Duncanville Independent School District

Daniel Elementary School

2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: F

Board Approval Date: October 20, 2025
Public Presentation Date: October 7, 2025

Mission Statement

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

Vision

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

Revised/Approved: October 3, 2025

Needs Assessment Overview

Needs Assessment Overview Summary

Daniel Elementary conducted a comprehensive needs assessment to identify strengths, challenges, and priorities for improvement across four key areas: **Demographics, Student Learning, School Processes & Programs, and Perceptions.**

Demographics:
The school serves a highly diverse student population, with 78% identified as economically disadvantaged, 44% African American, 51% Hispanic, 21% English Learners, and 17% receiving Special Education services. This diversity provides rich opportunities for cultural inclusion but also highlights the need for targeted academic and language supports. The primary demographic need is improving achievement among economically disadvantaged and English Learner students, who scored significantly below state averages in reading and math due to inconsistent scaffolds and sheltered instruction strategies.

Student Learning:
Student achievement data reveal that only 18–20% of students meet grade-level expectations in Reading/Language Arts and 14–15% in Math. Academic growth, particularly in math, remains well below state targets. Root causes include inconsistent implementation of Tier I instruction, limited progress monitoring, and insufficient scaffolds for struggling readers and English Learners. Teachers also need deeper content knowledge and strategies for conceptual math instruction. Strengths include student resilience and growth in reading, as well as a positive response to intervention supports.

School Processes & Programs:
The campus has established strong foundational systems, including the Bluebonnet Curriculum, I-Ready diagnostics, WIN (What I Need) Time for intervention and enrichment, and a structured PLC process focused on lesson internalization and data analysis. However, differentiation within Tier I instruction and WIN time remains an area for growth, particularly for students performing below grade level. PBIS and the Panther Bucks system promote positive behavior, and the Environmental Science Signature Program provides hands-on learning experiences that connect academics to real-world applications.

Perceptions:
As a new campus, Daniel Elementary currently lacks formal perception data from students, staff, and families. Despite this, early indicators point to a positive and collaborative school culture grounded in clear expectations, social-emotional learning, and family engagement events such as Academic Night and Coffee with Crosby. Future perception data will be gathered through Panorama Surveys to inform continuous improvement efforts.

Demographics

Demographics Summary

H. Bob Daniel Sr. Elementary serves a highly diverse student population, with 78% identified as economically disadvantaged. The campus is comprised of 44% African American, 51% Hispanic, 21% English Learners (EB/ELs), and 17% Special Education students, along with a notable percentage of highly mobile scholars. These demographics emphasize the importance of providing targeted supports, culturally responsive instruction, and equitable access to rigorous, high-quality learning experiences to close achievement gaps and ensure that all students reach their full potential.

Demographics Strengths

H. Bob Daniel Sr. Elementary is strengthened by its rich diversity, with a student body that is 44% African American, 51% Hispanic, and inclusive of other racial and ethnic groups. This diversity fosters cultural awareness, inclusion, and the celebration of multiple perspectives within the school community. The 21% of students identified as English Learners bring valuable bilingual and biliteracy assets that, when nurtured, enhance academic success and cultural pride. Additionally, the resilience of families, with 78% identified as economically disadvantaged, reflects a strong sense of perseverance that can be leveraged to build determination and grit in scholars. The growing population of Special Education students highlights the campus's inclusive learning environment, offering opportunities to strengthen differentiated practices and targeted supports. Finally, the cultural richness of the community creates natural opportunities for meaningful family engagement, cultural celebrations, and instructional practices that connect students' identities to learning.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math
Root Cause: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Student learning at H. Bob Daniel Sr. Elementary reflects both strengths and areas for significant growth. While scholars demonstrate resilience and a willingness to learn, overall STAAR performance shows that only a small percentage of students are meeting or mastering grade-level expectations in reading and math. Academic growth is stronger in reading than in mathematics, where growth rates remain well below state targets. Achievement gaps are most evident among English Learners, Special Education students, and African American males, indicating the need for targeted interventions, differentiated instruction, and equitable access to high-quality Tier I instruction. Continued focus on literacy, math conceptual understanding, and language development will be critical in ensuring that all students make accelerated progress toward closing achievement gaps.

