

Georgetown Independent School District

Wagner Middle School

2022-2023 Campus Improvement Plan



Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	3
Demographics	3
Student Learning	3
School Processes & Programs	11
Perceptions	13
Priority Problem Statements	16
Goals	17
Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.	18
Goal 2: Communication: Engage the community to become champions and advocates for student success and the future of the District.	33
Goal 3: Leadership: Cultivate an adaptive system of empowered leadership where collaboration and problem-solving are our natural behaviors.	35
Goal 4: Establish an innovative culture that encourages risk-taking, diverse thinking, and meaningful exploration.	38

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Wagner Middle School continues to be a growing community with increasing housing development within our zone. Currently, our enrollment is about 913 students - 329 6th grade students, 300 7th grade students, and 284 grade students. Our campus serves a diverse population with our campus demographic report indicating the following - 52% Hispanic, 33.3% White, 5.8% African American, and 4% Asian. Our campus also serves the following populations - 5.3% gifted and talented, 25% bilingual emergent, 14% special education, and 11.2% 504. Additionally, 43.2% of our students utilize Free or Reduced lunch and are therefore identified as "economically disadvantaged".

Wagner Middle School is home to 96 staff members, including 68.5 teachers, 11 educational aides, 6.5 administrative support staff, and 10 professional support staff. (Note: half positions are shared with other campuses.) Of our teachers, 23 are new to Georgetown ISD, this year. Additionally, our campus 23 teachers are either new to their content or to their grade level, with 7 teachers being new to the profession.

Demographics Strengths

Our student enrollment reflects the diversity within our community.

The addition of an assistant principal, a learning design coach, and several teaching positions helps to provide more real-time supports for both students and teachers.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1: Wagner enrollment is the largest of our GISD middle schools and continues to increase annually. **Root Cause:** The Wagner community is continuously growing with the increase in housing developments in our attendance zone.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. **Root Cause:** About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Academic:

2021-2022 STAAR Results

Approaches or Above (All Grades)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)	SPE (Form
Subject Area - Reading												
2022	67%	69%	58%	79%	100%	N/A	74%	72%	64%	71%	33%	88%
2021	58%	70%	47%	75%	100%	N/A	86%	55%	53%	65%	N/A	N/A
2019	64%	52%	57%	76%	33%	100%	73%	64%	59%	71%	N/A	N/A
Subject Area - Math												
2022	50%	43%	42%	63%	100%	N/A	60%	50%	53%	47%	20%	100%
2021	40%	28%	33%	51%	100%	N/A	58%	43%	41%	39%	N/A	N/A
2019	61%	67%	55%	71%	N/A	N/A	75%	59%	60%	62%	N/A	N/A
Subject Area - Writing												
2021	54%	67%	40%	74%	N/A	N/A	50%	55%	48%	61%	N/A	N/A
2019	41%	40%	29%	63%	N/A	N/A	33%	63%	32%	54%	N/A	N/A
Subject Area - Science												
2022	58%	60%	48%	68%	100%	N/A	56%	75%	60%	56%	33%	100%
2021	62%	50%	51%	76%	100%	N/A	100%	75%	60%	65%	N/A	N/A
2019	70%	33%	63%	83%	N/A	N/A	67%	67%	70%	70%	N/A	N/A
Subject Area - Social Studies												
2022	51%	50%	38%	66%	N/A	N/A	22%	75%	54%	46%	44%	100%
2021	44%	17%	33%	60%	100%	N/A	60%	50%	45%	42%	N/A	N/A
2019	54%	17%	47%	67%	N/A	N/A	67%	44%	55%	53%	N/A	N/A

Approaches or Above (6th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	56%	46%	46%	74%	100%	N/A	67%	43%	55%	60%	17%
2021	50%	45%	42%	66%	N/A	N/A	80%	17%	36%	67%	N/A

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
2019	60%	80%	50%	74%	50%	100%	50%	63%	55%	65%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	52%	46%	46%	66%	100%	N/A	50%	43%	57%	48%	15%
2021	44%	22%	43%	48%	N/A	N/A	33%	67%	46%	41%	N/A
2019	54%	100%	47%	66%	N/A	N/A	100%	57%	59%	50%	N/A

Approaches or Above (7th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	70%	67%	62%	81%	100%	N/A	100%	70%	66%	75%	38%
2021	61%	90%	45%	84%	N/A	N/A	75%	67%	59%	63%	N/A
2019	55%	40%	49%	70%	N/A	N/A	33%	50%	48%	64%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	51%	27%	40%	68%	100%	N/A	88%	55%	52%	49%	17%
2021	41%	38%	32%	56%	N/A	N/A	80%	25%	43%	38%	N/A
2019	55%	43%	51%	62%	N/A	N/A	100%	50%	59%	49%	N/A
Subject Area - Writing											
2021	54%	67%	40%	74%	N/A	N/A	50%	55%	48%	61%	N/A
2019	41%	40%	29%	63%	N/A	N/A	33%	63%	32%	54%	N/A

Approaches or Above (8th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	75%	85%	68%	80%	100%	N/A	67%	92%	71%	81%	45%
2021	63%	83%	53%	73%	100%	N/A	100%	71%	61%	66%	N/A
2019	79%	50%	76%	84%	N/A	N/A	100%	78%	75%	84%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	47%	56%	40%	54%	N/A	N/A	44%	50%	49%	44%	28%
2021	35%	25%	26%	49%	100%	N/A	50%	43%	34%	37%	N/A
2019	72%	70%	66%	82%	N/A	N/A	60%	62%	63%	81%	N/A

