

Duncanville Independent School District

Hastings Elementary School

2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: C



Board Approval Date: October 20, 2025

Mission Statement

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

Vision

Duncanville ISD: Where dreams are inspired and excellence is achieved

Value Statement

We are D'Ville...

P - Professionalism

A - Accountability and excellence

N - Nurturing, safe environments

T - Transparent communication

H - Honesty, integrity, and ethics

E - Everyone contributing to student success

R - Relationships, equity, and inclusion

S - Students as our top priority

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	4
Demographics	4
Student Learning	6
Math	6
Reading	6
School Processes & Programs	9
Professional Development	9
Leadership & Decision-Making Processes	10
Technology Integration/Plan	10
Other	10
Perceptions	12
Priority Problem Statements	14
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	15
Priorities	17
Priority 1: Student Academic Success	17
Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community	35
Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development	41
Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence	44
Title I	47
1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) ESSA Section 1114(b)(6)	47
1.1: Description of CNA Process	47
2. Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) ESSA Section 1114(b)	47
2.3: Description of Plan Availability, Format, and Language 1114(b)(4)	47
2.4: Description of Plan Coordination (if Applicable) 1114(b)(5)	47
Title I Personnel	48
Campus Funding Summary	49

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Hastings Elementary STEM Academy serves 563 students in EE through fifth grade. 52.97% males and 47.03% females. The demographics include a student population of African American (39.87%), Hispanic (55.86%), Asian (0.66%), American Indian (0.16%), White (1.64%), ESL (16.31%) and Bilingual (approximately 30%), Special Education (11.34%), Gifted Talented (4.39%), Economically Disadvantaged (free lunch (52.48%/reduced (8.03%) and 74.45% of our students are At Risk. The mobility rate for the campus in 2023 was 19.4% which was higher than district (16.8 %) and state (16.1%) averages. During the 2024-2025 school year our daily average attendance was approximately 94% compared to the previous year of approximately 92%. The first full month of the 2025-2026 school year the average attendance is 96.3%. We will continue focus on intervention and enrichment for our African American, ELL, Sped, GT, and Economically Disadvantaged students, as well as the Social Emotional needs for our demographics. The current campus population includes 563 students: EE - 37, PreK - 55, Kindergarten-83, 1st-84, 2nd-68, 3rd-84, 4th-70 and 5th -82. The average years' experience of the teachers is approximately 7 years, assistant principal 1 year and principal 4 years.

Demographics Strengths

- Family oriented environment for staff, students and parents
- Strong campus culture and climate.
- Student enrollment is nearly balanced with 52.97% males and 47.03% females
- ELL students represent approximately 30% of enrollment, slightly higher than district and state averages. This reflects strength in Bilingual/ESL programming and the potential for academic growth through targeted support.
- Leader In Me Program in year 5 of implementation.
- Chronic absenteeism decreased from 40% in 2022 to 30.7% in 2023, showing positive trends. The current attendance average is 96%.
- School enrollment increased from 523 for the 2024-2025 school year to current enrollment of 563 for the 2025-2026 school year.
- With 100% Title 1 participation and 57.6% identified At Risk for 2024-2025, Hastings provides a robust compensatory education, ensuring students receive interventions and wraparound support.
- Teacher Recruitment & Retention: The campus has a healthy pipeline with 91% of the previous year teachers returned for the 2025-2026 school year.
- Parent participation in school wide events include Meet the Teacher Night, Title 1 Open House Night, reading in a Winter Wonderland, Leader in Me Student Led Conferences, Math Night, Family Engagement Parent Classes and Slide Into Summer events. These efforts increase parent engagement.
- The staff practices restorative discipline.
- The campus offers eight afterschool clubs {Dance, Foodie, Crochet, Book, Nature, STEM 1st/2nd, STEM 3rd/4th, UIL for 3rd-5th and Robotics.
- After school tutoring is offered one day per week.
- All communication in English and Spanish.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Hastings has a high percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students (73%) and a mobility rate of 19%, both of which contribute to inconsistent student achievement and challenges with maintaining instructional continuity

Root Cause: Families face economic instability, housing transitions, and work obligations that increase student mobility and chronic absenteeism, limiting sustained instructional impact.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Special education enrollment (18%) is above the state average, yet SPED Current students scored only 14% Meets on STAAR compared to 54% for EB students.

