

# IDEA Public Schools

## Achieve College Prep

### 2026-2027 Targeted Improvement Plan

---

#### Needs Assessment, Stakeholder Engagement, and Additional Assurances

---

I assure that the campus named in this plan has conducted an on-site needs assessment in accordance with [TEC §39A.053](#) to determine the factors contributing to low performance and lack of progress. Examples of aligned diagnostics used may include, but are not limited to, the Effective Schools Framework (ESF) Diagnostic, the Effective District Framework Diagnostic, Texas Strategic Leadership (TSL) Landscape Analysis, or a locally developed needs assessment.

Yes

I assure that the locally conducted needs assessment met the requirements in [TEC §39A.053](#) of the Texas Education Code, and that the documentation of the needs assessment and supporting analyses is maintained locally and available upon request.

Yes

Upload a copy of the charter application

[IDEA Public Schools\\_renewal application\\_2.13.2025.pdf](#)

I assure that the Campus Intervention Team (CIT) has conducted a public meeting for this campus required to submit a Targeted Improvement Plan, in accordance with [TEC §39A.055\(2\)](#), with the campus principal, members of the campus-level planning and decision-making committee, parents of students attending the campus, and community members residing in the district to review the campus performance rating and solicit input for the development of the Targeted Improvement Plan.

Yes

I assure that written notice of the required public meeting was provided to the parents of students attending the campus and posted on the campus website, in accordance with [TEC §39A.056](#), and that the notice included the date, time, and place of the meeting.

Yes

I assure that the board conducted a public hearing for this campus identified for school improvement, in accordance with [TEC §39A.055](#) and [TEC §39A.057](#), to notify the public of the campus's insufficient performance, the improvements in performance expected by the agency, and the intervention measures or sanctions that may be imposed if performance does not improve. I further assure that the board solicited public comment on the plan and that the plan was posted on the district website prior to the hearing.

Yes

Please select the date of board approval for this plan:

November 17, 2026

## SI Strategy

Please select the option that best describes your overall school improvement strategy for this campus for the 2026-2027 school year.

Intensive Curriculum & Instruction Improvements

Describe the school's overall improvement strategy and how it addresses the indicators that resulted in identification.

Strengthen the campus instructional improvement cycle through consistent, data-driven identification of learning gaps, monitoring of student growth, and timely instructional adjustments. Weekly high-quality PLCs will analyze student outcomes and work, identify priority gaps, internalize and rehearse aligned instructional materials, and plan targeted instructional responses. Teachers will deliver grade-level Tier 1 instruction, targeted reteaching, and interventions for student groups with the largest gaps, particularly Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual (EB), and Continuously Enrolled students. Leaders will verify implementation through instructional rounds, lesson-plan feedback, SWAMs, and coaching to mastery.

## Student Outcome Goals

Identify the accountability indicator(s) and performance area(s) that resulted in campus identification.

IDEA Achieve College Preparatory was identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) – Low Performance because its 2026 Closing the Gaps (Domain 3) scaled score of 59 fell below the 63-point bottom-five-percent cutoff for its school type. The campus earned a Closing the Gaps raw score of 36. CSI identification is based on the campus's Domain 3 position among Title I campuses of the same school type, not on a TSI student-group rule. The campus's original identification-year score is 59.

**Domain 1 – Student Achievement:** The scorecard shows substantial mathematics proficiency gaps. In 2026, All Students reached 25% Meets in mathematics against a 38% target (–13 percentage points); African American students 22% versus 26% (–4); Hispanic students 25% versus 35% (–10); and High Focus students 23% versus 31% (–8). RLA Achievement was stronger for All Students (45% versus 44%, +1), African American students (40% versus 32%, +8), Hispanic students (45% versus 36%, +9), and High Focus students (43% versus 32%, +11), although White students were below target (58% versus 62%, –4). These differences call for sustained RLA performance while prioritizing mathematics mastery.

**Domain 2 – School Progress:** Growth outcomes are the most urgent instructional concern. RLA Growth was 63% for All Students against 69% (–6), 58% for African American students against 65% (–7), 63% for Hispanic students against 66% (–3), and 62% for High Focus students against 64% (–2). Mathematics Growth was 54% against 76% for All Students (–22), 67% against 74% for African American students (–7), 51% against 77% for Hispanic students (–26), and 52% against 75% for High Focus students (–23). The campus must accelerate growth, especially for Hispanic and High Focus students.

**Domain 3 – Closing the Gaps:** The campus earned 12 of 32 Academic Achievement indicator points, only 1 of 32 Academic Growth points, 0 of 4 English Language Proficiency (ELP) points, and 9 of 16 Student Success points. The 2024–2026 indicator matrix shows repeated Math Growth misses (0, 0, 0) for Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and EB Current & Monitored student groups. The 2026 matrix also shows Mathematics Achievement misses across evaluated groups, EB ELP = 0, and Student Success misses for White, Asian, Special Education Current and Former, and Continuously Enrolled students. The priority is to recover mathematics growth points while improving mathematics achievement, ELP, and Student Success.