Subject Area - Science

2022	58%	60%	48%	68%	100%	N/A	56%	75%	60%	56%	33%
2021	62%	50%	51%	76%	100%	N/A	100%	75%	60%	65%	N/A
2019	70%	33%	63%	83%	N/A	N/A	67%	67%	70%	70%	N/A

Subject Area - Social Studies

2022	51%	50%	38%	66%	N/A	N/A	22%	75%	54%	46%	44%
2021	44%	17%	33%	60%	100%	N/A	60%	50%	45%	42%	N/A
2019	54%	17%	47%	67%	N/A	N/A	67%	44%	55%	53%	N/A

Meets or Above (All Grades)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	38%	35%	29%	50%	67%	N/A	48%	28%	30%	46%	12%
2021	29%	26%	18%	45%	100%	N/A	43%	36%	25%	34%	N/A
2019	33%	10%	26%	45%	N/A	N/A	55%	28%	28%	39%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	13%	9%	9%	19%	50%	N/A	20%	10%	14%	12%	2%
2021	10%	4%	7%	15%	N/A	N/A	25%	5%	10%	9%	N/A
2019	19%	10%	14%	29%	N/A	N/A	38%	23%	17%	22%	N/A
Subject Area - Writing											
2021	26%	33%	15%	40%	N/A	N/A	N/A	36%	20%	33%	N/A
2019	13%	N/A	9%	21%	N/A	N/A	33%	25%	7%	22%	N/A
Subject Area - Science											
2022	27%	45%	14%	38%	N/A	N/A	11%	42%	29%	25%	6%
2021	33%	17%	21%	49%	100%	N/A	60%	38%	32%	33%	N/A
2019	30%	N/A	19%	48%	N/A	N/A	50%	11%	34%	26%	N/A
Subject Area - Social Studies											
2022	13%	15%	6%	21%	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	18%	8%	6%
2021	18%	N/A	14%	26%	N/A	N/A	20%	25%	18%	19%	N/A
2019	19%	N/A	18%	24%	N/A	N/A	33%	N/A	17%	22%	N/A

Meets or Above (6th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	27%	15%	21%	40%	100%	N/A	42%	14%	24%	32%	3%
2021	18%	9%	14%	24%	N/A	N/A	60%	N/A	14%	23%	N/A
2019	26%	20%	20%	38%	N/A	N/A	50%	13%	22%	31%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	10%	N/A	8%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12%	9%	N/A
2021	6%	N/A	8%	5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6%	5%	N/A
2019	7%	N/A	5%	13%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8%	5%	N/A

Meets or Above (7th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	48%	33%	36%	66%	100%	N/A	100%	30%	36%	60%	18%
2021	33%	40%	19%	55%	N/A	N/A	25%	56%	27%	40%	N/A
2019	25%	N/A	18%	38%	N/A	N/A	33%	50%	21%	31%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	17%	7%	12%	23%	100%	N/A	50%	9%	19%	15%	3%
2021	11%	N/A	7%	16%	N/A	N/A	40%	13%	12%	9%	N/A
2019	18%	14%	13%	29%	N/A	N/A	50%	N/A	18%	19%	N/A
Subject Area - Writing											
2021	26%	33%	15%	40%	N/A	N/A	N/A	36%	20%	33%	N/A
2019	13%	N/A	9%	21%	N/A	N/A	33%	25%	7%	22%	N/A

Meets or Above (8th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	37%	50%	32%	43%	N/A	N/A	22%	33%	29%	48%	15%
2021	35%	33%	22%	54%	100%	N/A	40%	43%	32%	40%	N/A
2019	48%	17%	42%	60%	N/A	N/A	67%	22%	42%	55%	N/A

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Math											
2022	11%	19%	5%	15%	N/A	N/A	11%	17%	9%	13%	3%
2021	13%	13%	7%	22%	N/A	N/A	25%	N/A	12%	13%	N/A
2019	29%	10%	21%	38%	N/A	N/A	40%	38%	22%	35%	N/A
Subject Area - Science											
2022	27%	45%	14%	38%	N/A	N/A	11%	42%	29%	25%	6%
2021	33%	17%	21%	49%	100%	N/A	60%	38%	32%	33%	N/A
2019	30%	N/A	19%	48%	N/A	N/A	50%	11%	34%	26%	N/A
Subject Area - Social Studies											
2022	13%	15%	6%	21%	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	18%	8%	6%
2021	18%	N/A	14%	26%	N/A	N/A	20%	25%	18%	19%	N/A
2019	19%	N/A	18%	24%	N/A	N/A	33%	N/A	17%	22%	N/A

Masters (All Grades)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	19%	17%	12%	28%	67%	N/A	30%	14%	13%	25%	3%
2021	12%	7%	7%	20%	N/A	N/A	21%	14%	8%	17%	N/A
2019	15%	5%	11%	23%	N/A	N/A	36%	8%	12%	18%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	3%	N/A	2%	4%	50%	N/A	12%	3%	4%	2%	1%
2021	1%	N/A	N/A	1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	5%	1%	1%	N/A
2019	3%	5%	2%	5%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4%	2%	N/A
Subject Area - Writing											
2021	6%	8%	3%	10%	N/A	N/A	N/A	9%	4%	8%	N/A
2019	1%	N/A	N/A	3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	13%	N/A	3%	N/A
Subject Area - Science											
2022	8%	15%	2%	12%	N/A	N/A	11%	25%	8%	10%	3%
2021	18%	17%	12%	28%	100%	N/A	N/A	13%	15%	21%	N/A
2019	11%	N/A	8%	17%	N/A	N/A	17%	N/A	13%	10%	N/A
Subject Area - Social Studies											
2022	4%	5%	4%	3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	8%	5%	2%	3%