Student Learning Strengths

Students at H. Bob Daniel Sr. Elementary demonstrate resilience, perseverance, and a strong desire to learn despite challenges. Academic growth in reading has shown positive trends, reflecting students' ability to respond to targeted instruction and interventions. Scholars benefit from a culturally rich environment that supports diverse perspectives and fosters collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking. The presence of bilingual learners adds value to the campus, as students bring linguistic strengths and cultural knowledge that enhance learning for all. With continued support in literacy, math, and language development, students have the foundation and potential to achieve at high levels.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets.
Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%.
Root Cause: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Daniel Elementary educators actively participated in summer training, as well as district and campus professional development throughout the school year, to strengthen instructional processes. Teachers utilize the Bluebonnet Curriculum, curriculum guides, TEKS, and professional development learnings to ensure lessons are both engaging and meaningful for our scholars.

Our master schedule reflects an intentional focus on ELAR and math, while also embedding an intervention and extension block called WIN (What I Need) Time. Teachers are committed to protecting Tier 1 instruction, with WIN time serving as an opportunity for targeted support, intervention, and enrichment. To strengthen early learning, Daniel implements CLI in Pre-K and Kindergarten and I-Ready for grades K–5 to monitor student progress and tailor instruction.

As a Professional Learning Community, we focus on student success through:

- Lesson internalization practices
- Progress monitoring
- Data Analysis
- Engagement strategies that promote higher-level thinking

Daniel Elementary also has schoolwide processes designed to ensure clear, consistent procedures and practices that lead to student growth. Our motto, *"At Daniel, Growing Is In Our Nature,"* is aligned with our Signature Environmental Science Program and reinforced through the GROW expectations:

- G – Goal Setter: Like planting seeds, we set goals and work toward them with determination.
- R – Respect Ourselves and Others Every Day: Just as we care for the environment, we show kindness and respect to people, places, and things.
- O – Own Our Actions and Think Things Through: We take responsibility for our choices, just as we protect the Earth through thoughtful decisions.
- W – Work Hard and Be Kind to Others: Just as a garden needs effort to thrive, we give our best effort and treat everyone with care.

Additionally, Daniel Elementary implements PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) to promote a safe, supportive, and respectful school environment. Students are recognized for positive behavior through Panther Bucks, which they can earn for acts such as helping a friend, showing kindness, or demonstrating responsibility. Panther Bucks can be redeemed at the Panther Store, reinforcing positive choices and student engagement.

Our counseling department provides training and support in Social Emotional Learning to meet the diverse needs of our student population, ensuring that every scholar has the tools to thrive both academically and emotionally.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Daniel Elementary demonstrates a range of strengths that support student growth and success. Our teachers utilize the BlueBonnet Curriculum, TEKS-aligned guides, and professional development to deliver meaningful and engaging lessons, while Tier 1 instruction is consistently protected, and WIN time provides targeted intervention and enrichment. Early learning is supported through CLI in Pre-K and Kindergarten and I-Ready for K–5, ensuring that instruction is both individualized and data-driven. As a Professional Learning

Community, staff collaborate regularly to focus on lesson internalization, content study, progress monitoring, and engagement strategies that promote higher-level thinking. Schoolwide processes are clear and consistent, fostering a safe and supportive environment aligned with our motto, *"At Daniel, Growing Is In Our Nature,"* and reinforced through the GROW framework.

Our positive school culture is strengthened through PBIS, which encourages respectful behavior, and the Panther Bucks system, which motivates students to make positive choices and engage fully in school life. The counseling department provides Social Emotional Learning support to meet the diverse needs of our students, promoting self-regulation, responsibility, and empathy. Additionally, family and community engagement is a priority, with events such as Academic Night and Coffee with Crosby fostering strong partnerships with parents. Finally, our Signature Environmental Science Program provides hands-on, meaningful learning experiences that integrate academics, behavior expectations, and social-emotional growth, ensuring all students have opportunities to thrive.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math.
Root Cause: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Daniel Elementary is a newly established elementary school, and as such, formal perception data from students, staff, and families is not yet available. However, the school has implemented strong processes and programs designed to foster a positive, supportive, and academically rigorous environment. Staff have engaged in summer training and ongoing professional development, ensuring that high-quality instructional practices, including the BlueBonnet Curriculum, CLI, I-Ready, and WIN time, are in place from the outset.

