

Duncanville Independent School District

Alexander Elementary School

2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: F



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

Mission Statement

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

Vision

Duncanville ISD: Where dreams are inspired and excellence is achieved

Value Statement

We are D'Ville..

P - Professionalism

A - Accountability and excellence

N - Nurturing, safe environments

T - Transparent communication

H - Honesty, integrity, and ethics

E - Everyone contributing to student success

R - Relationships, equity, and inclusion

S - Students as our top priority

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Comprehensive Needs Assessment | 4 |
| Needs Assessment Overview | 4 |
| Demographics Summary | 4 |
| Student Learning Summary | 4 |
| School Processes & Programs Summary | 5 |
| Demographics | 6 |
| Student Learning | 7 |
| School Processes & Programs | 8 |
| Perceptions | 10 |
| Priority Problem Statements | 11 |
| Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation | 13 |
| Priorities | 15 |
| Priority 1: Student Academic Success | 15 |
| Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community | 33 |
| Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development | 37 |
| Priority 4: Fiscal Stewardship and Operational Excellence | 39 |
| RDA Strategies | 42 |
| Targeted Support Strategies | 44 |
| Additional Targeted Support Strategies | 46 |
| Title I | 48 |
| 1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) ESSA Section 1114(b)(6) | 48 |
| 1.1: Description of CNA Process | 48 |
| 1.2: Location for Evidence of Multiple Meetings Held | 48 |
| 2. Schoolwide Program Plan/Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) ESSA Section 1114(b) | 48 |
| 2.1: Timeline for Schoolwide Program/CIP Development 1114(b)(1)(A) | 48 |
| 2.2: Stakeholders 1114(b)(2) | 48 |
| 2.3: Description of Plan Availability, Format, and Language 1114(b)(4) | 48 |
| 2.4: Description of Plan Coordination (if Applicable) 1114(b)(5) | 48 |
| 2.5: Statutorily Required Descriptions 1114(b)(7)(A) | 48 |
| 3. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness ESSA Section 114(b)(3) | 48 |
| 3.1: Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation | 49 |
| Title I Personnel | 50 |

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Revised/Approved: September 29, 2025

Needs Assessment Overview

Needs Assessment Overview Summary

Demographics Summary

- **Total Enrollment:** 310 students (PK3–5th grade)
- **Grade-level counts:**
 - PK3: 36 | PK4: 22 | K: 37 | 1st: 40 | 2nd: 34 | 3rd: 34 | 4th: 55 | 5th: 52
- **Gender:** 54% male, 46% female
- **Ethnicity:** 49% African American, 40% Hispanic
- **Special Populations:** 16% Special Education, 8% Emergent Bilingual (EB), 73% Economically Disadvantaged
- **Attendance:** 93% (2024–2025 school year)
- **Trend:** Enrollment declining over last 4 years
- **Staff:** 24 FTEs — 54% certified, remainder pursuing certification

Student Learning Summary

- **STAAR Results:**
 - 52% Approaches or above
 - 22% Meets
 - 5% Masters
 - 48% Did Not Meet
- **Reading:** 64% Approaches, 29% Meets, 7% Masters

- **Closing the Gaps:** All possible points earned for EB testers; improvement noted over past two year

School Processes & Programs Summary

- **Staffing & Structure:**

- 37% of staff new this year
- 54% uncertified teachers
- New principal and assistant principal
- ILT, team leads, and committees established

- **Instructional Systems:**

- PLCs twice weekly (Lesson Internalization & Data)
- District curriculum guides in place
- Dedicated time for core subjects, WIN, and small groups
- Daily *Leader in Me* time campus-wide
- RtI and accelerated instruction programs supported
- Data meetings occurred but were inconsistent

- **Programs & Practices:**

- *Leader in Me*, *Second Step*, *Restorative Practices*, *CHAMPS*, and *House System* in use
- SEL sessions daily
- Monthly counselor lessons + small groups
- Student clubs quarterly
- Technology increased; all teachers have One Screen devices
- 3 TexPerts support tech integration

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Demographics Summary

Alexander Elementary's demographics is made up of 310 total students between Pre-Kindergarten through 5th grade. The following are total class counts

by grade level: PK3- 36 PK4-22, K-37, 1st-40, 2nd-34, 3rd-34, 4th-55 and 5th-52. The student body is 54% male and 46% female. The student population is 49% AA, 40%

Hispanic, and 16% SpEd and 8% EB, also with 73% of the students categorized as economically disadvantaged. Overall student attendance for the 24-25 school year was

93%. Enrollment at Alexander has declined each year for the last 4 years. There are 24 FTE's and of those FTE's 54% are certified while the remaining FTE's are working towards certification.