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
2021	7%	N/A	3%	14%	N/A	N/A	20%	N/A	6%	8%	N/A
2019	4%	N/A	3%	6%	N/A	N/A	17%	N/A	1%	8%	N/A

Masters (6th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	12%	N/A	7%	19%	100%	N/A	17%	14%	9%	13%	N/A
2021	7%	N/A	6%	8%	N/A	N/A	40%	N/A	5%	9%	N/A
2019	10%	20%	7%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9%	12%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	1%	N/A	1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1%	1%	N/A
2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2019	1%	N/A	1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1%	N/A	N/A

Masters (7th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	27%	20%	19%	38%	100%	N/A	83%	10%	21%	34%	3%
2021	17%	20%	9%	29%	N/A	N/A	N/A	33%	12%	23%	N/A
2019	14%	N/A	9%	23%	N/A	N/A	33%	25%	13%	17%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	6%	N/A	3%	7%	100%	N/A	38%	9%	7%	4%	N/A
2021	2%	N/A	1%	3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	13%	2%	2%	N/A
2019	1%	14%	1%	1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2%	N/A	N/A
Subject Area - Writing											
2021	6%	8%	3%	10%	N/A	N/A	N/A	9%	4%	8%	N/A
2019	1%	N/A	N/A	3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	13%	N/A	3%	N/A

Masters (8th Grade)

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Pacific Islander	Asian	Two or More Races	Male	Female	SPED (Current)
Subject Area - Reading											
2022	18%	25%	12%	24%	N/A	N/A	11%	17%	9%	29%	6%
2021	11%	N/A	6%	21%	N/A	N/A	20%	N/A	7%	17%	N/A
2019	21%	N/A	16%	28%	N/A	N/A	50%	N/A	16%	26%	N/A
Subject Area - Math											
2022	1%	N/A	N/A	4%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3%	N/A	3%
2021	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2019	7%	N/A	4%	11%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8%	5%	N/A
Subject Area - Science											
2022	8%	15%	2%	12%	N/A	N/A	11%	25%	8%	10%	3%
2021	18%	17%	12%	28%	100%	N/A	N/A	13%	15%	21%	N/A
2019	11%	N/A	8%	17%	N/A	N/A	17%	N/A	13%	10%	N/A
Subject Area - Social Studies											
2022	4%	5%	4%	3%	N/A	N/A	N/A	8%	5%	2%	3%
2021	7%	N/A	3%	14%	N/A	N/A	20%	N/A	6%	8%	N/A
2019	4%	N/A	3%	6%	N/A	N/A	17%	N/A	1%	8%	N/A

2021-2022 MAP Assessment Results - Summary of All Grades:

Subject Tested	Performance Level	MOY MAP	EOY MAP
Reading	Approaches	64%	72%
Reading	Meets	34%	38%
Reading	Masters	14%	16%
Mathematics	Approaches	62%	58%
Mathematics	Meets	20%	19%
Mathematics	Masters	4%	5%

Behavioral:

The highest five disciplinary offenses based on total referrals each semester:

- Fall 2021 -- aggression (29%), skipping class (14.2%), following directions (12.6%), offensive language (12.3%), disrespect (9.2%)
- Spring 2022 -- following directions (14%), skipping class (13.2%), other code of conduct violation (11.1%), class disruption (9.9%), offensive language (9.5%)

The percentage of referrals by grade level:

- Fall 2021 -- 6th grade (28.7%), 7th grade (36%), 8th grade (35.2%)
- Spring 2022 -- 6th grade (22.8%), 7th grade (35.6%), 8th grade (41.2%)

Attendance:

Campus attendance by six weeks -- 1st six weeks (92.7%), 2nd six weeks (92.81%), 3rd six weeks (84.32%), 4th six weeks (93.11%), 5th six weeks (93.49%), 6th six weeks (92.31%).

Overall attendance was 91.6%.

Student Learning Strengths

STAAR results increased in the following areas, when considering all students:

- % of students approaching standard in all grades for reading, math, and social studies
- % of students meeting standard in 6th and 7th grade reading and math
- % of students mastering in 6th and 7th grade reading and math

MOY and EOY MAP assessment data showed an increase in the following areas, when considering all students:

- % of students approaching standard in reading
- % of students meeting standard in reading
- % of students mastering standard in reading and math
- only a slight decrease in % of students approaching or meeting standard in math

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. **Root Cause:** Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students. **Root Cause:** Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.

Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and low student attendance. **Root Cause:** Lack clear procedures to provide regular interventions for students with excessive absences.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. **Root Cause:** Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Leadership & Decision-Making Processes: We believe that the development of leaders is vital to our success. To that end, we believe that all staff are leaders in a variety of ways -- both formally and informally -- and are encouraged to seek out opportunities to develop their leadership skills in the following areas. The following leadership team help support various aspects of our campus work, with many of these teams composed of teacher leaders.

