Quinlan Independent School District

Ford High School

2025-2026 Campus Improvement Plan

Accountability Rating: C

Distinction Designation
Top 25 Percent: Comparative Academic Growth

Board Approval Date: September 15, 2025
Public Presentation Date: September 15, 2025

Mission Statement

The mission of the Quinlan Independent School District is to ensure that all children have access to a quality education that enables them to achieve their full potential and fully participate now and in the future in the social, economic, and educational opportunities of our state and nation.

Vision

To continue to build a true learning culture with academic rigor, strong discipline, competitiveness, and respect for others that yields positive student achievement and encourages progressive, entrepreneurial, innovative and creative thinking.,

To develop and prepare student leaders academically, vocationally, emotionally, and socially to take advantage of the opportunities and challenges of a 21st century world thorough authentic, engaging, interactive and progressive instruction.

To maintain long-term financial solvency and to pursue financial equity for all Texas children.

To develop early literacy partnerships with parents and community.

To promote a college and career readiness culture.

To foster increased parent and community involvement.

To continue to emerge as a lighthouse district worthy of emulation for all stakeholders.

Value Statement

The QISD Leadership Team believes that all students can succeed and communicate at the highest levels. We believe our students deserve a world class education. We believe great things are possible in QISD.

The QISD Leadership Team will earn and foster the public trust.

The QISD Leadership Team will be unified and committed to high expectations and accountability for all stakeholders, including ourselves.

The QISD Leadership Team will expect rigor, relevance and relationships in education.

The QISD Leadership Team will make decisions that are student centered and utilize a data driven, results oriented approach to instruction.

The QISD Leadership Team will exhibit honor, courage and commitment in all actions and decisions.

The QISD Leadership Team will make the tough/right decisions whether they are popular or not. Our students, community and staff deserve no less. The QISD

Leadership Team will treat all stakeholders with dignity and respect, using active listening skills and will follow up with prompt, effective communication.

Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

Demographics

W.H. Ford High School (FHS) is a rural 4A campus that serves approximately 800 students across a broad geographic area that includes Quinlan, West Tawakoni, parts of Royse City, and portions of Terrell ISD. Our student population is 47% female and 53% male. Demographically, FHS serves a diverse body of learners: 24% Emergent Bilingual (EB), 16% Special Education (SPED), 63% At-Risk, and 64% Economically Disadvantaged. Ethnic composition is comprised of 51% White and 46% Hispanic students, with the remaining percentage representing other groups.

Attendance and Graduation

Over the past three to five years, student attendance has consistently averaged 94%. Despite the challenges associated with mobility and at-risk indicators, FHS has maintained a

strong graduation rate of 98%. This success is attributed to intentional efforts in monitoring student progress, aligning credits, and implementing individualized support options such as credit recovery and the PRIDE program.

Discipline

Disciplinary data continues to highlight an area of focus for improvement. In the 2024–2025 school year, FHS recorded 315 student removals, accounting for 42% of the district's total. The majority of incidents resulted in ISS or OSS placements, with underclassmen most significantly represented. Specifically, 9th grade students accounted for 50% of removals, while 10th grade students represented 31%, meaning 81% of disciplinary actions involved underclassmen. These trends have informed campus-level discussions regarding the master schedule, class sizes, and strategies for increasing student engagement through more interactive and structured learning environments.

College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR)

FHS offers multiple tracks for CCMR completion and has expanded opportunities through its partnership with Paris Junior College (PJC). Programs in HVAC, Electrical, and Airplane Mechanics provide direct workforce pathways for students. For the Class of 2025, 78% earned at least one CCMR point due to increased emphasis on TSIA testing, the College Bridge program at PRIDE, and targeted support through Career and Technical Education (CTE) tracks. For the 2025–2026 school year, 92 students are being transported to PJC daily, while 24% of seniors and 26% of juniors are enrolled in advanced education opportunities through PJC programs or embedded dual-credit offerings on campus.

Staffing Stability

Through intentional recruitment and retention practices—including alignment of teacher selection to campus needs, utilization of the Teacher Incentive Allotment (TIA), and the benefits of the district's four-day instructional week—FHS continues to experience low staff turnover. Entering the 2025–2026 school year, only five teaching positions required replacement, with four of those due to retirement. This marks the third consecutive year of low turnover, resulting in consistent instructional staff and stability for students.

Implications for Improvement

The demographic realities of FHS provide both opportunities and challenges that will guide our campus improvement efforts for 2025–2026. Continued focus will be placed on improving daily attendance and reducing the discipline rate among underclassmen through proactive interventions, engaging instruction, and adjustments to the master schedule. Efforts will also be made to expand CCMR participation beyond the current levels by deepening partnerships with PJC and strengthening CTE pathways. Finally, maintaining teacher stability and leveraging the expertise of experienced staff will be essential for sustaining academic growth, supporting diverse learners, and ensuring equitable access to high-quality instruction for all students.

Demographics Strengths

Strengths

W.H. Ford High School demonstrates several notable strengths that provide a strong foundation for continued growth. Our consistent 98% graduation rate highlights the effectiveness of targeted interventions such as credit recovery and the PRIDE program. Strong partnerships with Paris Junior College have expanded CCMR opportunities, with nearly 25% of juniors and seniors engaged in advanced coursework or workforce certifications, preparing students for postsecondary success. Teacher retention remains a significant asset, as FHS has experienced low turnover for three consecutive years, allowing for instructional consistency and stability. Additionally, the dedication of staff to individualized student support has ensured that diverse learners, including Emergent Bilingual and Special Education students, have access to pathways for academic success and graduation readiness.

Problem Statements Identifying Demographics Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator.
Root Cause: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Student Learning

Student Learning Summary

Student Learning Summary

During the 2025–2026 school year, Ford High School increased its overall A–F rating from a 73 to a 74. The campus has earned recognition through Distinction Designations, including Top 25% in Growth Performance (2025) and Science Achievement (2024). College, Career, and Military Readiness (CCMR) indicators also continue to improve, with 78% of the Class of 2025 earning a CCMR point. In addition, FHS awarded multiple Industry-Based Certifications through its CTE programs, and 21 students graduated with an Associate's Degree prior to receiving their high school diploma.