Root Cause: Tier I instruction is not consistently adapted to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities; reliance on pull-out interventions and lack of co-teaching strategies hinder access to grade-level curriculum.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Hastings Elementary continues to demonstrate growth in overall student achievement and progress, though significant gaps remain between student groups. On the **2025 STAAR**, 67% of students scored at the Approaches level, 40% at Meets, and 14% at Masters. Reading outperformed math, with 74% Approaches and 43% Meets, compared to 61% Approaches and 37% Meets in math. **iReady Fall 2025 diagnostics** reinforce STAAR results, showing that only **13% of students are on or above grade level in Reading** and **8% in Math**. The majority of students are one grade level below, while 34–40% are two or more levels below, indicating the need for intensified Tier I instruction and targeted interventions. Performance gaps persist across subgroups. African American students scored **27% Meets** compared to **49% Hispanic**, while **SPED Current students scored 14% Meets** compared to **54% EB/EL students**

Economically Disadvantaged students scored **35% Meets**, far below their Non-Eco peers at 62%. Despite these challenges, there are signs of progress. EB/EL students exceeded district/state averages with **80% Approaches and 54% Meets**, and SPED Former students showed strong growth with **80% Approaches, 54% Meets**, indicating that targeted interventions are effective over time. Student attendance has also improved to **94.93%**, creating stronger access to learning.

Math

- **Overall Performance:** Only **12%** of students are on or above grade level.
- **Below Grade Level:**
 - 59% one grade below
 - 21% two grades below
 - 8% three or more grades below
- **Grade-Level Breakdown:**
 - Kindergarten: 90% one grade below
 - 1st Grade: 78% one grade below, 20% two grades below
 - 2nd Grade: 56% one grade below, 37% two grades below
 - 3rd Grade: 51% one grade below, 42% two or more grades below
 - 4th Grade: 40% one grade below, 35% two or more grades below
 - 5th Grade: 38% one grade below, 40% two or more grades below

Reading

- **Overall Performance:** **17%** of students are on or above grade level.
- **Below Grade Level:**

- 48% one grade below
- 21% two grades below
- 13% three or more grades below
- **Grade-Level Breakdown:**
 - Kindergarten: 74% one grade below
 - 1st Grade: 65% one grade below, 24% two grades below
 - 2nd Grade: 32% one grade below, 50% two grades below
 - 3rd Grade: 32% one grade below, 51% two or more grades below
 - 4th Grade: 51% one grade below, 30% two or more grades below
 - 5th Grade: 33% one grade below, 50% two or more grades below

Math results show that more than 80% of students in Grades 3–5 are performing below grade level, with only a small percentage (6–21% depending on grade) meeting expectations.

Reading performance is slightly stronger than math, but still concerning, with 70–80% of students in Grades 3–5 performing below grade level. Comprehension and vocabulary continue to be the largest areas of need.

Student Learning Strengths

- STAAR Reading Approaches at **74%**, reflecting stronger literacy foundations
- EB/EL students scored **80% Approaches, 54% Meets**, surpassing expectations
- SPED Former students significantly outperform SPED Current, proving interventions are impactful over time
- Student retention rates are **below 1.5%**, demonstrating strong grade-level promotion practices
- Attendance improved to **94.93%**, reducing chronic absenteeism

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters.

Root Cause: Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets).

Root Cause: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Problem Statement 3: SPED students are not meeting grade level expectations in Reading and Math.

Root Cause: Lack of consistent specialized support embedded in Tier 1 instruction.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Hastings Elementary STEM Academy has made measurable progress in establishing strong instructional systems, professional development supports, and leadership practices that are aligned to district priorities. The school culture emphasizes STEM integration, data-driven PLCs, and Leader in Me leadership development, which anchor curriculum, instruction, and extracurricular offerings.

Campus systems are intentionally designed to foster collaboration and instructional alignment. PLCs analyze iReady, STAAR, common assessment and benchmark data to guide reteach plans and WIN Time interventions. Leadership structures ensure teacher and staff voice in decision-making while maintaining alignment to the Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) and district strategic priorities.

The campus also benefits from family and community engagement, supported by bilingual communication systems, structured attendance campaigns, and active student leadership opportunities. Technology integration is ongoing, with efforts to embed digital tools in Tier I instruction and intervention.

