging blended learning strategies for students with intervention/enrichment needs.

Technology

Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. **Root Cause:** Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 1: The percentage of students achieving or exceeding the meets standard on state assessments will increase from 35% to 48% by May 2029 across all tested content areas.

Performance Objective 2: By May 2026, the percentage of 3rd through 5th grade students achieving or exceeding the "Meets Grade Level" performance category in STAAR math will increase from 46% to 58%.

Indicators of Success:

Growth (STAAR) - % of students who meet or exceed the STAAR academic annual growth - 2026 Goal: 62%, Closing the Gaps RLA - The performance of ECISD high focus subgroup compared to their peers across the state of Texas - 2026 Goal: 37%, Closing the Gaps Math - The performance of ECISD high focus subgroup compared to their peers across the state of Texas - 2026 Goal: 31%, Gr. 3 Reading - % of 3th grade students achieving the meets or exceeds standard in reading or math on STAAR - 2026 Goal: 36%, Gr. 3 Math - % of 3th grade students achieving the meets or exceeds standard in reading or math on STAAR - 2026 Goal: 35%, Gr. 5 Reading - % of 5th grade students achieving the meets or exceeds standard in reading or math on STAAR - 2026 Goal: 46%, Gr. 5 Math - % of 5th grade students achieving the meets or exceeds standard in reading or math on STAAR - 2026 Goal: 41%

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: During weekly professional learning communities, the Data-Driven Instruction protocol (DDI) will be followed to create Know and Show charts that identify the level of rigor and questioning in the daily lesson plans. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All teachers will be well prepared to deliver quality Tier 1 instruction and this will be observed in classroom walkthroughs. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers, instructional coach, and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Achievement 1, 2 - School Organization 1 - Technology 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will use blended learning to differentiate learning during math. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student individual diverse needs will be met. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Milam's at-risk population is not meeting state assessment standards with rigorous technology not consistently being leveraged across classrooms to enhance Tier I instruction. Root Cause: Inconsistent knowledge of TEKS implementation with blended learning.
Student Achievement
Problem Statement 1: In 24 -25, only 39% of third graders were performing on grade level for math. 49% of fourth graders were performing on grade level, and 48% of fifth graders were performing on grade level scoring meets on the math STAAR. Root Cause: There is not strong sense of understanding in how to effectively leverage technology to supplement Tier I instruction to successfully schedule targeted instructional time for enrichment and intervention. Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, only 29% of fifth grade students met grade level performance on the science STAAR scoring meets while only 13% mastered. Root Cause: Lack of opportunities for students to apply concrete learning and mastery of Tier I instruction.
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, only 37% of students met their projected growth goals in math on the NWEA MAP test. Root Cause: Lack concrete application leveraging blended learning strategies for students with intervention/enrichment needs.
School Organization
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, less than 50% of students in third and fourth grade did not meet grade level expectations on STAAR confirming that students are unable to comprehend on grade-level text. Root Cause: Lack of targeted instructional group knowledge to apply intentional support to students in reading.
Technology
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. Root Cause: Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.





Board Goal 1: The percentage of students achieving or exceeding the meets standard on state assessments will increase from 35% to 48% by May 2029 across all tested content areas.

Performance Objective 3: By May 2026, the percentage of students achieving or exceeding their reading RIT growth goal in grades Kindergarten through 5th grade will increase from 52% to 72% on the NWEA MAP assessment.

Indicators of Success:
Growth (MAP) - % student end of year RIT score met or exceeded individual growth projections based upon MAP - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA reading data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<p>Strategy 1: Differentiated instruction through Istation (bilingual classes) and IReady (monolingual and bilingual classes) will be used weekly. Students will complete a minimum of two lessons weekly, and teachers and students will track lesson completion data weekly.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Academic gaps in individual student needs will be addressed. High-performing students will grow academically.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team.</p> <p>Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: School Organization 1 - Technology 1</p>				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Small group instruction, interventions, and tutoring will be offered in math. Targeted at risk populations will include small group instruction for special education students, dyslexia students, 504 students, low-socio economic, and LPAC students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: NWEA reading data. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Leadership Team, Teachers, Dyslexia Teacher Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - School Organization 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Teachers will use blended learning to differentiate learning during reading. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students individual diverse needs will be met. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - School Organization 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, only 55% of students met or exceeded their projected growth goal in reading on the NWEA MAP test. Root Cause: Lack of understanding blended learning implementation and meeting students' needs through leveraging technology for science of teaching reading applications.