In 2024–2025, the campus earned a scaled score of 45 in the Student Achievement domain, which has remained unchanged for four consecutive years. A primary factor limiting growth is the performance of students who require retesting, particularly in English I and English II. More than 80% of re-testers were identified as Emergent Bilingual, highlighting a specific need to strengthen instructional support for this population. Increasing the percentage of students who meet or master grade-level expectations remains a central priority, especially as the campus seeks to improve Closing the Gaps performance measures.

Algebra I results also reflect both strengths and challenges. In 2024–2025, 81% of Algebra I students demonstrated growth, yet the lack of students scoring at the Meets and Masters

levels reduced the number of points the campus could earn in that domain. Similarly, Ford High School did not meet cut points for the EB/EL Success Rate. The requirement for students to pass both TELPAS and the first administration of STAAR English I and II was set at 34%, while FHS achieved only 23%. With the EB/EL population increasing from 136 students in 2023 to more than 240 students in 2025, this represents a significant area for improvement.

Looking ahead, the campus will focus on extending learning opportunities and exposing students to rigorous objectives in order to raise performance at the Meets and Masters levels. By prioritizing support for EB/EL students, enhancing literacy instruction, and strategically addressing Algebra I achievement, FHS will continue to build on its progress while working to increase overall academic performance.

Student Learning Strengths

Strengths in Student Learning

Ford High School has demonstrated clear strengths in several areas of student learning. The campus has maintained strong CCMR outcomes, with 78% of the Class of 2025 earning a CCMR point and 21 students graduating with an Associate's Degree prior to high school graduation. Growth in Algebra I reached 81%, reflecting effective instruction and progress toward higher achievement levels. FHS students also continue to earn Industry-Based Certifications across multiple CTE pathways, expanding their postsecondary readiness. Distinction Designations in both Growth Performance and Science Achievement further highlight the campus's commitment to continuous improvement and the ability of students to perform at high levels when provided with targeted support.

Problem Statements Identifying Student Learning Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain.
Root Cause: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits

their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.
Root Cause: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

School Processes & Programs Summary

Ford High School maintains a comprehensive professional development program designed to meet the specific needs of teachers and to build instructional capacity across the campus. Professional development is aligned with T-TESS processes, including goal setting, student learning objective development, and continuous monitoring. Regular observations and feedback cycles ensure that professional growth remains ongoing and targeted. The Teacher Incentive Allotment has further motivated teachers to refine their instructional practices, connecting teacher development directly to improved student outcomes.

The campus also demonstrates a strong commitment to transformational leadership through the use of leadership teams that engage in shared decision-making. This collaborative

approach has positively influenced campus culture, reduced teacher turnover, and ensured that classroom voices are represented in problem-solving processes. Open lines of communication among faculty, staff, and administration have created a culture of trust and collective ownership for student success.

In addition, Ford High School offers a wide range of high-quality student programs that enrich learning and strengthen community connections. The Fine Arts department has earned recognition at both state and national levels through outstanding band, theater, and visual arts programs. Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathways continue to expand social capital for students through strong partnerships with local businesses and organizations, including Hunt Regional Hospital for Health Science, as well as real estate collaborations with lending and title offices. These programs provide authentic, real-world learning experiences that prepare students for postsecondary success. Athletics also serve as a cornerstone of the school community, fostering teamwork, perseverance, and citizenship while consistently earning respect for both performance and character.

School Processes & Programs Strengths

Ford High School demonstrates notable strengths in professional development, leadership, and student programming. The alignment of PD with T-TESS and the Teacher Incentive Allotment has created a culture of continuous instructional growth. Collaborative leadership teams and open communication have strengthened campus culture while maintaining low teacher turnover. Student programs in Fine Arts, CTE, and Athletics continue to provide high-quality opportunities, with strong community partnerships and statewide recognition that expand both academic and social capital for students.

Problem Statements Identifying School Processes & Programs Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path
Root Cause: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Perceptions

Perceptions Summary

Quinlan ISD, and specifically Ford High School, has experienced significant growth in community perceptions due to intentional efforts to expand student opportunities. Partnerships with Paris Junior College, an expanding range of CTE programs, strong Fine Arts, and competitive athletic programs have enhanced the district’s reputation and attracted both students and highly qualified educators. Collaborations with local businesses and colleges have strengthened events such as career and college fairs, providing students with greater exposure to postsecondary options. The addition of a Student Success Advisor has further supported students in connecting with pathways after graduation, contributing to efforts aimed at breaking cycles of generational poverty within the community.

Perceptions Strengths

Ford High School is recognized as a campus that actively builds strong relationships with students, families, and the broader community. Partnerships with Paris Junior College, local businesses, and community organizations have enhanced opportunities for students, while programs in CTE, Fine Arts, and Athletics have elevated the school's reputation. The addition of a Student Success Advisor has further strengthened postsecondary readiness and reinforced community confidence in the school's ability to prepare students for success beyond graduation.

Problem Statements Identifying Perceptions Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): While Ford High School has improved community perceptions through expanded programs and partnerships, challenges remain in ensuring consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholder groups. Not all families and students are fully aware of the breadth of opportunities available, which limits the campus's ability to maximize participation and strengthen community trust across populations.
Root Cause: Although Ford High School has expanded programs and strengthened partnerships, systems for communicating opportunities and engaging all stakeholder groups are not fully developed or consistently implemented. This results in uneven awareness of available programs and limits broader community participation.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator.

Root Cause 1: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Demographics

Problem Statement 2: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain.

Root Cause 2: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 3: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Root Cause 3: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Learning

Problem Statement 4: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path

Root Cause 4: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 5: While Ford High School has improved community perceptions through expanded programs and partnerships, challenges remain in ensuring consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholder groups. Not all families and students are fully aware of the breadth of opportunities available, which limits the campus's ability to maximize participation and strengthen community trust across populations.