The school culture is guided by the motto, *"At Daniel, Growing Is In Our Nature,"* and the GROW expectations, which emphasize goal-setting, respect, responsibility, hard work, and kindness. PBIS and the Panther Bucks system provide a consistent framework for promoting positive behavior and student engagement. Additionally, the counseling department offers social-emotional support to meet the diverse needs of students, while family engagement opportunities, such as Academic Night and Coffee with Crosby, establish strong partnerships between school and home.

As the school year progresses, Daniel Elementary plans to utilize Panorama Surveys and other feedback tools to collect perception data from students, staff, and families. This data will inform continuous improvement efforts, helping to refine programs, instructional practices, and engagement strategies to ensure that all members of the school community feel supported, valued, and empowered.

Perceptions Strengths

Daniel Elementary demonstrates several strengths that position it for academic success and a positive school culture. Staff have engaged in summer training and ongoing professional development, ensuring strong instructional practices aligned to BlueBonnet Curriculum, TEKS, CLI, and I-Ready. Tier 1 instruction is protected, and WIN (What I Need) time provides targeted intervention and extension for students who need additional support or enrichment.

As a Professional Learning Community, teachers collaborate regularly to focus on lesson internalization, content study, progress monitoring, and engagement strategies that promote higher-level thinking. Schoolwide processes are clear and consistent, fostering a safe and supportive learning environment aligned with the school motto, *"At Daniel, Growing Is In Our Nature,"* and reinforced through the GROW expectations (Goal setting, Respect, Ownership, Work hard).

The school culture is further strengthened by PBIS and the Panther Bucks system, which promote positive behavior and accountability, and by a counseling department that provides Social Emotional Learning support. Family engagement is prioritized through events such as Academic Night and Coffee with Crosby, while the Signature Environmental Science Program offers enriching, hands-on learning opportunities that integrate academics, behavior, and social-emotional growth.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: This absence of baseline data limits the school's ability to fully understand the community's perceptions of instructional quality, school culture, engagement, and social-emotional support.
Root Cause: Stakeholders have not yet had sufficient exposure to the school environment or programs to provide comprehensive feedback.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math

Root Cause 1: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%.

Root Cause 2: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets.

Root Cause 3: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math.

Root Cause 4: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

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)

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Federal Report Card and accountability data

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR released test questions
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Observation Survey results
- Grades that measure student performance based on the TEKS

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- 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

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio
- State certified and high quality staff data

- T-TESS data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- 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 3, 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 23 % to 35% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 **Funding Sources:** Tutorials - 289 Title I - 289.11.6117.99.108.30.000 - $1,000				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 3% to 40% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.52 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level standards **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 10% to 40% at the 50th percentile

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **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 **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level standard **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- 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 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

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 23% to 35% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 **Funding Sources:** Tutorials - 199-30 SCE - 199.11.6117.99.108.30.000 - $1,400				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Math testing will increase from 5% to 40% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 5 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Math testing will increase from 2% to 40% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40% of students will meet grade level expectation. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Reading will increase at approaches from 55% to 75%, meets from 20% to 35%, and masters from 0% to 15% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40 percent of students will meet grade level grade level standard in Reading. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40 percent of students will meet grade level standard in Reading. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40 percent of students will meet grade level standard in Reading. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.

Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Math will increase at approaches from 31% to 75%, meets from 15% to 35%, and masters from 2% to 15% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: I Ready Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	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:** 40 percent of students will meet grade level standard in Math. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40 percent of students will meet grade level standard in Math. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - **TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - **Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 40 percent of students will meet grade level standard in Math. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.

Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Science will increase at approaches from 35% to 75%, meets from 8% to 30%, and masters from 4% to 20% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: MAP Data, Exit Tickets, District Common Assessments and Benchmarks.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 100% of science teachers will utilize MAP to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will meet grade-level standard **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: 100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will meet grade-level standard **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, 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:** School Processes & Programs 1				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 3: 100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students will meet grade-level standard **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Genita Crosby, Luis Garza **Title I:** 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

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 80% to 85%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Surveys, campus programming, Leader In Me implementation

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: 85% of the campus will implement the Leader In Me Curriculum. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** 85% of our student will be prepared for college and career readiness. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Instructional Coach, Counselor **- TEA Priorities:** Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 2: Implement activities under the Environmental Signature Program that will allow hands on activities, exposure and opportunities for real-world connections.