- **Process Champions** - Process Champions are a selected group of campus teachers that are models for and provide support on our campus' Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) implementation. These teachers embrace and consistently model the skills and behaviors of Capturing Kids' Hearts and receive additional training focused on leading campus growth in Capturing Kids' Hearts concepts and skills. Process Champions meet monthly.
- **Design Team** - Design Team members are a selected group of campus teachers that are models for and provide support on our Campus Pathway implementation. These teachers act as change agents, are good listeners, continual learners, and consistently model teacher attributes that support our Campus Pathway. Design Team meets bi-weekly.
- **Department Heads** - Department Heads consist of a selected teacher that will serve as a leader and resource for their respective content areas. These content areas include: Math, Science, English Language Arts/Reading, Social Studies, Intervention, Special Education, PE/Athletics, Fine Arts, and Future Ready Electives. Department Heads meet as a full team weekly, as well as facilitate their respective department meetings weekly.
- **Team Leads** - Wagner Academic Teams are interdisciplinary, collaborative groups composed of one math, one science, one English Language Arts/reading, and one social studies teacher that collectively share a group of students. Team Leads meet as a full team weekly, as well as facilitate their respective team meetings twice/weekly.
- **Instructional Leadership Team** - The ILT team consists of campus administration, the learning design coaches, and the librarian. This team meets weekly to determine/develop needed teacher supports and develop appropriate plans for coaching.
- **Administrative Team** - The administrative team consists of the principal and three assistant principals. This team meets weekly to discuss progress towards campus initiatives, determine/develop needed campus supports, and to collaborate as a PLC.
- **Mentors** - Mentors are selected campus teachers that provide support to our new Wagner staff. These teachers are champions of the Wagner Way and feel passionate about ensuring new staff feel welcomed, informed, and supported as they learn the Wagner Way. Mentors meet with their mentees on "as needed" basis with the exception of induction year teachers who meet several times per year with support for our district.
- **Campus Committees:** All members of the Wagner Team are needed to actively participate in a campus committee that promotes campus operations, relationships, and learning experiences. Committees will meet monthly, at minimum.

Curriculum & Instruction: Our campus has developed a Picture of Success that states the following: Wagner is a learning organization that grows all learners in content and Learner Profile through aligned instruction, intentional use of data, consistent feedback, and goal-setting/reflection. To continue our growth towards the full realization of this statement our campus and teachers are committed to the following:

- building strong, authentic relationships
- designing engaging work in alignment to the state standards and our district's Learner Profile
- assessing student understanding consistently
- utilizing assessment data to inform instructional decisions in real-time.

All teachers have common design/conference time with a grade-level/content colleague to promote collaborate and professional growth. Teachers are expected to utilize: 1) the four critical questions of a PLC (see below) to design aligned, engaging instruction for students, and 2) their design time to receive support and/or professional learning around these questions.

- What do we want students to learn?
- How will we know each student has learned it?
- How will we respond when some students do not learn it?
- How will we respond when some students already know it?

While teachers are committed to leveraging the above questions during the design process, they have varying levels of ability and/or content knowledge with this process. While several teachers or teams of teachers regularly assess student mastery and use this data to make instructional decisions, our campus has lacked a system to support all teachers in this.

Professional Learning: Wagner Middle School is home to 96 staff members, including 68.5 teachers, 11 educational aides, 6.5 administrative support staff, and 10 professional support staff. (Note: half positions are shared with other campuses.) Of our teachers, 23 are new to Georgetown ISD, this year. Additionally, our campus 23 teachers are either new to their content or to their grade level, with 7 teachers being new to the profession.

Professional learning of Wagner staff varies dependent on the experience of the teacher and how long the teacher has worked in our district or campus. Generally, returning staff have received professional learning around designing engaging work, content alignment and unpacking of state standards, and assessment practices. Newer staff will require this learning with some of it provided through campus professional learning days, regular design time or faculty meetings, or intentional scheduling of professional learning during the school day. All staff have been trained in Capturing Kids' Hearts with supports regularly provided through our Process Champion team.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Our campus seeks to involve all staff in collaborative decision making and provides a variety of structures to encourage staff involvement.

The master schedule is designed in a way to promote collaboration and embedded professional learning and supports.

Teachers are focused on designing instruction that is tightly aligned to their state standards.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. **Root Cause:** About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. **Root Cause:** Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. **Root Cause:** Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Student Experience Survey:

Our students participated in a student experience survey in May of 2022. This survey was conducted in class, during the school day, to allow students the opportunity to share feedback and perceptions in 5 domains. These domains including: intrapersonal, interpersonal, cognitive, environment, instruction. Students responded to questions using a 5 point scale. Overall, the students' responses trended more positive as compared to the results from the 2020-2021 school year.

Our students' highest ratings were:

- I contribute when I'm in group work. (Interpersonal, 2.50)
- I am able to read well. (Engagement, 2.38)
- I speak to others in a polite way. (Interpersonal, 2.38)
- I am able to wait for things I want. (Intrapersonal, 2.28)
- I feel comfortable waiting for the bus after school. (Environment, 2.38)

Our students' lowest ratings were:

- At this school students are kind to each other. (Environment, 1.37)
- When I come to school my mind is open and I want to learn. (Cognitive, 1.59)
- I think of interesting questions when I am in class. (Cognitive, 1.65)
- A person at this school has encouraged me about my options after high school. (Instruction, 1.67)
- I feel comfortable in the restrooms at school. (Environment, 1.69)
- I understand how my class choices are connected to my future after high school. (Instruction, 1.69)

The overall responses are shown below:

	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade	Campus
Average Intrapersonal	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.05
Average Interpersonal	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.11
Average Cognitive	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.01
Average Environment	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.85
Average Instruction	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.03

Staff & Parent Survey:

At the conclusion of the 2021-2022 school year, Wagner staff and parents were provided a survey to examine their perceptions of their work, the workplace environment and overall satisfaction.