Root Cause 5: Although Ford High School has expanded programs and strengthened partnerships, systems for communicating opportunities and engaging all stakeholder groups are not fully developed or consistently implemented. This results in uneven awareness of available programs and limits broader community participation. Ford High School

Problem Statement 5 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

Student Achievement Domain
Student Progress Domain
Closing the Gaps Domain
Effective Schools Framework data
Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
Accountability Distinction Designations
Federal Report Card and accountability data

Goals

Goal 1: The percent of students that score meets grade level or above on STAAR Reading will increase from 40% to 50% by June 2026.

Performance Objective 1: The percent of students that score meets grade level or above on Eng I and Eng II will increase to at least 50% by June 2026

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: CLI

Strategy 1 Details Reviews

Strategy 1: Two TIA-designated teachers have been assigned to teach Reading I and II remedial courses, with student placement determined by prior assessment data and identified needs. These teachers actively participate in the ELA department PLC to collaboratively design lessons and interventions that are targeted, relevant, and responsive to individual student learning gaps.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: The goal is to reduce the English I and English II retest number of students by 50% by the December administration, and then another 25% after the spring administration.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Principal, instructional coach, and ELA teachers in Reading I and II.

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math
- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 Ford High School

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

Strategy 2: ELA teachers will implement Questioning Sequences as a core instructional strategy to strengthen student engagement and critical thinking. Instruction will scaffold from detail-level questions to categorization, elaboration, and evidence-based responses, enabling students to make deeper connections between reading and writing.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, 50% of students required to retest in English I and English II will achieve a passing score. In addition, the percentage of students meeting grade-level standards will increase to 50% for all students, 43% for the High Focus group, 62% for White students, and 37% for Hispanic students. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administration, district level curriculum, instructional coaches, ELA teachers.

Strategy 2 Details Reviews

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator. **Root Cause**: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally,

program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Goal 2: The percent of students that score meets grade level or above on STAAR Math will increase from 23% to 33% by June 2026.

Performance Objective 1: The percent of students that score meets grade level or above on Alg I will increase to 33% by June 2026

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Circle Assessments

Strategy 1 Details **Reviews**

Strategy 1: To increase the number of students performing at the Meets and Masters levels in Algebra I, Ford High School will intentionally extend learning opportunities for high-achieving students. Instructional planning will incorporate extension activities that utilize questioning sequences aligned with Lead4Ward strategies and emphasize real-world, engaging content designed to promote deeper levels of understanding.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, Ford High School will increase the percentage of Algebra I students achieving the Meets Grade Level standard as follows: all students from 27% to 38%, the High Focus group from 23% to 31%, the White student group from 29% to 40%, and the Hispanic student group from 23% to 35%. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus administration, curriculum department, math teachers

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator. **Root Cause**: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Goal 3: The percentage of graduates that meet the criteria for CCMR will increase from 66% to 76% by August 2026.

Performance Objective 1: The percentage of graduates meeting TSI passing criteria in Math will increase from 30% to 35 % by August 2026.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: TSI

Strategy 1 Details **Reviews**

Strategy 1: Ford High School will embed intentional TSIA remediation within English and Math classrooms to support college readiness. Students who do not meet passing standards will receive targeted interventions, and monthly on-campus testing opportunities will be scheduled to provide ongoing access for retesting and progress monitoring.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By August 2026, 35% of Ford High School students will meet TSIA benchmarks in English and Math through targeted remediation and expanded testing opportunities. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administration, guidance counselors, classroom teachers in Math and English, Student Success Advisor, District Curriculum

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers

in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Goal 3: The percentage of graduates that meet the criteria for CCMR will increase from 66% to 76% by August 2026.

Performance Objective 2: The percentage of students graduating college-ready will increase from 30% to 35% by August 2026.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Closing the Gaps Student Groups Yearly Targets

Strategy 1 Details **Reviews**

Strategy 1: Ford High School will implement a college-readiness framework that integrates targeted academic interventions with structured preparation for TSIA, SAT, and ACT assessments. Core content teachers in English, Math, Science, and Social Studies will embed college-level questioning strategies, real-world problem-solving tasks, and

writing across the curriculum to strengthen higher-order thinking skills. Designated intervention periods will provide small-group support for students identified as not yet meeting readiness standards, with instructional materials aligned to TSIA benchmarks. Collaboration between classroom teachers, the Student Success Advisor, and CTE staff will ensure that students are not only academically prepared but also connected to postsecondary pathways that align with their strengths. Progress will be monitored through quarterly assessments, with instructional adjustments made to close learning gaps and ensure that the percentage of graduates deemed college-ready increases from 30% to 35% by August 2026.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By August 2026, the percentage of Ford High School graduates meeting college readiness standards will increase from 30% to 35%. This will be demonstrated through higher pass rates on TSIA, SAT, and ACT benchmarks, with progress monitored through quarterly assessments and targeted interventions in English and Math.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, curriculum department, Student Success Advisor, Guidance Counselor, teachers in Math and English

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

No Progress Accomplished Continue/Modify Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has improved community perceptions through expanded programs and partnerships, challenges remain in ensuring consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholder groups. Not all families and students are fully aware of the breadth of opportunities available, which limits the campus's ability to maximize participation and strengthen community trust across populations. **Root Cause**: Although Ford High School has expanded programs and strengthened partnerships, systems for communicating opportunities and engaging all stakeholder groups are not fully developed or consistently implemented. This results in uneven awareness of available programs and limits broader community participation.

Goal 3: The percentage of graduates that meet the criteria for CCMR will increase from 66% to 76% by August 2026.

Performance Objective 3: The percentage of students graduating career or military ready will increase from 50% to 76% by August 2026.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Closing the Gaps Student Groups Yearly Targets

Strategy 1: Ford High School will expand career and military readiness opportunities through targeted growth in CTE pathways, Industry-Based Certifications (IBCs), dual credit programs, and military enlistment supports. Teachers in CTE and core content areas will align instruction to workforce skills and certification standards, while campus leaders will increase access to embedded dual credit and workforce training programs in partnership with Paris Junior College and local industries. The Student Success Advisor will collaborate with military recruiters and workforce partners to connect students with viable postsecondary pathways. Progress will be monitored through CCMR tracking systems to ensure that by August 2026, the percentage of students graduating career or military ready increases from 50% to 76%.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By August 2026, the percentage of Ford High School graduates identified as career or military ready will increase from 50% to 76%. This will be achieved through measurable outcomes including:

An increase in the number of students earning Industry-Based Certifications (IBCs) across CTE pathways. Growth in dual credit course completion through Paris Junior College partnerships.