School Organization

Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, less than 50% of students in third and fourth grade did not meet grade level expectations on STAAR confirming that students are unable to comprehend on grade-level text. **Root Cause:** Lack of targeted instructional group knowledge to apply intentional support to students in reading.

Technology

Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. **Root Cause:** Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 1: The percentage of students achieving or exceeding the meets standard on state assessments will increase from 35% to 48% by May 2029 across all tested content areas.

Performance Objective 4: By May 2026, 5th grade students achieving or exceeding the "Meets Grade Level" performance category in STAAR science will increase from 30% to 45%.





Indicators of Success:

Growth (STAAR) - % of students who meet or exceed the STAAR academic annual growth - 2026 Goal: 62%

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will ask at least two Costa's Level 3 questions daily that align with the TEKS, evident in their science lesson plans and weekly walkthroughs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All science teachers will be well prepared to deliver quality Tier I instruction. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Achievement 2 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3 - School Organization 1 - Technology 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will use blended learning to differentiate learning during science lessons. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student diverse needs will be met. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Achievement 2 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Teachers will have two PLCs weekly led by a member of the Milam instructional leadership team or district approved support member. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All teachers will analyze incoming students' data and BOY MAP scores, form small groups, and develop plans to individualize student instruction. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Instructional Leadership team Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Achievement 2 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 3 - School Organization 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Milam's at-risk population is not meeting state assessment standards with rigorous technology not consistently being leveraged across classrooms to enhance Tier I instruction. Root Cause: Inconsistent knowledge of TEKS implementation with blended learning.
Student Achievement
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, only 29% of fifth grade students met grade level performance on the science STAAR scoring meets while only 13% mastered. Root Cause: Lack of opportunities for students to apply concrete learning and mastery of Tier I instruction.
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Problem Statement 3: In 24-25, only 30% of fifth grade students met grade level expectations on the science STAAR. Root Cause: Lack of conceptual application for 3rd-5th grade science TEKS across grade levels.
School Organization
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, less than 50% of students in third and fourth grade did not meet grade level expectations on STAAR confirming that students are unable to comprehend on grade-level text. Root Cause: Lack of targeted instructional group knowledge to apply intentional support to students in reading.
Technology
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. Root Cause: Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 2: The percentage of 3rd grade students reading at or above grade level will increase from 34% to 48% by May 2029.





Performance Objective 1: By May 2025, the percentage of Kindergarten students who meet their projected growth on MAP English reading will increase from 68% to 78%.

Indicators of Success:

Growth (MAP) - % student end of year RIT score met or exceeded individual growth projections based upon MAP - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will follow the C&I framework for reading and use high-quality instructional materials approved through C&I. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Rigorous Tier 1 instruction will be observed during walkthrough observations, student engagement will be at a rigorous level, and student performance and progress will be evident in multiple data points- classroom discussions, iReady, intervention time, MAP scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Culture and Climate 1 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Kindergarten monolingual teachers will use Saxon phonics daily with fidelity. Bilingual teachers will use Estrellita daily with fidelity. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Rigorous Tier 1 instruction will be observed during walkthrough observations, student engagement will be at a rigorous level, and student performance and progress will be evident in multiple datapoints- classroom discussions, Istation, intervention time, MAP scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - Technology 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: An instructional coach has been hired to plan and implement PLCs and coach kindergarten teachers. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Kindergarten teachers will receive coaching using the district protocol and high quality PLCs. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal and Assistant Principal Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 3 - Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1, 2 - Technology 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Milam's at-risk population is not meeting state assessment standards with rigorous technology not consistently being leveraged across classrooms to enhance Tier I instruction. Root Cause: Inconsistent knowledge of TEKS implementation with blended learning.
School Culture and Climate
Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. Root Cause: There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.

School Culture and Climate
Problem Statement 3: In 24-25 only 62% of staff felt as though professional learning was relatable to their role and professional growth according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Organization and tracking of differentiated professional learning at the campus level has not allowed for application of learning and feedback for improvement.
Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention
Problem Statement 1: Beginning the 25-26 school year, 5 out of 27 teaching staff are not fully certified. Three teachers are DOI, one is an instructional facilitator, and one is a long term substitute. Root Cause: Systems are needed in place to develop and communicate pipelines for certification assistance.
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, 68% of teachers felt positive connections to feedback and coaching from administration according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Lack of system for structured coaching cycles for all instructional staff to apply action steps once feedback has been given.
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, only 55% of students met or exceeded their projected growth goal in reading on the NWEA MAP test. Root Cause: Lack of understanding blended learning implementation and meeting students' needs through leveraging technology for science of teaching reading applications.
Family and Community Engagement
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25 only 59% of 3rd-5th grade students reported having a a sense of belonging according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: A lack of consistent student data tracking and communication systems for parent communication.
Technology
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. Root Cause: Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 2: The percentage of 3rd grade students reading at or above grade level will increase from 34% to 48% by May 2029.