Demographics Strengths

- Attendance increased during the 2024-2025 school year to above 93% average.
- Chronic absences decreased from 22% during the 2023-2024 school year to 15% for the 2025-2025 school year.
- Staff retention increased for the start of the 2025-2026 school year.
- Increased diversity in staff across all grade levels.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years.

Root Cause: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): ADA is below the district goal of 96%.

Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Alexander Elementary success rates on STAAR indicates 52% of students are approaches or above, while 22% are scoring at meets and 5% at masters. This indicates 48% of students are scoring at did not meets.

Student Learning Strengths

- Reading scored higher than math with 64% approaches, 29% meets and 7% masters.
- For Closing the Gaps the campus earned all possible points for EB testers.
- Campus increased Closing the Gaps over the last two years.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards.

Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math.

Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance.

Root Cause: Data practices not implemented consistently

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

- Hiring practices include the use of a committee interview process, standardized interview questions, and a reflective questioning processes from candidates.
- 37% of staff are new to the school this year
- 54% are uncertified teachers
- New assistant principal
- New principal
- Instructional Leadership Team, Team Leads, and campus committees/action teams are in place
- PLC's meet 2/week (Lesson Internalization and Data)
- District Curriculum Guides are in in place
- Campus master schedule includes dedicated time for all core subjects in WIN time and small group instruction
- Leader in Me time protected each day across the entire campus
- Campus provides program support for RtI and accelerated instruction requirements
- Data meetings occurred last year, but were inconsistent
- Campus and district increased technology device availability.
- Campus continues to offer an SEL session for all students first thing in the morning through Leader in Me
- Second Step curriculum used through specials
- Campus has been trained and implementing Leader in Me Habits and student leadership curriculum
- Staff has been trained implements Restorative Practices campus wide
- CHAMPS in place across the campus for common areas and classrooms
- House System in place to build community across the campus
- Counselor provides monthly guidance lessons for all students and small groups on specific skills
- Campus restorative specialist and paraprofessional in place
- Student clubs occur 1/nine weeks
- teachers all have new One Screen devices to present instruction

School Processes & Programs Strengths

- Leader in Me program
- Student leadership opportunities expanded current school year
- consistent PLC structure weekly
- Building fully staffed except for a recent resignation in SpEd
- ILT meets weekly
- Lighthouse team meets monthly
- Campus curriculum and instructional priorities are a continued effort aligned with campus needs and Targeted Improvement Plan requirements
- 3 TexPerts on campus to develop teacher understanding and use of technology

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions.

Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Lack of student ownership of data.

Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Data below was collected in the spring survey of 2025 given to parents, students and staff through the Leader in Me program.

Overall score of 77/100

Leadership 76/100

Culture 78/100

Academics 79/100

Perceptions Strengths

- Staff leadership increased
- Supportive environment for both staff and students increased
- Student led practices increased

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school.

Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years.

Root Cause 1: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%.

Root Cause 2: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 3: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards.

Root Cause 3: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math.

Root Cause 4: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 5: Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance.

Root Cause 5: Data practices not implemented consistently

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 6: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions.

Root Cause 6: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 7: Lack of student ownership of data.

Root Cause 7: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 8: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school.

Root Cause 8: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Perceptions

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

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

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data

Student Data: Assessments

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

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data
- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Emergent Bilingual (EB) /non-EB data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, gender etc.
- 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
- Student surveys and/or other feedback
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

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

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices

Priorities

Revised/Approved: October 6, 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 29% to 45% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Data

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia 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, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | | |

Goal 1 Problem Statements:





| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years. Root Cause: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math. Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year. Problem Statement 3: Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance. Root Cause: Data practices not implemented consistently |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |
| Perceptions |
| Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school. |

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 2: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 8% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | |

Goal 2 Problem Statements:





| Student Learning |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 3: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Reading testing will increase from 21% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | |

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. |
| Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |

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 15% to 45% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| Strategy 1: 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia 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, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | | | |
| 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1 | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Goal 4 Problem Statements:





| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years. Root Cause: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math. Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year. Problem Statement 3: Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance. Root Cause: Data practices not implemented consistently |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |
| Perceptions |
| Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school. |

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 5: By June 2026, student achievement on the 1st grade iReady Math testing will increase from 0% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Phillips/Banks/Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Phillips/Banks/Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | |

Goal 5 Problem Statements:





| Student Learning |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. |
| Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |

Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 6: By June 2026, student achievement on the 2nd grade iReady Math testing will increase from 9% to 45% at the 50th percentile.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: iReady reports

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of core teachers will utilize I-Ready to create intentional small groups and provide individualized instructional plans during WIN time. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: 100% of core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student achievement based on iReady diagnostic assessment. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math - 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 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | |

Goal 6 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|--|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. |
| Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |





Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 7: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Reading will increase at approaches from 64% to 75%, meets from 29% to 45%, and masters from 7% to 20% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the SustainedED Reading and 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia 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, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Reviews | | | |
| 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | | |

Goal 7 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years. Root Cause: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math. Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year. Problem Statement 3: Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance. Root Cause: Data practices not implemented consistently |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |
| Perceptions |
| Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school. |





Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 8: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Math will increase at approaches from 40% to 75%, meets from 15% to 45%, and masters from 3% to 20% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

| Strategy 1 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the SustainedED Reading and 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia 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, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | | Reviews | | | |
| 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | | |

Goal 8 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years. Root Cause: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math. Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year. Problem Statement 3: Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance. Root Cause: Data practices not implemented consistently |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |
| Perceptions |
| Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school. |





Priority 1: Student Academic Success

Goal 9: By June 2026, student achievement on the state assessments in Science will score approaches at 75%, meets at 45%, and 20% on the STAAR test.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR data

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: 100% of teachers will use the district Science 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia 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, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| 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: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 - Perceptions 1 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |

| Strategy 3 Details | | Reviews | | | |
|--|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 3: 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Science. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased STAAR scores to meet Domain 1, 2 and 3 goals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction - Targeted Support Strategy - Additional Targeted Support Strategy - Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Demographics 1, 2 - Student Learning 1, 2, 3 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2 | | Formative | | | Summative |
| | | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | | |
| <div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div> | | | | | |

Goal 9 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Enrollment has declined at Alexnader over the last 4 years. Root Cause: Changing neighborhood and other school options in the community Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |
| Student Learning |
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math. Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year. Problem Statement 3: Students in grade 4 had limited to 0 growth as evidenced by STAAR performance. Root Cause: Data practices not implemented consistently |
| School Processes & Programs |
| Problem Statement 1: Learning gaps are the result of underdeveloped formative assessment practices and ineffective classroom data tracking, review, and intervention actions. Root Cause: Lack of and inconsistencies of PLC structure that are data driven and designed to develop aligned common assessments. Problem Statement 2: Lack of student ownership of data. Root Cause: Inconsistent implementation of data driven practices that drill down to the student level. |
| Perceptions |
| Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school. |

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 1: By June 2026, stakeholder's beliefs as measured on the Spring Climate Survey- MRA "in our commitment to prepare our students for college career readiness" will increase from 77% to 80%.

Evaluation Data Sources: Leader in Me MRA spring survey

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Create and implement a system to gather data for our MRA survey. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased MRA scores in spring of May 2026. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Patience Reed TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Perceptions 1 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: Design and implement along with the counselor a "Career Day" plan. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased MRA scores. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Robyn Moline TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Perceptions 1 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div></div> No Progress<div></div> Accomplished<div></div> Continue/Modify<div></div> Discontinue</div> | | | | |

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|--|
| Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. **Root Cause:** Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school.

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 2: By June 2026, ADA will increase from 93% to 96%.

High Priority
Evaluation Data Sources: ADA reports

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Weekly monitoring of attendance. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased ADA. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillip/Mayra Yera TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| Strategy 2 Details | Reviews | | | |
| Strategy 2: Create and implement an attendance incentive plan. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased ADA. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Mayra Yera Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Perceptions 1 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div></div> No Progress<div></div> Accomplished<div></div> Continue/Modify<div></div> Discontinue</div> | | | | |

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|--|
| Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |
| Perceptions |
| Problem Statement 1: Staff and parents indicate a desire for more home-school collaboration and involvement in the school. Root Cause: Existing structures and communication methods have not been sufficient to develop stronger connections between home and school. |

Priority 2: Students, Families, and Community

Goal 3: By June of 2026, students will be exposed to various college and career opportunities.

Evaluation Data Sources: Schedules from various college and career exposure opportunities.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Lighthouse team will design and implement a plan to expose students to college and career opportunities. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Exposure to college and career readiness. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Robyn Moline/Patience Reed Problem Statements: Student Learning 1 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div><div></div>No Progress</div><div><div></div>Accomplished</div><div><div></div>Continue/Modify</div><div><div></div>Discontinue</div></div> | | | | |

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 1: By June 2026, the number of teachers meeting "accomplished" or higher on T-TESS in dimension 2.3 will increase from 50% to 55% by June 2026.