Expanded student participation in workforce training programs.

Increased numbers of students enlisting in the military, supported by ongoing collaboration with recruiters.

Strategy 1 Details Reviews

Students in CTE classes will be continually monitored to ensure they are achieving "completer" status through Career Craft.

Students who are not able to obtain CCMR points through traditional routes will be enrolled in College Prep courses to provide additional opportunities for meeting readiness standards.

Progress will be tracked quarterly using CCMR data reports to ensure steady advancement toward the 76% target. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administration, Curriculum, Counselors, SSA, CTE teachers, PRIDE Academy

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 - Perceptions 1 Ford High School

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

☐ No Progress ☐ Accomplished ☐ Continue/Modify ☐ Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has improved community perceptions through expanded programs and partnerships, challenges remain in ensuring consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholder groups. Not all families and students are fully aware of the breadth of opportunities available, which limits the campus's ability to maximize participation and strengthen community trust across populations. **Root Cause**: Although Ford High School has expanded programs and strengthened partnerships, systems for communicating opportunities and engaging all stakeholder groups are not fully developed or consistently implemented. This results in uneven awareness of available programs and limits broader community participation.

Goal 4: Each campus will increase its academic growth domain component score to a 75 (scaled to B) as evidenced by the 2026 accountability ratings.

Performance Objective 1: Every English learner will increase his/her English proficiency rating by at least one level this school year.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 2026 TELPAS scores

Strategy 1 Details **Reviews**

Strategy 1: To ensure every English learner increases his or her English proficiency rating by at least one level during the school year, teachers will implement Questioning Sequences as a scaffolded instructional approach. Students will engage in a progression of questions moving from detail to category, elaboration, and evidence, allowing them to strengthen both reading and writing skills. This process will intentionally embed the development and application of academic vocabulary, enabling English learners to build capacity and confidence in navigating complex texts and written responses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, at least 34% of English learners at Ford High School will advance by one proficiency level on TELPAS, demonstrating growth in academic vocabulary, reading comprehension, and written expression through the consistent use of scaffolded Questioning Sequences in classroom instruction. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administration, Kathleen Witte, ELDA teacher and paraprofessionals on campus.

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 Ford High School

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

Strategy 2: Ford High School will implement ELDA classes with hand-selected students to provide targeted support in language development. Instruction will emphasize integrated processes for reading, speaking, and writing, allowing English learners to strengthen foundational skills while progressing toward academic proficiency.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, at least 34% of English learners enrolled in ELDA classes will advance by one proficiency level on TELPAS, demonstrating measurable growth in reading, speaking, and writing through structured language development instruction.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, Kathleen Witte, ELDA teacher and paraprofessionals

Strategy 2 Details Reviews

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

Strategy 3: Ford High School will utilize the EB/EL paraprofessional to provide targeted small-group instruction that exposes students to the content and skills needed for success on TELPAS. Instruction will incorporate curriculum resources from the Summit program, allowing students to work at their own pace while receiving guided support and supervision to address individual strengths and weaknesses.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, at least 34% of English learners receiving small-group support from the EB/EL paraprofessional will advance by one proficiency level on TELPAS, demonstrating growth through targeted instruction and the strategic use of Summit curriculum resources.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, Kathleen Witte, ELDA teacher and paraprofessionals **Problem Statements:** Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

Strategy 3 Details Reviews

☐ No Progress ☐ Accomplished ☐ Continue/Modify ☐ Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator. **Root Cause**: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Goal 4: Each campus will increase its academic growth domain component score to a 75 (scaled to B) as evidenced by the 2026 accountability ratings.

Performance Objective 2: Campuses will improve Closing the Gaps by meeting the 26-27 Interim Targets.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Closing the Gaps data 2026

Strategy 1 Details Reviews

Strategy 1: Teachers in English I, English II, and Algebra I will implement Questioning Sequences to guide students through progressive levels of critical thinking. Instruction will scaffold from detail level questions to elaboration and evidence based responses, culminating in real-world extension activities that deepen understanding. This approach is
designed to strengthen student engagement and increase the number of students achieving at the Meets Grade Level standard in English and Math.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, the percentage of students achieving the Meets Grade Level standard will increase as follows:

English I and II combined: 50% of students will meet grade-level expectations, with at least 50% of retesters passing. Algebra I: All students will increase from

27% to 38% at the Meets level.

High Focus group will increase from 23% to 31%.

White student group will increase from 29% to 40%.

Hispanic student group will increase from 23% to 35%.

Progress will be monitored through formative assessments, benchmark testing, and PLC data reviews to ensure alignment with campus accountability goals.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, teachers in English and Math, curriculum, instructional coaches

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools
- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 Ford High School

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

Strategy 2: Ford High School will strengthen English Language Proficiency by combining the implementation of ELDA classes with the strategic utilization of the EB/EL paraprofessional to provide targeted small-group remediation. Students will engage with the Summit program to address individual strengths and weaknesses while receiving guided support. This dual approach is designed to increase the number of EB students demonstrating sufficient growth to exit services through TELPAS or ITBS testing in the spring.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, at least 34% of English learners will advance by one proficiency level, and the number of students exiting EB status through TELPAS or ITBS will increase compared to the prior school year. Progress will be measured using TELPAS results, ITBS testing data, and interim checkpoints through Summit program reports.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, Kathleen Witte, ELDA teacher and paraprofessional, District Level Curriculum

Strategy 2 Details Reviews

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

☐ No Progress ☐ Accomplished ☐ Continue/Modify ☐ Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator. **Root Cause**: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient

academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Goal 4: Each campus will increase its academic growth domain component score to a 75 (scaled to B) as evidenced by the 2026 accountability ratings.