Despite these strengths, the campus continues to refine processes in Tier I instructional consistency, teacher development for rigorous questioning, differentiation, student engagement/discourse, productive struggle and expanded access to extracurricular opportunities for underrepresented student groups.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Professional Development

Strengths

- Targeted coaching cycles tied to T-TESS trends and walkthrough data.
- Partnerships with SustaineED and district ongoing training.
- Weekly focused PLC's to increase teacher capacity and collaboration to support student growth.
- Weekly support with unit and/or lesson internalization
- Ongoing targets Faculty PLC that focuses on quality Tier 1 instruction.

Curriculum & Instruction

Strengths

- Core instruction anchored in Bluebonnet Reading and Math, Second Steps and Leader in Me frameworks.
- Regular PLC meetings analyze common assessment data for targeted reteach cycles.
- WIN Time interventions built into the master schedule provide structured small-group support.
- Strong integration of STEM through field trips, STEM clubs and partnerships.

Leadership & Decision-Making Processes

Strengths

- Shared decision-making through CIP/CNA committee, Lighthouse Team, and leadership cohorts {Academic, Culture and Leadership}.
- Leadership team uses Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles for continuous improvement through the work with Holdsworth Cohort in 4th grade math.

Communication

Strengths

- Weekly HESA Parent newsletter for parents in English and Spanish.
- Clear internal communication through Panther Press, calendar reminders and PLC agendas.
- Active use of Talking Points, ClassDojo, and parent newsletter to reach families.

Organization & Context (Scheduling, Support Services, Extracurriculars)

Strengths

- Master schedule ensures adequate instructional minutes for core instruction, WIN Time interventions, and PLC blocks.
- Support services include counseling, SEL circles, and bilingual/ESL supports.
- Strong extracurricular programs: Nature, Dance, Food, STEM, UIL, Book, Robotics and Crochet

Technology Integration/Plan

Strengths

- Use of iReady, Lead4Ward, and Sirius to support instruction.
- Classroom technology (interactive boards, Chromebooks) available to all students.
- Teachers trained on instructional software and data dashboards.

Other

Strengths

- Monthly Attendance campaigns (Ex: October “Fall into Great Attendance”) with incentives have improved ADA.
- Increase in family engagement through Title I Nights, Academic Nights and career readiness events.

- Community partnerships (Golden Chick, Texas Rangers, In-N-Out Burger, Big Kahuna, Kona Ice)

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions.

Root Cause: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Problem Statement 2: Teachers report a need for support in higher-order questioning, language acquisition strategies, and aggressive monitoring.

Root Cause: Professional development is provided but not always job-embedded or sustained with coaching and accountability measures.

Problem Statement 3: Extracurricular and enrichment opportunities exist, but access is uneven across subgroups.

Root Cause: Recruitment for advanced programs (GT, STEM clubs, leadership roles) does not consistently reach underrepresented groups, resulting in inequitable participation.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Perception data for Hastings Elementary is collected annually through surveys, focus groups, and Leader in Me's Measurable Results Assessment (MRA). Results reflect strong growth in leadership culture, school climate, and family engagement. The **Fall 2025 MRA overall score was 79 ("Satisfactory/Effective")**, demonstrating continued progress in leadership development, supportive environments, and stakeholder engagement.

Parents at Hastings reported feeling welcomed and valued as partners in their children's learning, reflected in a strong **School & Family Partnerships score of 87** and a **Family Engagement score of 80**. Families appreciate bilingual communication and opportunities to participate in events such as student-led conferences and Title I nights, though some expressed a desire for more academic-focused workshops and stronger two-way communication.

Staff expressed high confidence in their collective ability to impact student learning, with **Collective Efficacy at 87** and **Staff Voice at 85**. They value the positive climate (**School Climate 84**) and their role in decision-making, though they noted areas for growth in instructional efficacy (**78**) and consistency of student behavior supports.

Students reported strong connections to the school, with **School Belonging (78)**, **Trusting Relationships (78)**, and **School Climate (84)** all scoring high. They expressed feelings of empowerment, well-being, and recognition of leadership opportunities through Leader in Me practices, though some students shared that access to academic leadership roles could be expanded.