Describe how the evidence-based interventions included in this plan are expected to improve the identified performance indicators.

Weekly data-driven PLCs will focus first on mathematics achievement and growth, the campus's greatest gaps. Teachers and content leaders will examine exit tickets, interim assessment data, growth-point projections, and student work by standard and student group. Using the Mistake–Misconception–Action (MMA) protocol, teams will identify underlying conceptual and procedural gaps, select aligned reteaching, and reassess for mastery. Growth-point students will have explicit student-level targets and frequent progress checks, with priority monitoring for Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, EB, and High Focus students. Lesson-plan internalization, written feedback, and rehearsals will strengthen first instruction. Leaders will verify that lessons contain grade-level tasks, purposeful checks for understanding, planned misconceptions, appropriate accommodations, and structured language supports for EB students. RLA and mathematics teachers will use real-time student evidence to adjust instruction, and leaders will conduct short-cycle coaching and follow-up observations to ensure feedback is implemented to mastery. This is expected to improve the quality and consistency of Tier 1 instruction, increase Meets/Masters performance, and generate stronger RLA and mathematics growth.

Targeted small-group reteaching and intervention will be scheduled for students whose work demonstrates persistent prerequisite, conceptual, or procedural gaps. Intervention groups will be adjusted based on reassessment rather than remaining static. EB students will receive explicit academic-language routines, opportunities to speak and write using content vocabulary, and progress monitoring aligned to ELP expectations. Campus leaders will also review STAAR distribution and Student Success measures, not only Meets rates, so that improvements extend across Approaches, Meets, and Masters and support recovery of available Domain 3 points.

The next-interim planning targets in the scorecard show the scale of improvement needed: Mathematics Growth requires +28 percentage points for All Students, +32 for Hispanic students, and +30 for High Focus students; Mathematics Achievement requires +23, +21, and +20 points respectively. These are planning targets labeled in the scorecard as 2027 next-interim goals; they will guide campus milestones rather than be treated as guaranteed TEA accountability point awards.

Describe how progress on the identified indicators will be monitored throughout implementation of the improvement plan.

**Quarterly Progress Toward Goals (PTG) Meetings:** The district will review progress toward CSI exit, domain outcomes, interim assessments, growth projections, ELP progress, and Student Success, disaggregated by subgroup. Each meeting will identify which indicators are improving, which remain below target, and the instructional or operational changes required. Leaders will document owners, deadlines, and evidence of impact.

**Monthly Leadership Progress-Monitoring Meetings:** District Coordinators of School Improvement (DCSIs), principals, and the Vice President of Schools will review implementation

fidelity and student results. Special emphasis will be placed on the recurring Math Growth misses for Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, and EB students and on 2026 gaps in Mathematics Achievement and Growth. The team will inspect intervention rosters, reteach effectiveness, teacher coaching follow-through, and subgroup trends, then assign time-bound corrective actions.

**Monthly School Report Cards:** Each report card will show the three accountability domains, Domain 3 indicator-level results, RLA and Math Achievement and Growth by student group, ELP and Student Success, current performance, TEA target, point gap, month-over-month movement, and a red/amber/green status. Leaders will monitor progress toward the next-interim planning targets and identify classrooms or groups requiring intensified support.

**Twice-Monthly School Status Boost Ratings:** Principals will rate priority teacher practices based on observations and student learning evidence, provide actionable feedback, and verify coaching to mastery through follow-up. Coaching will prioritize mathematics task rigor, checks for understanding, student discourse, responsive reteaching, and EB language supports in classrooms with the largest subgroup gaps.

**Monthly ESF-Aligned Quick Checks:** The Vice President of Schools and Vice President of School Improvement will complete at least one monthly principal quick check focused on PLCs, ILTs, instructional rounds, SWAMs/student-work analysis, or lesson-plan internalization. Each check will evaluate both mechanism quality and its connection to student mastery and growth. Findings will determine principal coaching and district support.

**Weekly Analysis and Instructional Response:** PLCs and ILTs will use exit tickets, student work, and assessment evidence to identify the mistake, misconception, and instructional action. Each response will specify the students, reteach approach, responsible adult, delivery date, and reassessment date. Leaders will inspect whether reassessment data demonstrate improvement and escalate unresolved gaps to monthly monitoring meetings.

**CSI Exit Monitoring:** Each quarterly and monthly review will include the campus Closing the Gaps scaled score trajectory relative to the applicable school-type bottom-five-percent cutoff. TEA requires two consecutive years outside the bottom five percent and a Closing the Gaps scaled score higher than the original identification score (59) by the end of the second year. The campus will track both conditions; annual cutoffs may change.

## Additional Info

---

Please share any additional information about your strategy that was not included in the prior sections. You may also upload documents. (Optional)

—