Performance Objective 3: By May 2026, 76% of Ford High School students enrolled in English I, English II, and Algebra I will demonstrate academic growth as measured by STAAR assessment results.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: CUA data, benchmark tests, Lead4Ward Growth Matrix, STAAR tests in English I, English II and Algebra I

Strategy 1 Details Reviews

Strategy 1: To ensure that 76% of students in English I, English II, and Algebra I demonstrate growth on STAAR assessments, teachers will implement targeted instructional practices that emphasize Questioning Sequences, scaffolded literacy and numeracy supports, and real-world application of concepts. PLCs will be used to analyze student data, adjust lesson planning, and identify students in need of intervention or enrichment. Targeted small-group instruction and reteach opportunities will be embedded within classrooms via the utilization of co-teachers, while benchmark and formative assessments will guide ongoing instructional adjustments to maximize growth outcomes.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, students in English I, English II, and Algebra I will demonstrate academic growth on STAAR

assessments, meeting or exceeding the following targets:

English Growth Rate

All Students: 74%

High Focus Group: 72%

White Students: 77%

Hispanic Students: 72%

Math Growth Rate

All Students: 81%

High Focus Group: 81%

White Students: 84%

Hispanic Students: 80%

Progress will be monitored through formative assessments, district benchmarks, and PLC data reviews to ensure alignment with campus accountability goals
Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, Eng I/II teachers and Alg I teachers. Curriculum, Testing Coordinator, Instructional Coach

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math
- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction
Problem Statements: Demographics 1 - Student Learning 1, 2 - School Processes & Programs 1 Ford High School

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

☐ No Progress ☐ Accomplished ☐ Continue/Modify ☐ Discontinue

Performance Objective 3 Problem Statements:

Demographics

Problem Statement 1: At FHS our demographic numbers are changing, and as a result we are noticing an upward climb of students who are needing services through EB/EL programs to help them be successful on campus. In prior years, we have had one paraprofessional on campus to help service students, but that has become unrealistic to obtain success, specifically in our closing the gaps domain of our ELP status indicator. **Root Cause**: With a rapid increase of students and funding that has been tight from the State level, and coupled with trouble finding teachers who are qualified to help our students, we have struggled to adequately remediate students in our EB/EL population, specifically our new English Learners.

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

School Processes & Programs

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has strong professional development structures and community-based student programs, gaps remain in ensuring that all instructional practices consistently translate into improved student outcomes, particularly for targeted populations such as Emergent Bilingual and at-risk students. Additionally, program access and alignment across academic, fine arts, CTE, and athletic path **Root Cause**: Although professional development, leadership structures, and student programs are well established, there is not yet consistent alignment between training, classroom implementation, and measurable student achievement. In particular, instructional practices and program supports are suffering many times from the proverbial "knowing-doing" gap.

Goal 5: Attendance-QISD will increase the amount of time during which students are engaged in successful and productive learning to 96% as evidenced by 2025-2026 PEIMS data.

Performance Objective 1: Maintain a district attendance rate of 96% for the 2025-2026 school year

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: PEIMS data reports

Strategy 1 Details **Reviews**

Formative **Summative** **Nov** **Feb** **Apr** **June**

Strategy 1: Ford High School will restructure campus personnel responsibilities to ensure a streamlined focus on attendance. Attendance clerks, front office staff, and administrators will collaborate in a coordinated system for daily monitoring, parent contact, and intervention for students with excessive absences. This approach will improve efficiency, strengthen communication with families, and ensure that attendance concerns are addressed promptly.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, Ford High School will achieve a campus-wide attendance rate of 96%. In addition, the percentage of students identified as chronically absent (missing 10% or more instructional days) will decrease by at least 5% compared to the previous school year. Progress will be monitored monthly through attendance reports, with adjustments made to interventions and incentives as needed.

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, Attendance personnel, District Truancy Prevention

ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Student Learning 1, 2 - Perceptions 1

Strategy 2: Ford High School will implement an attendance incentive program to recognize and reward students with high attendance rates. Incentives such as certificates, public recognition, privileges, and tangible awards will be provided at regular intervals throughout the year. This program will encourage students to prioritize consistent attendance while promoting a positive campus culture that values and celebrates commitment to learning.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, Ford High School will achieve a campus-wide attendance rate of 96%. In addition, the percentage of students identified as chronically absent (missing 10% or more instructional days) will decrease by at least 5% compared to the previous school year. Progress will be monitored monthly through attendance reports, with adjustments made to interventions and incentives as needed.

Strategy 2 Details Reviews

Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Campus administration, attendance personnel, District Truancy prevention

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture **Problem Statements:** Student Learning 1, 2 - Perceptions 1
Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

☐ No Progress ☐ Accomplished ☐ Continue/Modify ☐ Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Learning

Problem Statement 1: Although student learning demonstrated improvement with a growth score of 71 in 2024-2025, performance in Algebra I remains below expectations, particularly at the Meets and Masters levels. This gap contributes to lower outcomes in the Closing the Gaps domain, as students are not consistently meeting accountability markers in the Academic Achievement domain. **Root Cause**: A significant number of students, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, lack consistent mastery of foundational literacy and numeracy skills. This limits their ability to perform at the Meets and Masters levels on Algebra I and English I/II assessments, resulting in missed accountability markers in the Academic Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains.

Problem Statement 2: Despite overall campus growth, performance among English I and English II re-testers remains a significant area of concern. In 2024-2025, more than 80% of students who required retesting were identified as Emergent Bilingual, and their low success rates on first-time STAAR administrations have directly limited progress in the Student Achievement and Closing the Gaps domains. **Root Cause**: English I and English II retesters, particularly those identified as Emergent Bilingual, often lack sufficient academic language proficiency and targeted instructional support to demonstrate success on STAAR assessments. Limited alignment between TELPAS performance, classroom instruction, and STAAR readiness contributes to persistent underperformance on initial and subsequent test administrations.