Overall, survey data reflects a positive and supportive school culture. Students report high levels of belonging and empowerment, families express satisfaction with communication and partnership opportunities, and staff consistently believe their actions impact student success. In addition, **community partnerships** with The Links; Incorporated, Golden Chick, Texas Rangers, In-N-Out Burger, Big Kahuna, and Kona Ice continue to strengthen school–community ties, while volunteer participation is growing through **STEM Academic Nights, career exploration days, and other parent engagement events**.

Perceptions Strengths

- Parents feel welcomed and valued
- Students feel cared for and connected to the staff
- Staff and students report a strong campus climate
- Students reported high empowerment through Leader in Me, with growth in self-advocacy, goal setting, and student-led practices.
- Teachers believe their collective actions positively impact student success and feel their voices are valued in decision-making
- Leadership team with a servant leadership and growth mindset
- Staff cares about students and each other
- Team collaboration
- A systematic way for parent communication (Weekly Smore Parent Newsletter and Talking Points)
- SEL time built into the daily schedules
- Positive Referrals and Parent/Teacher Conferences
- Two team meetings weekly
- Targeted Professional Development during Faculty Meetings {twice per month}
- Grade Level Administrator support
- Learning walks with feedback (Praise and Probe/Polish)

- STEM choice school

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Parent participation in academic-focused workshops is lower than in cultural or incentive-based events.

Root Cause: Parents feel more comfortable engaging in celebratory events; academic sessions may lack family-friendly formats, translation, or flexible scheduling.

Problem Statement 2: Staff express concerns with instructional efficacy (78) and student discipline supports.

Root Cause: Classroom management systems and intervention supports are inconsistently implemented, increasing teacher workload and impacting perceptions of instructional effectiveness.

Problem Statement 3: Students feel connected (Belonging 78, Trusting Relationships 78) but report limited academic leadership opportunities beyond Leader in Me.

Root Cause: Leadership systems prioritize behavioral and cultural leadership, but academic leadership roles (peer tutoring, academic competitions, student-led inquiry) are not systematically developed.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters.

Root Cause 1: Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets).

Root Cause 2: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions.

Root Cause 3: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: Special education enrollment (18%) is above the state average, yet SPED Current students scored only 14% Meets on STAAR compared to 54% for EB students.

Root Cause 4: Tier I instruction is not consistently adapted to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities; reliance on pull-out interventions and lack of co-teaching strategies hinder access to grade-level curriculum.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 5: Parent participation in academic-focused workshops is lower than in cultural or incentive-based events.

Root Cause 5: Parents feel more comfortable engaging in celebratory events; academic sessions may lack family-friendly formats, translation, or flexible scheduling.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 6: Hastings has a high percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students (73%) and a mobility rate of 19%, both of which contribute to inconsistent student achievement and challenges with maintaining instructional continuity

Root Cause 6: Families face economic instability, housing transitions, and work obligations that increase student mobility and chronic absenteeism, limiting sustained instructional impact.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Demographics

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3
- 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
- Accountability Distinction Designations

Student Data: Assessments

- State and federally required assessment information
- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR released test questions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Intervention data

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- Emergent Bilingual (EB)/non-EB data, including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility/stability
- Gifted and talented data
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Attendance data
- Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data
- Discipline records
- Class size averages by grade and subject
- Enrollment trends

- Mobility/stability rate, including longitudinal data

Employee Data

- Professional learning communities (PLC) data
- Teacher/Student Ratio
- State certified and high quality staff data
- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Professional development needs assessment data
- Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact
- T-TESS data
- Staff mobility/stability
- Support structures: mentors
- Teacher recruitment/retention rates and other data
- Classroom and school walkthrough data

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback
- Parent engagement rate
- Parent and community partnership data
- Parent activity evaluations and feedback data

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Technology and resource allocation data
- Scope and Sequence; Pacing Guides; and Other Focus Documents

Priorities

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 will increase from 43% to 50% and Masters from 12% to 18%.