Evaluation Data Sources: TTESS summative ratings

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Embed TTESS dimension 2.3 connections into PLC's. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased TTESS ratings. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Natasha Banks/Lisa Maia TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div></div> No Progress<div></div> Accomplished<div></div> Continue/Modify<div></div> Discontinue</div> | | | | |

Goal 1 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|---|
| Problem Statement 2: Student achievement as evidenced on STAAR is below expectations in reading and math. Root Cause: Lack of alignment of curriculum and classroom instruction, limited coaching and feedback to improve instructional practices of teachers. Student achievement deficiencies were not identified and addressed effectively via Tier 1 instruction, re-teach/remediation, or intervention services last year. |

Priority 3: Personnel and Professional Development

Goal 2: The retention rate of "certified teachers" will increase from 79% to 82% by 2028.

Evaluation Data Sources: HR documentation of certified vs. non-certified.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: Create and implement a support plan to assist staff with obtaining certification. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: More staff on campus are fully certified. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Lisa Maia 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 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div></div>No Progress<div></div>Accomplished<div></div>Continue/Modify<div></div>Discontinue</div> | | | | |

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |

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: Campus budget.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: The campus principal will regularly review campus budget expenditures by Function Code 11 to ensure maximum allocation toward instruction once a month. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Balanced budget Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Maria Ramirez TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div></div> No Progress<div></div> Accomplished<div></div> Continue/Modify<div></div> Discontinue</div> | | | | |





Goal 1 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|--|
| Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |

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: Campus budget.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: The principal will build staff awareness of fiscal compliance through campus training on purchasing and budget procedures twice a year. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Balanced budget. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Maria Ramirez TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div> <div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div> </div> | | | | |

Goal 2 Problem Statements:

| Demographics |
|--|
| Problem Statement 2: ADA is below the district goal of 96%. Root Cause: Lack of family engagement to understand importance of attending school regularly |

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: Campus budget.

| Strategy 1 Details | Reviews | | | |
|--|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Strategy 1: The principal will work with Human Resources to prioritize campus staffing based on student needs and instructional priorities to reduce expenditures at campus leveling and the district budgeting at district level and the district annual budget review. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased staff retention. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Alicia Phillips/Maria Ramirez 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 | Formative | | | Summative |
| | Oct | Jan | Apr | June |
| | | | | |
| <div><div><div></div>No Progress</div><div><div></div>Accomplished</div><div><div></div>Continue/Modify</div><div><div></div>Discontinue</div></div> | | | | |

Goal 3 Problem Statements:

| Student Learning |
|---|
| Problem Statement 1: Tier 1 practices are not adequate to meet student needs as evidenced by STAAR scores that indicate that less than half of students are achieving grade level standards. Root Cause: Inconsistent use of HQIM and PLC Internalization process |

RDA Strategies

| Priority | Goal | Strategy | Description |
|----------|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 3 | 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 7 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading and Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. |
| 1 | 7 | 3 | 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |

| Priority | Goal | Strategy | Description |
|----------|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 8 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the SustainedED Reading and 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 9 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the district Science 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Science. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |

Targeted Support Strategies

| Priority | Goal | Strategy | Description |
|----------|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 3 | 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 7 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading and Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. |
| 1 | 7 | 3 | 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |

| Priority | Goal | Strategy | Description |
|----------|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 8 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the SustainedED Reading and 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 9 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the district Science 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Science. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |

Additional Targeted Support Strategies

| Priority | Goal | Strategy | Description |
|----------|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 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 | 1 | 3 | 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 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 core teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 7 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the SustainED Reading and Math PLC protocol to deeply internalize upcoming units by unpacking standards, anticipating student misconceptions, "Know and Show" charts, and preparing exemplar responses. |
| 1 | 7 | 3 | 100% of core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |

| Priority | Goal | Strategy | Description |
|----------|------|----------|--|
| 1 | 8 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the SustainedED Reading and 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Reading and Math. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |
| 1 | 9 | 1 | 100% of teachers will use the district Science 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 core STAAR teachers will implement student trackers aligned to TEKS in Science. Teachers will update trackers weekly based on district formative assessments, exit tickets, and i-Ready data. Students will use trackers to set personal goals, monitor progress, and reflect during PLC and teacher-student conferences. |

Title I

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

1.1: Description of CNA Process

Please see TitleICrate for the following documentation.

1.2: Location for Evidence of Multiple Meetings Held

Please see TitleICrate 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 TitleICrate for the following documentation.

2.2: Stakeholders 1114(b)(2)

Please see TitleICrate 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 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, especially in my school with is improvement required.

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

Embedded in the plan.

3. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness ESSA Section 114(b)(3)

3.1: Location and Confirmation for Evaluation of Program Effectiveness Documentation

Embedded in the Formative Reviews.

Title I Personnel

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Position</u> | <u>Program</u> | <u>FTE</u> |
|---------------|---------------------|----------------|------------|
| Natasha Banks | Instructional Coach | Title 1 | 1 |
| Patience Reed | Intervention | Title 1 | 1 |
| Ratna Long | Intervention | Title 1 | 1 |