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has improved community perceptions through expanded programs and partnerships, challenges remain in ensuring consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholder groups. Not all families and students are fully aware of the breadth of opportunities available, which limits the campus's ability to maximize participation and strengthen community trust across populations. **Root Cause**: Although Ford High School has expanded programs and strengthened partnerships, systems for communicating opportunities and engaging all stakeholder groups are not fully developed or consistently implemented. This results in uneven awareness of available programs and limits broader community participation.

Goal 5: Attendance-QISD will increase the amount of time during which students are engaged in successful and productive learning to 96% as evidenced by 2025-2026 PEIMS data.

Performance Objective 2: QISD will improve/maintain the graduation rate to at least 97%

Evaluation Data Sources: PEIMS Data

Strategy 1: Ford High School will strengthen individualized graduation planning by closely monitoring student credits, assessment requirements, and postsecondary readiness indicators. Counselors, administrators, and the Student Success Advisor will collaborate with students and families to ensure timely interventions, consistent communication, and targeted support for those at risk of not graduating on schedule.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, Ford High School will maintain a graduation rate of at least 97%. All seniors identified as at risk of not graduating will be supported through individualized graduation planning, PRIDE Academy, or credit recovery interventions to ensure timely completion of high school requirements. **Staff Responsible for Monitoring:** Campus Administration, Campus Counselors, SSA, Pride Academy Director

TEA Priorities:
Build a foundation of reading and math, Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools - **ESF Levers:**
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 4: High-Quality Instructional Materials and Assessments, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Strategy 1 Details Reviews

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

Strategy 2: Ford High School will expand the use of PRIDE Academy and credit recovery programs to support students who have fallen behind. Students will be provided with flexible pathways to regain credits through online platforms, teacher-led instruction, and extended learning opportunities. This intentional focus will allow at-risk students to remain on track for graduation while receiving academic and support tailored to their needs.

Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: By May 2026, Ford High School will maintain a graduation rate of at least 97%. All seniors identified as at risk of not graduating will be supported through individualized graduation planning, PRIDE Academy, or credit recovery interventions to ensure timely completion of high school requirements. **Staff**

Strategy 2 Details Reviews

Responsible for Monitoring: Campus Administration, Pride Academy Director, SSA, Campus Counselors

TEA Priorities:
Connect high school to career and college, Improve low-performing schools

- ESF Levers:
Lever 1: Strong School Leadership and Planning, Lever 2: Strategic Staffing, Lever 3: Positive School Culture, Lever 5: Effective Instruction

Problem Statements: Perceptions 1

Formative Summative Nov Feb Apr June

☐ No Progress ☐ Accomplished ☐ Continue/Modify ☐ Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Perceptions

Problem Statement 1: While Ford High School has improved community perceptions through expanded programs and partnerships, challenges remain in ensuring consistent communication and engagement with all stakeholder groups. Not all families and students are fully aware of the breadth of opportunities available, which limits the campus's ability to maximize participation and strengthen community trust across populations. **Root Cause**: Although Ford High School has expanded programs and strengthened partnerships, systems for communicating opportunities and engaging all stakeholder groups are not fully developed or consistently implemented. This results in uneven awareness of available programs and limits broader community participation.

Site Based Decision Making Committee

Committee Role Name Position

Campus Teacher Stacey Wallen Teacher

District Level Administration Gary Pamplin Truancy Prevention Director Special Education Teacher Ashley King Special Education Teacher Special Education Teacher Jenni Sandman Special Education Teacher Parent Representative Derrick Scott Parent

Parent Representative Danielle Hood Parent

District Level Administration Alice Lafferty Secondary Curriculum Community Business Nicholas Wallen Owner A Better Climate Campus Teacher Jody Delzell Campus Teacher Campus Teacher CTE Kara Harding CTE Teacher

Campus Teacher Lori Barber FHS Teacher

Campus Teacher Dr. Melisa Ward FHS Teacher

CTE Teacher J.R. Watson CTE Teacher

Instruction/Teacher Martin Filip Fine Arts Director Campus Administration Joli Maroney Campus Assistant Principal Campus Administration Josh Glosson Campus Assistant Principal Campus Counselor Kelly Jones Campus Counselor Campus Counselor Jeanette Rowland Campus Counselor

Campus Administration Dr. Jason Wallen Campus Principal

Policies, Procedures, and Requirements

The following policies, procedures, and requirements are addressed in the District Improvement Plan. District addressed Policies, Procedures, and Requirements will print with the Improvement Plan:

Title Person Responsible Review Date Addressed By Addressed On Coordinated Health Program Kara Clark 8/26/2025 Kara Clark 8/26/2025 Bullying Prevention Michael Tull 8/26/2025 Kathleen Witte 10/8/2024 Child Abuse and Neglect Sherry Reville 8/28/2025 Sherry Reville 10/8/2024 Decision-Making and Planning Policy Evaluation John Michael Milton 10/10/2024 John Michael Milton 10/10/2024 Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) Don Madden 8/28/2025 Kathleen Witte 10/15/2024 Dyslexia Treatment Program Natasha Wallace 9/8/2025 Kathleen Witte 10/15/2024 Pregnancy Related Services Dana Gibbs 8/28/2025 Dana Gibbs 8/28/2025 Post-Secondary Preparedness Alice Lafferty 8/26/2025 Alice Laferty 8/26/2025 Recruiting Teachers and Paraprofessionals Sherry Reville 8/28/2025 Sherry Reville 10/8/2024 Student Welfare: Crisis Intervention Programs and Training Jeanette Rowland 9/4/2025 Jeanette Rowland 10/14/2024 Student Welfare: Discipline/Conflict/Violence Management John Michael Milton 10/10/2024 John Michael Milton 10/10/2024 Texas Behavior Support Initiative (TBSI) Natasha Wallace 9/8/2025 Kathleen Witte 9/8/2025 Technology Integration Courtney

Addendums

1Instructional Focus at FHS
2025-2026 School Year

Top 5 Key Focal Points for the school year: (In no particular order) 1. Intentional cross-curricular planning, specifically at the 9th and 10th grade levels. Fewer items of study, but with more emphasis on Deeper Learning between content areas. (eg. detailed historical writing in Social Studies aligned with topics of study in ELAR, argumentative essays in English, based upon claims made through lab research in Biology, DNA probability in Biology with probability thinking in Alg I classes)

2. Targeted questioning strategies, based on the instructional model of *questioning sequences*, that blend knowledge-based and higher order thinking in order to establish a curriculum that is engaging and rich in rigor. Allowing teachers to move from ping-pong questioning, and only direct teach to utilizing methods for reflection, justification, analysis, and critical thinking through specific strategies of sequencing.