High Priority

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: DCAs, Benchmarks and STAAR Reading

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use iReady reading during WIN time to close instructional gaps. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students receive differentiated instruction based on their current performance levels, which accelerates growth for struggling learners while extending advanced readers. This targeted approach helps move more students from Approaches to Meets and Masters. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson and Joyce Hawkins 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: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide after-school tutoring using Sirius that has STAAR aligned items. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students have extended learning time focused on their specific needs using STAAR-aligned materials. This additional practice builds test-taking stamina, improves familiarity with STAAR question formats, and increases overall student achievement. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Teachers 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: Student Learning 1 Funding Sources: Extra Duty Pay - 289 Title I - 289.11.6117.00.104.30.000 - \$2,681	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 1 Problem Statements:





Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters. Root Cause: Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.
Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). Root Cause: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2026, the percentage of 1st grade students at/above the 50th percentile in Reading will increase from 12% to 25%.

High Priority
Evaluation Data Sources: iReady Assessment

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Strengthen phonics/phonological awareness instruction through daily Heggerty instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The consistent use of Heggerty reduces early reading gaps, increases the percentage of students reading on or above grade level by 2nd grade, and supports long-term growth on iReady Reading and STAAR assessments. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Use iReady during WIN Time to provide differentiated, data-driven instruction tailored to individual student needs Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using iReady during WIN Time will provide students with targeted practice aligned to their diagnostic results, ensuring instruction meets their individual learning needs. This will close specific skill gaps, accelerate growth for below-grade-level students, and extend learning for advanced students. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters. Root Cause: Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2026, the percentage of 2nd grade students at/above the 50th percentile in Reading will increase from 16% to 30%

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady Assessment

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use iReady personalized lessons during WIN Time to close foundational gaps and provide enrichment for advanced students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students receive differentiated instruction based on their current performance levels, which accelerates growth for struggling learners while extending advanced readers. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, and Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Use vocabulary building strategies during Tier 1 Instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Embedding vocabulary-building strategies into Tier I instruction strengthens students' word knowledge, which directly improves comprehension across all content areas. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Brigett Freeman 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: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). **Root Cause:** Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.





Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 4: By June 2026, student achievement on third grade state assessment in Mathematics at the Meets performance level will increase from 37% to 45%, and Masters from 16% to 22%.

- High Priority
- HB3 Priority
- Evaluation Data Sources: DCAs, Benchmarks and STAAR Math

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Strengthen Tier I math instruction using Bluebonnet math modules with fidelity. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Implementing Bluebonnet Math with fidelity ensures that all students receive rigorous, TEKS-aligned Tier I instruction that builds conceptual understanding and procedural fluency. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide targeted math tutoring for students below grade level. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using Sirius for targeted math tutoring provides students with STAAR-aligned practice that builds both content knowledge and test-taking skills. The program's focus on high-priority TEKS and rigorous problem types helps close gaps for below-grade-level students while improving their ability to apply strategies to multi-step questions. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:


Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters. Root Cause: Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions. Root Cause: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2026, the percentage of 1st grade students at/above the 50th percentile on iReady Math will increase from 2% to 20%

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Use manipulatives to strengthen foundational numeracy skills. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Incorporating manipulatives into daily math instruction helps students build concrete understanding of abstract concepts, such as place value, operations, and fractions. Hands-on learning supports multiple learning styles, increases engagement, and makes problem-solving more accessible for struggling learners. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide targeted small group instruction during WIN time using iReady. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Targeted small-group instruction during WIN time will close specific learning gaps, increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Teachers Title I: 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: School Processes & Programs 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 5 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters. **Root Cause:** Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.

School Processes & Programs



Problem Statement 1: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions. **Root Cause:** Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2026, the percentage of 2nd grade students at/above the 50th percentile will increase from 6% to 20%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Provide math intervention for Tier III math intervention pull out and Tier II intervention during WIN time in class. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Providing Tier III math intervention through targeted pull-outs and Tier II intervention during WIN Time will close foundational skill gaps and accelerate growth for struggling learners. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Math Interventionist, classroom teachers 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: Student Learning 2		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Target fact fluency daily through Bluebonnet Math fluency practice portion of the lesson. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: It will strengthen students' number sense, improve problem-solving efficiency, and support higher performance on classroom assessments, district benchmarks, and STAAR math outcomes Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Teachers 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 2		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Special education enrollment (18%) is above the state average, yet SPED Current students scored only 14% Meets on STAAR compared to 54% for EB students. **Root Cause:** Tier I instruction is not consistently adapted to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities; reliance on pull-out interventions and lack of co-teaching strategies hinder access to grade-level curriculum.