Evaluation Data Sources: Evaluate student work on environmental projects, including application of concepts, creativity, and collaboration. Observation Checklist, Student Journals,

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Invite community experts (farmers, environmental scientists,) to classrooms or garden days. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Partnerships with community experts and organizations provide exposure to environmental careers and practices. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus librarian, counselor, Environmental Science Committee. **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2: Utilize Gardyn curriculum to grow plants using hydroponics. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Students demonstrate responsibility, teamwork, and leadership through roles such as "Garden Ambassadors" or "Recycling Captains." **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Environmental Science Committee **Title I:** 2.53 **- TEA Priorities:** Improve low-performing schools **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 3: By June 2026, ADA will increase from 93% to 96%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Daily Attendance Records, Campus Attendance tracker, PBIS

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Reward classes with the highest weekly/monthly attendance with extra recess, Panther Bucks and other incentives. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Increase attendance to 94%. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Attendance clerk, office clerk, Assistant Principal **Title I:** 2.52 **- ESF Levers:** Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability** **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 1: Economically disadvantaged students scored 43% Approaches, 18% Meets, and 1% Masters--well below state averages. EB/EL Current students scored 0% at Meets in RLA and Math **Root Cause**: Insufficient scaffolds and language supports embedded in daily lessons. Inconsistent integration of sheltered instruction strategies (e.g., visuals, sentence stems, structured talk). Limited opportunities for academic vocabulary development across content areas.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: African American, Hispanic, English Learners (EL), and economically disadvantaged students--are not consistently meeting grade-level expectations in reading and math. **Root Cause**: Tier 1 instruction is protected, but differentiation during core lessons and WIN time may not fully meet the needs of all students, particularly those below grade level or with language acquisition needs.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2026, the number of teachers meeting "accomplished" or higher on T-TESS will increase 5% by June 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: T-TESS, Walkthroughs, observations,

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: By May 2026, campus leaders will conduct 5 weekly instructional walkthroughs with teachers, providing timely, actionable feedback within 48 hours of each walkthrough. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** At least a 5% increase in the number of teachers rated "Accomplished" or higher in the T-TESS dimensions of Planning, Instruction, and Learning Environment. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal **Title I:** 2.52 - **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - **ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

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: SBEC, Alt. certification programs

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Provide mentoring and coaching for teachers working toward certification or in alternative certification programs and assign a campus mentor to check progress every 9 weeks. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Teacher Certification will increase to 88% **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

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			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: Offer pathways for certified teachers to lead PLCs, model lessons, take on coaching, mentor, or committee roles to expand their leadership skills. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Empower teachers by providing a strong voice in decision-making, fostering a sense of belonging, building a supportive community, and creating meaningful opportunities for leadership and growth. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

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

Evaluation Data Sources: Monitor annual budget reports to track the percentage of funds allocated to Function 11 and identify year-over-year increases.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Monitor annual budget reports to track the percentage of funds allocated to Function 11 and identify year-over-year increases. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal/Campus Secretary **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 2: The campus will support the district goal of improving the School FIRST rating from an A-90 to A-94 by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: ADA reports, attendance daily tracker

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 1: The principal will build staff awareness of fiscal compliance through campus training on purchasing and budget procedures twice a year. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** School FIRST rating will increase from an A-90 to A-94 by 2028. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 3: The campus will support the district goal in reducing the payroll expenditures by 5% from 85.36% to 80.36% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: Review campus budgets

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
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. **Strategy's Expected Result/Impact:** Payroll expenditures will decrease by 5% from 85.36% to 80.36% by 2028. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Principal, Assistant Principal **TEA Priorities:** Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals **- ESF Levers:** Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2				

No Progress | Accomplished | Continue/Modify | Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Only 18-20% of students are performing at the Meets Grade Level standard in Reading/Language Arts, well below state targets. **Root Cause**: Inconsistent implementation of Tier I literacy instruction with limited alignment to rigorous standards. Insufficient scaffolds for English Learners and struggling readers. Limited use of progress monitoring to adjust instruction in real time.
Problem Statement 2: Only 14-15% of students meet grade-level standards in Math, and academic growth is 26%, significantly below the state target of 69%. **Root Cause**: Teachers need deeper content knowledge and strategies for teaching math conceptually. Small-group, data-driven interventions are not consistently implemented. Limited student opportunities to engage in problem-solving and application of mathematical concepts.