Performance Objective 2: By May 2025, the percentage of first grade students who meet or exceed their projected growth on MAP reading will increase from 72% to 82%.

Indicators of Success:
Growth (MAP) - % student end of year RIT score met or exceeded individual growth projections based upon MAP - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: Teachers will follow the C&I framework for reading and use high-quality instructional materials approved through C&I.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will follow the C&I framework for reading and use high-quality instructional materials approved through C&I. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Rigorous Tier 1 instruction will be observed during walkthrough observations, student engagement will be at a rigorous level, and student performance and progress will be evident in multiple datapoints- classroom discussions, iReady, intervention time, MAP scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1, 3 - Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 2 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May

Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Monolingual teachers will use Saxon phonics daily with fidelity. Bilingual teachers will use Estrellita daily with fidelity. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Rigorous Tier 1 instruction will be observed during walkthrough observations, student engagement will be at a rigorous level, and student performance and progress will be evident in multiple data points- classroom discussions, Istation, intervention time, MAP scores. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - Technology 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Mar	May

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate
Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. Root Cause: There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.
Problem Statement 3: In 24-25 only 62% of staff felt as though professional learning was relatable to their role and professional growth according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Organization and tracking of differentiated professional learning at the campus level has not allowed for application of learning and feedback for improvement.
Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, 68% of teachers felt positive connections to feedback and coaching from administration according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Lack of system for structured coaching cycles for all instructional staff to apply action steps once feedback has been given.
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, only 55% of students met or exceeded their projected growth goal in reading on the NWEA MAP test. Root Cause: Lack of understanding blended learning implementation and meeting students' needs through leveraging technology for science of teaching reading applications.
Technology
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. Root Cause: Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 2: The percentage of 3rd grade students reading at or above grade level will increase from 34% to 48% by May 2029.





Performance Objective 3: By May 2025, the percentage of second grade students who meet or exceed their projected growth goal on MAP reading will increase from 73% to 83%.

Indicators of Success:
Growth (MAP) - % student end of year RIT score met or exceeded individual growth projections based upon MAP - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will follow the C&I framework for reading and use high-quality instructional materials approved through C&I. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: : Rigorous Tier 1 instruction will be observed during walkthrough observations, student engagement will be at a rigorous level, and student performance and progress will be evident in multiple data points- classroom discussions, intervention time, MAP scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teacher and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1 - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - Family and Community Engagement 1 - School Organization 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May

Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Monolingual and bilingual teachers will use Saxon phonics daily with fidelity. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Rigorous Tier 1 instruction will be observed during walkthrough observations, student engagement will be at a rigorous level, and student performance and progress will be evident in multiple data points- classroom discussions, intervention time, MAP scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers and instructional leadership team. Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment 2 - Technology 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Mar	May

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate
Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. Root Cause: There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.
Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, only 55% of students met or exceeded their projected growth goal in reading on the NWEA MAP test. Root Cause: Lack of understanding blended learning implementation and meeting students' needs through leveraging technology for science of teaching reading applications.
Family and Community Engagement
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25 only 59% of 3rd-5th grade students reported having a a sense of belonging according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: A lack of consistent student data tracking and communication systems for parent communication.
School Organization
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, less than 50% of students in third and fourth grade did not meet grade level expectations on STAAR confirming that students are unable to comprehend on grade-level text. Root Cause: Lack of targeted instructional group knowledge to apply intentional support to students in reading.
Technology
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. Root Cause: Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 3: The percentage of high school graduates considered College, Career or Military Ready will increase from 88% to 93% by May 2029.

Performance Objective 1: By May 2026, student school connectedness will increase to at least 72% from 60%.

HB3 Board Goal

Indicators of Success:

Attendance - % of student daily attendance - 2026 Goal: 92.5%, School Connectedness - The belief held by students that adults and peers in the school care about their learning as well as about them as individuals - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: Panorama Survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Student of the month luncheon will take place monthly to promote student belonging and connectedness beginning in August. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will build character by practicing monthly character traits. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration, counselor and teachers. Title I: 2.531 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1, 2 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will utilize the SEL lessons provided by the district to support students social and emotional needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All adults and students Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration Title I: 2.531, 2.533, 2.534 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Family and Community Engagement 1 Funding Sources: I Lead - Local	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. **Root Cause:** There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.