3. Utilization of PLC time to establish high-level, intentional cross-curricular planning, and planning of questioning sequences aligned with priority standards.

4. Building of teacher instructional capacity through the use of reflective practices, utilizing a phased-in, systematic approach to improving the art and science of teaching.

5. Continued building of CCMR metrics through Deeper Learning, and three phases of capital development in students. (Let Randy Magee and his classes be the example)

6. Continued use of our SSA to ensure graduates have a plan to continue on the PK-20 spectrum.

Campus needs when budget opens: These can come from campus budget 1. Purchase of a campus-wide program called JSTOR. For $780, the campus could purchase the entire access to JSTOR (the most sophisticated, and academically accepted form of peer-reviewed and scholarly journals for student research). This will aid in individual student research, as the program has access to over 2000 peer-reviewed academic journals in the areas of: Arts & Sciences, Life Sciences, Business IV collection, and all four Primary Source Collections.

2. Purchase of the text: *Questioning Sequences in the Classroom*, by Robert J. Marzano and Julia Simms. This text will be a major resource as we build the questioning sequences in our instructional planning as the year progresses.

Instructional Impact: T-TESS specific focus from the above points **Domain I: Planning engaging lessons through the use of Deeper Learning Concepts.** ● *1.1: Standards and Alignment:* deepen the understanding of broader unit and course objectives, providing relevant, and enriching extensions of the learning.

● *1.2: Data and Assessment*: formative assessment data to engage students in self-assessment. ● *1.3: Knowledge of Students:* lessons that connect prior knowledge, experiences, interests and future-learning expectations across content areas.

● 1.4: Activities: Opportunities for students to generate questions that lead to further inquiry and promote complex, higher-order thinking, problem-solving, and real-world application. **Domain II: Instruction…supporting all learners in their pursuit of high levels of academic success** ● 2.1: Achieving expectations: persists with the lesson until there is evidence that all students demonstrate mastery of the objective.

● 2.2: Content knowledge and expertise: integrates learning objectives with other disciplines, content areas, and real-world experiences. Consistently provides opportunities for student to use

different types of thinking. Sequencing instruction that allows students to understand how the lesson fits within the structure of the discipline, the state standards, related content, and within real-world applications.

● 2.3: Establishes classroom practices that encourage all students to communicate safely and effectively using a variety of tools and methods with the teacher and their peers. Uses possible student misunderstandings at strategic points in the lesson. Asks questions at the creative evaluative and/or analysis level that requires Deeper Learning and broader understanding of the unit objectives. Skillfully balances wait time, questioning techniques and integration of student responses. Skillfully provokes and guides discussion to pique curiosity and inspire student-led learning of

meaningful and challenging content.

● 2.4: Differentiation: consistently monitors the quality of student participation and performance. ● 2.5 Monitor and Adjust: systematically gathers input from students in order to monitor and adjust instruction, activities, or pacing to respond to differences in student needs. Adjust instructional methods and activities to maintain student engagement. Uses discrete and explicit checks for understanding through questioning and academic feedback.

Reasons behind this small area of focus:

● We must help teachers utilize strategic questioning sequencing that are aligned with priority standards to help increase academic performance and engagement of students. ● We must adopt an instructional practice/model that aligns with the four-day instructional week, and maximizes learning time for all students.

● We must increase student engagement, and deeper learning in the classroom to help students make connections to real-world applications so that there is a depth of understanding, as opposed to surface level.

● Too many times in classrooms, questioning is more of a ping pong game, aimed at few students, while the majority of students (especially our EB/EL, SPED/504 students) are either compliant and not learning, or bored and become disruptive.

○ ***This can be verified by discipline, attendance and EOC data.***

○ ***Of our failures on EOC, only 22.4% of our students were not under EB/EL, or SPED***

Where this will be accomplished:

● The main focal area will be in PLC times. As the instructional leader, I have to improve on strategically implementing the focal points of campus needs. This is based upon linear, real-campus data if we are to improve academic performance.

● Other areas will be Friday meeting times with team-leads as they are able to help with this, along with our Campus Leadership Team (which we will utilize more in the upcoming year) ● AP's must be a more involved participant in the process.

● Friday intentional time will be 1:00 pm - 2:00 pm.

● Teachers with PLC times at this juncture are: ***ELAR 6th*** (Delzell, Manross, Geiger, Waldrup, Ward, Wilbanks, upper level ELAR can focus on lesson development and TSIA/SAT development), ***Science 7th*** (Wallen, Mexia..Wallen can switch from time to time to go with ELAR as her conf and PLC time allow for it), ***Alg I 7th*** (Biggie and Wright, can also plan with Sci from time to time, labs, punnet squares, probability, etc), ***Other Math*** (8th Shepperd and Tam, focus on TSIA math, SAT), Social Studies (Lentz has 6th to be with ELAR)

● Friday intentional planning will be with: Lentz (SS Chair), Barber (Sci Chair), Tambourine (math chair) Ward (ELAR chair), and Sandman (SPED chair), Watson (CTE Chair), Filip (Fine Arts Director)

2

What The Research Says
RBIS (Secondary Approach)

The information below summarizes key research findings on the use of questioning strategies in classrooms, with a focus on Bloom's Taxonomy, the 2001 revision by Anderson et al., and pivotal studies by Dunking & Biddle (1974), Rosenshine (1976), Winne (1979), and Levin (1981). Much insight was also gleaned from the text "Questioning Strategies in the Classroom" Marzano & Simms

Bloom's Taxonomy Clarification (2001 Revision)

● Anderson and colleagues (2001) clarified that learning objectives do not dictate teaching methods.