Student Learning







Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). **Root Cause:** Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2026, Reading STAAR scores will increase: Approaches from 74% to 80%, Meets from 43% to 50%, Masters from 12% to 18%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: DCAs, Benchmarks and STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Embed STAAR question stems in daily instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Embedding STAAR question stems in daily instruction will familiarize students with the rigor, format, and language of STAAR assessments. This consistent exposure will improve students' ability to analyze multi-step questions, strengthen academic vocabulary, and build test-taking stamina. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Instructional Support Specialist, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Use Lead4Ward and item analysis to target TEKS gaps. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Using Lead4Ward resources and item analysis will allow teachers to identify specific TEKS where students show the greatest gaps and misconceptions. Targeted reteach and intervention on these standards will result in improved student performance Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Brigett Freeman, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). Root Cause: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions. Root Cause: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.



Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2026, Math STAAR scores will increase: Approaches from 61% to 70%, Meets from 37% to 45%, Masters from 16% to 22%.

High Priority

HB3 Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: DCAs, Benchmarks, STAAR

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Embed STAAR question stems in daily instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Embedding STAAR question stems in daily instruction will familiarize students with the rigor, format, and language of STAAR assessments. This consistent exposure will improve students' ability to analyze multi-step questions, strengthen academic vocabulary, and build test-taking stamina. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Instructional Support Specialist, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Provide Targeted WIN Time for At-Risk students using iReady and Sirius. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Providing targeted WIN Time for at-risk students using iReady and Sirius will accelerate growth by addressing individual learning gaps. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Instructional Support Specialist, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

Student Learning



Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). **Root Cause:** Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2026, Science STAAR scores will increase from 54% Approaches to 65%, Meets from 28% to 38%, and Masters from 12% to 18%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: DCAs, MAP and STAAR

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Embed STAAR question stems in daily instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Embedding STAAR question stems in daily instruction will familiarize students with the rigor, format, and language of STAAR assessments. This consistent exposure will improve students' ability to analyze multi-step questions, strengthen academic vocabulary, and build test-taking stamina. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Instructional Support Specialist, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Embed Spiral review in daily warm-ups. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Embedding spiral review in daily warm-ups will reinforce retention of previously taught science TEKS Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Instructional Support Specialist, Teachers Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: The majority of students are below grade level: only 17% Reading and 12% Math are on/above grade level in Fall 2025 iReady; STAAR 2025 showed 40% Meets and 14% Masters. **Root Cause:** Teachers limit the time for students to engage in productive struggle, inconsistent implementation of aggressive monitoring, instructional pacing and Tier I instructional rigor.



Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). **Root Cause:** Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 1: By June 2026, parent survey responses on "commitment to prepare students for college/career readiness" will increase from 79% to 85%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Parent Leader in Me MRA and Campus based "Parent Surveys"

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Host College & Career Day featuring information about all of DHS pathways and college information. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Implementation of college and career readiness activities will increase parent confidence in the school's commitment to preparing students for future success. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: School Counselor, Committee Leaders, Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Teachers - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Expand Student-Led Conferences where students share not only academic progress, personal goals; but, career interests with parents, reinforcing readiness planning. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Expanding student-led conferences to include academic progress, personal goals, and career interests will strengthen parent engagement and awareness of their child's readiness planning. Parents will gain clearer insight into how the school supports college and career pathways, while students will build ownership of their learning and future goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Committees, School Counselor, Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins Title I: 2.51, 2.52, 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Perceptions 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Hastings has a high percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students (73%) and a mobility rate of 19%, both of which contribute to inconsistent student achievement and challenges with maintaining instructional continuity **Root Cause:** Families face economic instability, housing transitions, and work obligations that increase student mobility and chronic absenteeism, limiting sustained instructional impact.

Perceptions


Problem Statement 1: Parent participation in academic-focused workshops is lower than in cultural or incentive-based events. **Root Cause:** Parents feel more comfortable engaging in celebratory events; academic sessions may lack family-friendly formats, translation, or flexible scheduling.


Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community





Goal 2: By June 2026, Hastings Elementary will increase overall MRA scores for students, families, and community engagement from the current average of 77-79 to at least 83.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Leader in Me MRA Survey

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
<p>Strategy 1: Share MRA growth data, leadership highlights, and success stories regularly through parent newsletters and social media to build ownership and transparency among all stakeholders.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Leadership highlights, and success stories through newsletters and social media will strengthen transparency, celebrate progress, and build shared ownership among students, families, and the community. Stakeholders will report increased awareness of Leader in Me practices and stronger confidence in the school's commitment to leadership development, contributing to an increase in MRA perception scores.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Lighthouse Committee Members, Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins</p> <p>- TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture</p> <p>- Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Perceptions 1</p>	<div> No Progress</div>			

Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: Host a family night and/or parent workshop that models the 7 Habits, highlight student leadership, and provide families with tools to reinforce leadership. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Hosting family nights and parent workshops that model the 7 Habits, highlight student leadership, and provide families with practical tools will strengthen school-home connections and empower parents to reinforce leadership principles at home. As a result, families will report greater engagement and alignment with Leader in Me practices, leading to improved MRA family and community scores Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Lighthouse Committee, Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Perceptions 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			

 No Progress
 Accomplished
 Continue/Modify
 Discontinue

Goal 2 Problem Statements:



Perceptions
Problem Statement 1: Parent participation in academic-focused workshops is lower than in cultural or incentive-based events. Root Cause: Parents feel more comfortable engaging in celebratory events; academic sessions may lack family-friendly formats, translation, or flexible scheduling.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 3: By June 2026, ADA will increase from 93% to 94.5%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Weekly ADA Report

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Continue monthly attendance campaigns with incentives. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Continuing monthly attendance campaigns with incentives will motivate students and families to prioritize daily attendance. As a result, campus attendance rates will increase, reducing chronic absenteeism and supporting improved student achievement Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Attendance Committee, Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Consistent parent-school communication on attendance expectations. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Consistent parent-school communication on attendance expectations will increase family awareness of the importance of daily attendance and reduce misunderstandings about policies. As a result, families will be more proactive in ensuring students attend school regularly, contributing to improved ADA rates and a decrease in chronic absenteeism Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Attendance Committee, Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins - TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	 No Progress			



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: Hastings has a high percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students (73%) and a mobility rate of 19%, both of which contribute to inconsistent student achievement and challenges with maintaining instructional continuity **Root Cause:** Families face economic instability, housing transitions, and work obligations that increase student mobility and chronic absenteeism, limiting sustained instructional impact.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2026, the number of teachers scoring 'Accomplished' or higher on T-TESS Domain - 2.2 will increase from 36% to 40%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: T-TESS Observation & Summative

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Provide coaching cycles focused on Tier 2 & Tier 3 teachers using Get Better Faster. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Coaching sessions will emphasize differentiated needs identified through walkthroughs, T-TESS data, and student performance trends to move teachers toward Accomplished ratings in targeted domains. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson and Joyce Hawkins - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	<div><div></div>No Progress</div>			
<div><div></div>No Progress<div></div>Accomplished<div></div>Continue/Modify<div></div>Discontinue</div>				

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions. Root Cause: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 2: By June 2026, the percentage of teachers holding a valid Texas certification will increase from 85 % to 90 %.

High Priority
Evaluation Data Sources: TAPR Report, HR Report

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Recruit certified teachers through early job fairs and partnerships. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Recruiting certified teachers through early job fairs and strategic partnerships will increase the pool of highly qualified applicants holding a valid Texas certification. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson and Joyce Hawkins. Title I: 2.51 - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		<div><div></div></div> No Progress			
<div><div></div> No Progress</div> <div><div></div> Accomplished</div> <div><div></div> Continue/Modify</div> <div><div></div> Discontinue</div>					






Goal 2 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions. Root Cause: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 3: By June 2026, teacher retention will increase from 79% to 83%.

High Priority
Evaluation Data Sources: TAPR Report, HR Report

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Create leadership pathways for teacher-leaders. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Creating leadership pathways for teacher-leaders will foster a culture of professional growth, recognition, and shared ownership of campus goals. The campus will experience higher morale, stronger team cohesion, and a deeper pipeline of future campus and district leaders. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins and Campus Leaders - TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: School Processes & Programs 1		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			
<div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div>					

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Tier I instruction lacks consistent rigor and differentiation, limiting the impact of WIN Time interventions. Root Cause: Variation in teacher capacity and inconsistent monitoring of instructional expectations reduce the effectiveness of Tier I practices.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 1: By June 2026, the percent of funds spent on instructional expenditures will increase from 52.7 to 55%.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: Campus Budget Reports