Problem Statement 2: In 24-25 only 59% of students reported having a sense of connectedness according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** Intentional time for students to connect with one another and build connections has not been integrated in the school day.

Family and Community Engagement

Problem Statement 1: In 24-25 only 59% of 3rd-5th grade students reported having a a sense of belonging according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** A lack of consistent student data tracking and communication systems for parent communication.

Board Goal 3: The percentage of high school graduates considered College, Career or Military Ready will increase from 88% to 93% by May 2029.

Performance Objective 2: By May 2026, student panorama data for self-efficacy will increase from 57% to 70%.

Indicators of Success:

College, Career, and Military Readiness - % of current seniors meeting at least one CCMR accountability indicator by the completion of their junior year - 2026 Goal: 37%,
School Connectedness - The belief held by students that adults and peers in the school care about their learning as well as about them as individuals - 2026 Goal: 52%

Evaluation Data Sources: Panorama Data

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Milam will utilize morning assembly where the campus will come together first thing in the morning and will use morning affirmations to build self-esteem. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will have positive affirmations they can repeat to themselves when they are facing challenges in the classroom. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers, supporting staff, and leadership. Title I: 2.531 - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Students will set SEL and academic goals for themselves. Students will reflect on their goals and track their progress towards meeting them. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will learn how to set short-term and long-term goals and determine the steps needed to reach those goals. Students will gain confidence. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom teachers, counselor, and leadership. Title I: 2.53, 2.531 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. **Root Cause:** There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.

Family and Community Engagement





Problem Statement 1: In 24-25 only 59% of 3rd-5th grade students reported having a a sense of belonging according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** A lack of consistent student data tracking and communication systems for parent communication.

Board Goal 4: Classroom Excellence

Performance Objective 1: By May 2026, an AVID Site Team committee, comprised of various teachers, will collaborate to align the work of AVID and Blended Learning within the classroom.

HB3 Board Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: AVID Coaching and Certification Instrument

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Ensure all new teaching staff are trained in AVID implementation utilizing district AVID support. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Implementation and understanding of AVID strategies. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administrators, teachers, AVID Site team Title I: 2.532, 2.534 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 3 - Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 2 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies within their lessons and across content. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Rigorous and equitable instruction. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: AVID Site team, teachers, administrators. Title I: 2.51, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - School Culture and Climate 1 - School Organization 1 - Technology 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div>				





Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Milam's at-risk population is not meeting state assessment standards with rigorous technology not consistently being leveraged across classrooms to enhance Tier I instruction. Root Cause: Inconsistent knowledge of TEKS implementation with blended learning.
School Culture and Climate
Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. Root Cause: There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.
Problem Statement 3: In 24-25 only 62% of staff felt as though professional learning was relatable to their role and professional growth according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Organization and tracking of differentiated professional learning at the campus level has not allowed for application of learning and feedback for improvement.
Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention
Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, 68% of teachers felt positive connections to feedback and coaching from administration according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Lack of system for structured coaching cycles for all instructional staff to apply action steps once feedback has been given.
Family and Community Engagement
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25 only 59% of 3rd-5th grade students reported having a a sense of belonging according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: A lack of consistent student data tracking and communication systems for parent communication.
School Organization
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, less than 50% of students in third and fourth grade did not meet grade level expectations on STAAR confirming that students are unable to comprehend on grade-level text. Root Cause: Lack of targeted instructional group knowledge to apply intentional support to students in reading.
Technology
Problem Statement 1: In 24-25, there was a lack of consistent technology usage across campus balancing hands on and technology in grades PK - 5th grade observed in classroom walkthroughs. Root Cause: Lack of understanding balanced approaches to intentional scheduling of student applications being balanced in hands on versus technology.

Board Goal 4: Classroom Excellence

Performance Objective 2: By May 2026, all students and staff will be sorted into Houses utilizing the Ron Clark Academy House System in which students will engage in student led house meetings to have student voices heard.