Parent responses with more than 50% favorable response (mostly or completely agree) include:

- Overall, how much respect do you think the teachers at your student's school have for the students?
- Does your student have an adult at school whom they trust?
- In general, how well does your student learn from feedback around their work?
- How much does the school value diversity of students' background?
- In general, how safe does your student feel at school?

Parent responses with the at least 25% unfavorable response (not well at all) include:

- How well do the teaching styles of your student' teachers match your student's learning style?
- On average, how well does your student work independently on learning activities at home?

Staff responses with more than 50% favorable response (mostly or completely agree) include:

- In general, I am satisfied with my current job.
- My work is valued by my supervisor.
- I have the resources I need to get my work done.
- I find my work interesting, satisfying, and/or challenging.
- I enjoy collaborating with my colleagues.
- My supervisor trusts me and/or I trust my supervisor.
- I have the authority to make decisions necessary for my day-to-day work.
- I feel safe and/or welcomed at work.
- I feel like there are opportunities for me to grow professionally in GISD.
- I am encouraged to share my ideas openly.
- I am committed to GISD's vision, mission and beliefs.

Staff responses with the at least 25% unfavorable response (do not agree) include:

- I think GISD is moving in the right direction.
- I am hesitant to speak up because of fear of retaliation.

Capturing Kids' Hearts Survey:

Student responses that exceeded the national average include:

- My teachers treat me with respect and care about me.
- If I have a problem, I have at least one teacher I can go to in confidence.
- I have one or more teachers that knows more about me than my grades.
- Students are involved in helping to solve school problems.
- Teachers make it clear that bullying is not tolerated.
- I have a good relationship with most of my teachers.
- I look forward to school on most days.
- My teachers have found ways to encourage me.

Student responses that were less than the national average include:

- When students break the rules, they are treated fairly.
- Students at this school treat each other respectfully.
- Teachers and students complement each other or find ways to celebrate achievements.
- Generally, I receive personal encouragement from my teachers.

Perceptions Strengths

Wagner parents feel their child(ren) are safe and respected on our campus. Generally, parents responded favorably to the design and implementation of instruction to meet their students' needs.

Wagner staff expressed:

- feeling connected, supported, and find value in their role on campus.
- feeling connected to the vision, mission, and beliefs of the district.
- appreciation towards opportunities for professional growth, collaboration, and appropriate autonomy.

While students shared some specific aspects about their learning or experiences on campus, overall student responses trended positive in the areas of inter- and intrapersonal relationship/skills and instruction. Students feel respected and connected to adults on campus.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1: Parents lack clear understanding/information of student's learning experience and their student's academic progress. **Root Cause:** Teachers have been apprehensive to reach out to parents directly and relied heavily on Skyward as the main form of communication.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Students lack opportunities to consistently build connection with others and/or our campus. **Root Cause:** Lack of clarity around campus clubs/organizations. Inconsistency with campus-wide implementation of CKH affirmation strategy.

Problem Statement 3: Not all teachers feel engage in collaborative conversations around feedback and/or decision-making. **Root Cause:** Processes and habits of the pandemic have made it difficult for teachers to connect with other and develop strong relationships outside those they regularly work alongside.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students. **Root Cause:** Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Students lack opportunities to consistently build connection with others and/or our campus.

Root Cause 1: Lack of clarity around campus clubs/organizations. Inconsistency with campus-wide implementation of CKH affirmation strategy.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge.

Root Cause 2: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Demographics - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 3: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention.

Root Cause 3: Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 4: High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students.

Root Cause 4: Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Learning - Perceptions

Problem Statement 5: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments.

Root Cause 5: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Learning - School Processes & Programs





Goals

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.

Performance Objective 1: All students will receive targeted feedback, set goals, and track progress on Learner Profile growth (5 year goal).

Evaluation Data Sources: Board Target Dashboard





Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will intentionally utilize our district's Learner Profile attributes in designing learning experiences for students. Students will have opportunities to assess and reflect on their Learner Profile growth. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased attainment of Learner Profile attributes. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools -	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Students will have opportunities to demonstrate growth in several of our district's Learner Profile attributes (specifically developing self-knowledge and personal responsibility) through the use of PRIV cards while advocating for their individual learning needs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student engagement, Increased student proficiency demonstrated on assessments, Increased attainment of Learner Profile attributes Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Design Team TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: All teachers will receive peer feedback on their unit plan design, prior to delivering instruction to students, using the Critical Friends protocol. This feedback will focus on alignment to content standards, Schlechty's design qualities and our GISD Learner Profile. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student engagement, Increased attainment of Learner Profile attributes Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.

Performance Objective 2: Implementation of the phase-in plan toward the development of SEL competencies for all GISD students.