RDA Strategies

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	1	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	1	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	2	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	2	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	2	3	100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity.
1	3	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	3	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	3	3	100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity.
1	4	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	4	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	4	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	5	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	5	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	5	3	100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics.
1	6	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	6	2	100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics.
1	6	3	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	7	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	7	2	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	7	3	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	8	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	8	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	8	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	9	1	100% of science teachers will utilize MAP to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	9	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	9	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
2	3	1	Reward classes with the highest weekly/monthly attendance with extra recess, Panther Bucks and other incentives.

Targeted Support Strategies

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	1	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	1	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	2	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	2	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	2	3	100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity.
1	3	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	3	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	3	3	100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity.
1	4	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	4	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	5	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	5	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	5	3	100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics.
1	6	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	6	2	100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics.
1	6	3	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	7	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	7	2	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	7	3	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	8	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	8	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	8	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	9	1	100% of science teachers will utilize MAP to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	9	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	9	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
2	3	1	Reward classes with the highest weekly/monthly attendance with extra recess, Panther Bucks and other incentives.

Additional Targeted Support Strategies

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	1	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	1	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	1	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	2	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	2	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	2	3	100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity.
1	3	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	3	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	3	3	100% of grade-level teachers will consistently implement daily Heggerty phonics instruction with fidelity.
1	4	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	4	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	4	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	5	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	5	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	5	3	100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics.
1	6	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.

Priority	Goal	Strategy	Description
1	6	2	100% of teachers will implement small group rotations during core instruction in response to student performance data from Tier 1 instruction and i-Ready diagnostics.
1	6	3	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	7	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	7	2	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	7	3	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	8	1	100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	8	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	8	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
1	9	1	100% of science teachers will utilize MAP to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time.
1	9	2	100% of teachers will use the SustainED PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses.
1	9	3	100% of all core STAAR teachers will implement a systematic data-driven cycle using district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data to monitor student mastery and adjust instruction. Teachers will engage in weekly PLCs to analyze results, identify misconceptions, and plan reteach or enrichment.
2	3	1	Reward classes with the highest weekly/monthly attendance with extra recess, Panther Bucks and other incentives.

State Compensatory

Budget for Daniel Elementary School

Total SCE Funds: $1,600.00
Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0
Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Funds will be used for supporting at-risk students with tutorials and interventions.

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)

Campus Improvement Plans are made available to the public via our campus and district website. It will be made available in print upon request and it will also be made available int Spanish.

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

Our plan is coordinated with Federal, State and local programs, integrating resources to support student's academic, behavioral and social and emotional needs, especially in schools with Comprehensive or Targeted Support and improvement activities.

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

Embedded in the plan

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

3.1: Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation

Embedded in the Formantive Review

Title I Personnel

Name	Position	Program	FTE
KeAndra Mason	Instructional Coach	Title 1	1
Naomi Salazar	Interventionist	Title 1	1
Nicole Cato	Interventionist	Title 1	1

Campus Funding Summary

199-30 SCE					
Priority	**Goal**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	4	3	Tutorials	199.11.6117.99.108.30.000	$1,400.00
				Sub-Total	$1,400.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$1,600.00
				+/- Difference	$200.00

289 Title I					
Priority	**Goal**	**Strategy**	**Resources Needed**	**Account Code**	**Amount**
1	1	3	Tutorials	289.11.6117.99.108.30.000	$1,000.00
				Sub-Total	$1,000.00
				Budgeted Fund Source Amount	$1,081.00
				+/- Difference	$81.00
				Grand Total Budgeted	$2,681.00
				Grand Total Spent	$2,400.00
				+/- Difference	$281.00