Evaluation Data Sources: Panorama Survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: All students and staff will be sorted into houses by September 2025. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: All students will have a connect space of students in which they belong. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Leadership Team Title I: 2.531 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Student and staff house meetings with planned agendas surrounding the campus improvement plan goals will begin no later than October 2025. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student and staff show growth in voice, belonging, and connectedness. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Leadership Team Title I: 2.52, 2.53, 2.531 Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 1, 2, 3 - Family and Community Engagement 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 1: In the 24-25 school year, only 57% of students felt a sense of self-efficacy according to the Panorama survey which is a 10% decrease from the previous year. **Root Cause:** There is a lack of student led data tracking and goal creating systems for students.

Problem Statement 2: In 24-25 only 59% of students reported having a sense of connectedness according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** Intentional time for students to connect with one another and build connections has not been integrated in the school day.

Problem Statement 3: In 24-25 only 62% of staff felt as though professional learning was relatable to their role and professional growth according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** Organization and tracking of differentiated professional learning at the campus level has not allowed for application of learning and feedback for improvement.

Family and Community Engagement

Problem Statement 1: In 24-25 only 59% of 3rd-5th grade students reported having a a sense of belonging according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** A lack of consistent student data tracking and communication systems for parent communication.

Board Goal 4: Classroom Excellence

Performance Objective 3: By May 2026, student daily attendance will increase to 98% from 96%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Monthly attendance dashboard

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Classroom teachers will contact parents at three absences a month. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Parent Connections and increased student attendance. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Classroom Teachers and Administration Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Milam will utilizing parent contact through the use of attendance growth plans for two way parent communication once students reach eight absences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved student attendance Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration Title I: 2.52 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div><div></div>No Progress<div></div>Accomplished<div></div>Continue/Modify<div></div>Discontinue</div>				

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 2: In 24-25 only 59% of students reported having a sense of connectedness according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** Intentional time for students to connect with one another and build connections has not been integrated in the school day.

Board Goal 5: Culture of Excellence

Performance Objective 1: By May 2026, the staff professional learning will increase to at least 72% on the Panorama survey.

Evaluation Data Sources: Panorama Survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Formation of various campus committees to develop teamwork and teacher voice in campus decisions through the use of the Ron Clark Academy House System. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Improved moral and campus culture. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration, teachers, staff, and committees. Title I: 2.52, 2.534 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 3 - Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Milam will provide more opportunities at Milam for staff to be more familiar with each other and understand each others individual needs (especially support needs), and the best way for each staff member to receive feedback. Through Title I funds and/or local funds, teachers and administration will attend research based training to build individual teacher pedagogy that will be brought back to the campus and shared campus wide to build pipelines within the school and increase professional growth. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers and staff will have increased knowledge and increased sense of appropriate professional learning. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: All teaching staff and administration. Title I: 2.534 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing Problem Statements: School Culture and Climate 3 - Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 2 Funding Sources: Professional Development - Local - \$1,000	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

School Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 3: In 24-25 only 62% of staff felt as though professional learning was relatable to their role and professional growth according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** Organization and tracking of differentiated professional learning at the campus level has not allowed for application of learning and feedback for improvement.





Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention

Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, 68% of teachers felt positive connections to feedback and coaching from administration according to the Panorama survey. **Root Cause:** Lack of system for structured coaching cycles for all instructional staff to apply action steps once feedback has been given.

Board Goal 5: Culture of Excellence

Performance Objective 2: By May of 2026, Milam will be fully staffed with high quality teaching staff that are certified and/or working towards their certification.

Evaluation Data Sources: Teacher certification, staffing, and retention

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: All staff will participate in goal setting meetings with the campus instructional team to create two goals, one being a professional development goal. If teaching staff is not certified, administration will support that teacher utilizing district resources. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Teachers will reach professional learning goals through action steps achieved throughout the year. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Staff and Instructional Leadership Team Title I: 2.534 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing Problem Statements: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1, 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Milam will continue engaging in community recruiting practices. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Highly qualified staff in all teaching positions. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Administration Title I: 2.534 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing Problem Statements: Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Mar	May
<div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Staff Quality, Recruitment, and Retention
<p>Problem Statement 1: Beginning the 25-26 school year, 5 out of 27 teaching staff are not fully certified. Three teachers are DOI, one is an instructional facilitator, and one is a long term substitute. Root Cause: Systems are needed in place to develop and communicate pipelines for certification assistance.</p> <p>Problem Statement 2: In 24-25, 68% of teachers felt positive connections to feedback and coaching from administration according to the Panorama survey. Root Cause: Lack of system for structured coaching cycles for all instructional staff to apply action steps once feedback has been given.</p>