Evaluation Data Sources: Board Target Dashboard

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Our Campus SEL Team will partner with our district's SEL specialist to 1) establish campus annual goals, 2) develop a plan of support towards these goals, and 3) support campus implementation of this plan. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student use of coping strategies, Increased use of affirmations to build positive culture, Increased teacher awareness and use of SEL supports, Decrease in discipline referrals in the areas of negative student-student interactions, Increase student time in classroom due to decreased discipline referrals. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Lead SEL Teacher TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - Perceptions 2, 4	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Wagner teachers will be trained in and implement Capturing Kid's Hearts strategies to develop authentic relationships with their students and to build a positive campus culture. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student perception of a safe/welcoming campus culture, Increased use of affirmations, Consistent use of CKH strategies, Increase in student engagement/learning due to increased positive classroom culture. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Process Champions TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - Perceptions 2, 4	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students. **Root Cause:** Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 2: Students lack opportunities to consistently build connection with others and/or our campus. **Root Cause:** Lack of clarity around campus clubs/organizations. Inconsistency with campus-wide implementation of CKH affirmation strategy.

Problem Statement 4: High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students. **Root Cause:** Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.

Performance Objective 3: All students will meet College, Career, & Military Readiness (as defined by TEA indicators) by 2025.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: 1. CCMR Data from the State and OnData Suite and 2. Eduphoria Workshop Attendance. 3. Board Target Dashboard





Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Counselors will meet with all students to discuss various elective course, specifically those eligible for high school credit to include: Spanish, Health, Project Lead the Way, Teen Leadership, Computer Science. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased awareness of high school pathways, Increased student engagement, Increased opportunities for students to discover and explore areas of interests Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Counselors TEA Priorities: Connect high school to career and college -		Formative			Summative
		Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div><div><div>0%</div>No Progress</div><div><div>100%</div>Accomplished</div><div><div>→</div>Continue/Modify</div><div><div>✗</div>Discontinue</div></div>					

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.

Performance Objective 4: GISD provides learning experiences that are personalized to the learner's unique academic and social and emotional needs.

Evaluation Data Sources: Observational data obtained via campus visits, classroom walk throughs, and results from Student Experience Survey

Strategy 1 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will utilize the design process (based on Schlechty's Designing Engaging Work learning), along with Dufour's PLC questions, to intentionally design units that incorporate engaging learning activities that align to state standards. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student engagement, Increased student proficiency of state standards Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 3		Formative			Summative
		Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details		Reviews			
Strategy 2: All core and intervention teachers will engage in collaborative PLC conversations at least three times per week. Teachers will receive regular support and/or feedback from our district's Content Coordinators and our campus' Learning Design Coaches during this time. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student engagement, Increase in student proficiency of state standards Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 3		Formative			Summative
		Dec	Mar	May	Aug





Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Students will be scheduled into inter-disciplinary teams. Each interdisciplinary team of teachers will meet at least twice per week to provide academic, behavior, and social-emotional supports for students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased interdisciplinary collaboration around instruction and student supports, Increased behavioral and academic supports for students, Decrease in discipline referrals and/or classroom disruption, Increase opportunity for student recognition, Increase in team-parent communication Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principals, Team Leader TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - Perceptions 4	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: Wagner will partner with Emergent Tree to collaboratively develop/refine campus-wide system for: 1) establishing campus core values, 2) implementing a tiered approach to struggling behaviors, and 3) increasing opportunities to affirm positive behaviors. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Decrease in disciplinary referrals, Increase in student affirmations, Increase in student perception of positive campus culture Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Principals, Team Leaders TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture Problem Statements: Student Learning 2 - Perceptions 2, 4	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 5 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 5: Campus teachers will leverage the support of Special Education LDCs to set, address and monitor goals related to academic progress, social emotional learning, and the Learner Profile attributes. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Students will improve academic growth over time, utilizing a goal-setting tracker once per week that consists of grade snapshots, setting priorities, and action steps towards goals. Students develop agency in their own learning by helping to track improvement. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Teachers, Learning Design Coaches, Interventionists, Administrators, Counselors	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 4 Problem Statements:

Demographics
<p>Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.</p>
Student Learning
<p>Problem Statement 2: High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students. Root Cause: Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.</p> <p>Problem Statement 4: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.</p>
School Processes & Programs
<p>Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.</p> <p>Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.</p>
Perceptions
<p>Problem Statement 2: Students lack opportunities to consistently build connection with others and/or our campus. Root Cause: Lack of clarity around campus clubs/organizations. Inconsistency with campus-wide implementation of CKH affirmation strategy.</p> <p>Problem Statement 4: High number of disciplinary referrals involving inappropriate social interactions amongst students. Root Cause: Students lack coping strategies to appropriately respond to negative feelings.</p>

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.

Performance Objective 5: GISD will develop an education system focused on demonstrating mastery of academic, social and emotional, and learner profile competencies.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Teachers will collaboratively design common formative and summative assessments to regularly assess student progress towards mastery. Teachers will leverage assessment data to design intentional, real-time intervention for identified students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student proficiency of state standards Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: All core and intervention teachers will engage in collaborative PLC conversations at least bi-weekly focusing on analysis of student assessment data and/or development of real-time intervention to meet student needs. Teachers will receive regular support and/or feedback from our campus' Learning Design Coaches during this time. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student proficiency of state standards, Increase in data analysis and intervention Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 5 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. **Root Cause:** Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 4: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. **Root Cause:** Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. **Root Cause:** Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. **Root Cause:** Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.





Performance Objective 6: 100% of GISD students will demonstrate grade level numeracy (number sense, patterns & relationships, problem-solving) by the end of 8th grade.

Grade level numeracy determined by multiple measures including, but not limited to NWEA MAP, STAAR, and Standards Based Teacher Assessments).