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Prioritize funding for classroom resources and STEM field trips to support the campus academic programs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: These intentional funding decisions will strengthen instructional quality, promote equity in access to enrichment opportunities, and reinforce Hastings Elementary's commitment to fiscal responsibility and academic excellence. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Elizabeth Ortiz, Joyce Hawkins Title I: 2.53 - TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	<div><div></div></div> No Progress			
<div><div></div>No Progress</div> <div><div></div>Accomplished</div> <div><div></div>Continue/Modify</div> <div><div></div>Discontinue</div>				






Goal 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). Root Cause: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 2: By June 2026, Hastings will contribute to improving the district's School FIRST rating from A-90 to A-92.

High Priority
Evaluation Data Sources: Budget Reports

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Monitor the monthly budget reports with the Campus Improvement Committee. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Monitoring monthly budget reports with the Campus Improvement Committee will ensure transparency, accountability, and informed decision-making regarding campus expenditures. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson & Campus Improvement Committee Title I: 2.51 - TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2		Formative			Summative
		Oct	Jan	Apr	June
		 No Progress			
<div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div>					

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). Root Cause: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence

Goal 3: By June 2026, Hastings will support district efforts to reduce payroll expenditures from 85.36% to 84%.

High Priority
Evaluation Data Sources: Campus Budget

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Building capacity in the instructional aides to maximize their use in critical need areas. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Building capacity in instructional aides to serve effectively in critical-need areas will maximize the campus's existing human resources and ensure efficient use of allocated funds. As a result, instructional support will become more targeted and consistent across classrooms, reducing the need for additional staffing expenditures while improving student engagement and academic progress in intervention and small-group settings. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Delonda Robinson, Joyce Hawkins, Team Leaders Title I: 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 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Learning 2	Formative			Summative
	Oct	Jan	Apr	June
	<div><div></div></div> No Progress			

No Progress Accomplished

→

 Continue/Modify

✗

 Discontinue

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 2: Significant subgroup gaps exist: African American (27% Meets) vs. Hispanic (49% Meets), and Eco Dis (35% Meets) vs. Non-Eco (62% Meets). Root Cause: Gaps in academic vocabulary, interventions and enrichment are not fully targeted to subgroup needs; limited culturally responsive practices and targeted academic interventions during WIN time.

Title I

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

1.1: Description of CNA Process

Hastings Elementary STEM Academy conducted its Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) in two formal meetings: the first on July 21, 2025, and the second on August 11, 2025 with additional review and refinement scheduled for August 25, 2025. The process was led by the Campus Education Improvement Committee (CEIC), which included administrators, teachers representing each grade level and instructional specialists. Various stakeholders were invited to ensure diverse representation of the campus community and to include voices from instructional staff, families, and community partners. Stakeholders were selected based on the CEIC stakeholder required roles.

The CNA process examined data across four key areas: Demographics, Student Learning and Academic Achievement, School Processes and Programs, and Perceptions

. Each team reviewed a variety of quantitative and qualitative data sources such as STAAR, MAP, i-Ready diagnostics, attendance, enrollment, mobility, and parent feedback surveys to identify strengths, problem statements, root causes, and targeted improvement needs. Teams followed a structured analysis framework that included data summary, identification of strengths, and development of root causes that were both factual and controllable

Findings were presented and discussed during the CEIC meetings to ensure consensus and alignment with campus goals. This collaborative process provided the foundation for setting priorities in the 2025–2026 Campus Improvement Plan, ensuring that all action steps were data-driven, measurable, and aligned to district and strategic priorities.

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

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

The Campus Improvement Plan 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 in 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 students' academic, behavioral and social-emotional needs.

Title I Personnel

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Brigett Freeman	Instructional Support Specialist	Title 1	1
Keith DeGrow	INTERVENTION (FEDERAL)	Title 1	1
Krizia Isaac	Interventionist	Title 1	1
Velma Taylor	Aide Instructional	Title 1	1

Campus Funding Summary

289 Title I					
Priority	Goal	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2	Extra Duty Pay	289.11.6117.00.104.30.000	\$2,681.00
Sub-Total					\$2,681.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$2,681.00
+/- Difference					\$0.00
Grand Total Budgeted					\$2,681.00
Grand Total Spent					\$2,681.00
+/- Difference					\$0.00