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP, STAAR, Skyward Standards Based Grade Book, Eduphoria

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Students will be assessed in each core class, three times annually. Teachers will use this assessment information during PLC time to determine intentional spiraling of concepts and needed student interventions Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased student engagement, Increased student proficiency of state standards Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 4 - School Processes & Programs 2, 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Individualized intervention will be provided to all students who did not meet standard on their previous year's Math and/or Reading STAAR test, in accordance with HB4545. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase student proficiency with state standards Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Campus will use Title 3 funds to target Emergent Bilingual students in need of support in English language development, passing STAAR exams (MS) , and support in content area instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus will increase Emergent Bilingual EOC or STAAR passing rate by 5% and will increase the number of Emergent Bilingual students making 1 year progress on TELPAS by 5%. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal/Assistant Principal; Learning Design Coach; Bilingual Support Staff TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: See additional strategies in Goal 1, Performance Objectives 4 & 5.	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 6 Problem Statements:

Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. Root Cause: Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices. Problem Statement 4: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. Root Cause: Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices. Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.





Performance Objective 7: 100% of GISD students will demonstrate grade level literacy (phonics, phonological awareness, vocabulary, fluency, oral & reading comprehension, writing) by the end of 8th grade by August 2025.

Grade level literacy determined by multiple measures including but not limited to NWEA MAP, STAAR, DRA & Standard Based Teacher Assessments.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP, STAAR, Skyward Standards Based Grades, Eduphoria (DRA)

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: All ELAR, Social Studies, SpED, and Reading Intervention teachers will participate in the Texas A&M KAT reading pilot program. Teachers will receive professional learning around improving reading comprehension and coaching sessions to support implementation of strategies. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased teacher use of reading comprehension best practices, Increased student proficiency on state standards. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Students will consistently engage in independent reading, at their reading level, throughout the day, several times per week. Teachers will engage in conferencing conversations with students around this reading. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in student's reading comprehension Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Librarian, ELAR Teachers, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 3: Campus will use Title 3 funds to target Emergent Bilingual students in need of support in English language development, passing STAAR exams (MS) , and support in content area instruction. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus will increase Emergent Bilingual EOC or STAAR passing rate by 5% and will increase the number of Emergent Bilingual students making 1 year progress on TELPAS by 5%. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal/Assistant Principal; Learning Design Coach; Bilingual Support Staff TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 4: See additional strategies in Goal 1, Performance Objectives 4-6.	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Performance Objective 7 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 4: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district. Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

Goal 1: Student-Centered: Develop a future-ready learning experience that reflects student voice, choice, and ownership.

Performance Objective 8: Wagner will collaborate with our district's Department for Teaching and Learning in order to support and equip teachers to provide and implement instruction that is aligned to state standards and best practices.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: The Chief Strategist and Director for Teaching and Learning will partner with our Instructional Leadership Team to collaborate on providing : 1) individualized teacher supports and 2) feedback and support around the implementation/progress of campus efforts to grow teacher content knowledge and instructional best practices. This partnership will occur regularly in a variety of settings/groups.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase in authentic collaboration between campus and district, Increase teacher content knowledge, Increase practices of unpacking standards prior to design of lessons, Increase in student proficiency of state standards</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal</p> <p>TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 1, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: All core and intervention teachers will receive intentional professional learning focused on increasing content knowledge as provided by the district's content coordinators.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increase teacher content knowledge, Increase practices of unpacking standards prior to design of lessons, Increase in student proficiency of state standards</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Learning Design Coaches, Content Coordinators</p> <p>TEA Priorities: Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools</p> <p>- ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 3</p>	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: See also Strategy 2 listed in Goal 1, Performance Objective 6.</p>	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug

0% No Progress	100% Accomplished	→ Continue/Modify	✗ Discontinue	





Performance Objective 8 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.
Student Learning
Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. Root Cause: Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.
Problem Statement 4: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.
School Processes & Programs
Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.
Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. Root Cause: Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.
Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. Root Cause: Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

Goal 2: Communication: Engage the community to become champions and advocates for student success and the future of the District.





Performance Objective 1: Community-Based Accountability System: Develop and implement the pilot community-based accountability system.(BT5)

Evaluation Data Sources: Board Dashboard

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Wagner will participate as a pilot campus to engage in 1) continued learning around CBAS processes, 2) the building of the remaining pillars, and 3) internal signaling of system response progress. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Our campus will finish building out the remaining pillars with Key Questions, System Responses, and identified Evidences. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Design Team TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Implement system responses to Key Questions in the following pillars: Student Learning and Progress & Well Rounded Students. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Our campus will have quarterly, internal signals for the listed two pillars and made the appropriately needed adjustments. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Design Team TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 2: Communication: Engage the community to become champions and advocates for student success and the future of the District.





Performance Objective 2: Invite deeper participation and gather input in decision-making through recurring engagement opportunities that connect students, parents, teachers/staff and community members.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Continue and enhance ongoing communication efforts to keep stakeholders informed, connect decisions to the vision/mission/beliefs to the district and our campus, and gather input. Our campus will continue to leverage social media, our campus website, and weekly communication with our staff and parents. We will seek revisions for improvement as needed. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased input and feedback opportunities from stakeholders; Increased connection to the work and decisions of the district Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 3: Leadership: Cultivate an adaptive system of empowered leadership where collaboration and problem-solving are our natural behaviors.





Performance Objective 1: GISD will function as a learning organization in which collaboration and involvement with key stakeholders drive decision making and work flow processes.

Evaluation Data Sources: Design Team and Action team rosters; stakeholder feedback

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: All Wagner staff members will participate in a campus committee to collaboratively make decisions around campus initiatives aligned to our campus goals. Each committee will focus on either increasing teacher understanding/implementation of instructional best practices or increased campus connections amongst Wagner students and/or staff. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased collaboration in decision-making, Advancement of campus work Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals, Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Our Campus Design Team will meet twice/monthly to monitor and support the progress of our campus' priority work, with a specific focus on CBAS implementation and campus growth in classroom instruction and assessment practices. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased collaboration in decision-making, Advancement of campus work Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div>  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </div>				

Goal 3: Leadership: Cultivate an adaptive system of empowered leadership where collaboration and problem-solving are our natural behaviors.

Performance Objective 2: Create, implement, and utilize systems and opportunities to develop leadership skills and competencies at multiple levels of leadership.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: All Campus Leadership Team members will engage in learning, goal-setting/reflection, and coaching focused on leadership development. These campus leaders will meet quarterly to discuss their new learning and collaborate around ways to apply this learning to their respective teams. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased leadership knowledge and skills of campus leadership Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: All Instructional Leadership Team members will engage in regular coaching conversations to support their role as campus leaders and to further their leadership development. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Leadership behaviors and habits cultivated, Growth in leadership behaviors of campus leadership Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div> <div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div> </div>				





Goal 3: Leadership: Cultivate an adaptive system of empowered leadership where collaboration and problem-solving are our natural behaviors.

Performance Objective 3: Create, implement, and utilize systems and opportunities for leaders to collaborate and problem solve.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Current efforts around leadership collaboration and problem-solving include the following regularly scheduled meetings: Design Team, Instructional Leadership Team, Process Champions, Department Heads & Department Meetings, Team Leads & Teaming. See additional strategies listed in Goal 3, Performance Objective 1.	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div><div><div><div></div><div>0%</div></div>No Progress</div><div><div><div></div><div>100%</div></div>Accomplished</div><div><div><div></div></div>Continue/Modify</div><div><div><div></div></div>Discontinue</div></div>				





Goal 4: Establish an innovative culture that encourages risk-taking, diverse thinking, and meaningful exploration.

Performance Objective 1: Mission driven (lead, grow, serve) and aligned work in GISD is highlighted, recognized, and celebrated at all levels.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: Wagner will continue to utilize a hiring process that asks prospective employees to model risk-taking and creativity in alignment with the GISD Learner Profile and the Wagner Leader Profile. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased in new hire staff connection/commitment to GISD vision, mission, beliefs, and Learner Profile Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: Staff recognition opportunities will include annual Wagner Leader Profile awards, monthly Teacher of the Month awards, and regular staff affirmations. Recognition opportunities focus on a commitment to our GISD Vision, Mission, Beliefs, & Learner Profile, our Wagner Leader Profile, our Wagner Social Contract, and our Wagner beliefs. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Positive reinforcement of desired habits and behaviors, Improved relationship and connection between stakeholder group, Improved morale. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principal, Process Champions TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div> <div> No Progress</div> <div> Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div> </div>				

Goal 4: Establish an innovative culture that encourages risk-taking, diverse thinking, and meaningful exploration.

Performance Objective 2: GISD will continue to support personalized learning and continuous improvement needs through quality and aligned professional learning that includes voice, choice, and ownership.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 1: All newly hired Wagner staff and interested returning Wagner staff will participate in a professional learning opportunity (Wagner Academy) to deepen their understanding of and alignment to the GISD Vision, Mission, Beliefs, and Learner Profile. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased connection to GISD vision, mission, beliefs, and Learner Profile Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Recruit, support, retain teachers and principals - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
Strategy 2: All campus professional learning will be designed to provide staff with opportunities for intentional learning, collaboration, and connection to available supports, in alignment to our campus goals. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased staff connection to GISD vision, mission, beliefs, and Learner Profile, Increase in staff capacity towards campus goals, Increased staff connection to campus and campus work. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Principal, Assistant Principals, Learning Design Coaches TEA Priorities: Improve low-performing schools - ESF Levers: Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction Problem Statements: Demographics 2 - Student Learning 1, 4 - School Processes & Programs 1, 2, 3	Formative			Summative
	Dec	Mar	May	Aug
<div> <div> 0% No Progress</div> <div> 100% Accomplished</div> <div> Continue/Modify</div> <div> Discontinue</div> </div>				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics
Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. Root Cause: About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. **Root Cause:** Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 4: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. **Root Cause:** Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: Inconsistency between Wagner teachers' level of understanding and/or skillset with the design process and content knowledge. **Root Cause:** About 1/3 of our Wagner teachers are new to their content, grade level, and/or our campus. As a whole, teachers are at varying levels of understanding and skillset based on their number of years of teaching experience and their tenure in our district.

Problem Statement 2: Inconsistency in assessment practices and subsequent development/delivery of intervention. **Root Cause:** Varying levels of teacher content knowledge and lack of campus-wide system for assessment/intervention practices.

Problem Statement 3: Inconsistent and/or low academic performance on STAAR and MAP assessments. **Root Cause:** Lack and/or inconsistent use of formative assessments to regularly progress monitor students understanding to drive instructional decisions. Over-reliance on summative assessment data to measure student understanding. Lack of intentionality in unit design/planning to allow for and provide real-time intervention.