● The taxonomy was never intended to classify instructional techniques (e.g., questioning, discussion).
● Focus is on student learning outcomes—not instructional delivery.

Dunkin & Biddle and Related Research (1974–1981)
1. Dunkin & Biddle (1974):
● Lower-order questions can be just as effective as higher-order ones for promoting understanding.
● Type of question alone does not guarantee improved achievement. Educators often overvalue higher-order processes without supporting evidence.
2. Barak Rosenshine (1976):
● Called for reevaluation of the bias toward higher-order questioning.
● Found that factual/lower-level questions can be effective if well-structured.
● Emphasized shifting focus to outcomes rather than assumed question value. 3. Philip Winne (1979):
● Reviewed 18 studies; found no clear link between question level and achievement. ● Found little difference in student performance based on question type.
● Lower-order questions are often positively related to student success.
4. Tamar Levin (1981):
● Expressed surprise that lower-order questions showed positive or neutral effects on achievement.
● Findings contradict common educator assumptions favoring higher-order questions.

Overall Insight
● Effectiveness of questioning is not solely determined by cognitive level.
● Well-planned lower-order questions can support learning effectively.
● There's a mismatch between educator assumptions and research evidence. ● Instructional decisions should be guided by evidence-based outcomes, not assumptions about question hierarchy.

Continuing Bias and Modern Understanding of Questioning

The Continuing Bias for Higher-Order Questions

● By the late 1980s, higher-order questioning was the most heavily investigated issue in questioning research, but skepticism persisted (Gall & Rhody, 1987).

● Critics noted that despite widespread belief, many principals and observers continued to expect more higher-order questions without strong supporting evidence (Wilen, 1987).
● Lists of questions tied to Bloom's taxonomy became standard in teacher training, often without citation of research.
● Dantonio & Beisenherz (2001) emphasized that years of studies show mixed or disillusioning results on the effect of question level on student achievement.
● ***The central debate persists:*** does the level of questioning matter more than how it is sequenced or used?

Where We Are Today

● Research since Sanders' 1966 work still shows no definitive answer about whether higher or lower order questions are more effective.
● Good & Brophy (2003) note that research has been mixed and uninformative about when and why different types of questions should be

used.
● ***The key insight:*** effective questioning depends more on planning thoughtful sequences than on simply choosing higher or lower cognitive levels.

"It is not true that higher-order or complex questions are always better than lower-order or simpler questions... Varying combinations of lower-order and higher-order questions will be needed, depending on the goals that a teacher is pursuing. Guidelines need to focus on sequences of questions designed to help students develop connected understandings, not just on the cognitive levels of individual questions considered in isolation from one another." (p. 378)

Emphasis on Questioning Sequences Over Individual Questions

● Past problems with classroom questioning often stemmed from an overemphasis on classifying individual questions (Ivan Hannel, 2009).
● Using Bloom's taxonomy to classify individual questions is considered ineffective without a broader pedagogy of questioning.
● The more effective approach: teachers should use a series of questions (questioning sequences) that build and deepen students' understanding of content.

Questioning Sequences

● Research since 2007 (e.g., Pashler et al.) has focused on questioning sequences rather than isolated questions.
● ***Sequences help students*** engage in deeper thinking, connecting facts, elaborating on ideas, and defending conclusions.
● Dantonio & Beisenherz (2001): ***Questioning sequences*** help students create, elaborate, and defend generalizations.
● Good & Brophy (2003): ***When sequences are planned with worthwhile*** instructional goals, cognitive-level issues take care of themselves.
● ***Sequences should include*** specific types of questions ordered to guide students through deeper thinking.

Translating Research and Theory Into Practice

● Drawing from Marzano (2007) and other sources, questioning sequences are defined as structured prompts that:
○ Ask students to articulate details about content

○ Identify characteristics of concepts
○ Generate elaborations
○ Provide evidence and support
This approach guides students through critical thinking, collecting info, categorizing,drawing conclusions, and supporting claims with evidence.

Detailed Components of Questioning Sequences

Based on the text, 'Questioning Sequences in the Classroom', effective questioning sequences help students navigate complex thinking processes. The sequence typically involves prompting students to engage with content through four key components: details, categories, elaboration, and evidence. Below is a summary of each component, including examples and research support.

1. Details

● ***Purpose:*** To prompt students to recall, observe, and articulate factual or descriptive information from content.
● ***Example:*** What do you notice about the way this character reacts in the story? ● ***Scholarly Insight:*** According to Marzano (2007), starting with

concrete details activates prior knowledge and prepares students to analyze more complex ideas.

2. Categories

● ***Purpose:*** To help students classify information into conceptual groups or themes. ● ***Example:*** Which of these events would you classify as causes versus effects? ● ***Scholarly Insight:*** Grouping information supports cognitive organization, aiding in retention and pattern recognition (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

3. Elaboration

● ***Purpose:*** To encourage students to go beyond the given information and extend their understanding by making connections.

● ***Example:*** How might this event have turned out differently if another decision was made? ● ***Scholarly Insight:*** Dantonio and Beisenherz (2001) emphasize that elaboration deepens comprehension by connecting new learning to existing knowledge structures.

4. Evidence

● Purpose: To require students to justify their thinking using textual, logical, or empirical support. ● Example: What information from the article supports your conclusion?

● Scholarly Insight: Asking for evidence strengthens critical thinking and argumentation skills, as noted by Good & Brophy (2003). It also aligns with academic expectations across content areas.

What This Looks Like

PLC Focus & Friday Planning

● Book study of two texts: Question Sequences in the classroom, and PLC's that work ● PLC structure: 2 days of planning, one day of reflective practices (see pg. 7, 1 day intentional focus on questioning sequences)

● Emphasis daily on questioning sequences, and how they build from detail, to category, to elaboration, and through evidence, coupled with navigating a structured, intentional reflective practice regimen.

● Goal will be providing teachers a framework of focus in an area that is heavily needed at FHS (questioning sequences, and reflective practices), to build efficacy in Cartesian critical thinking in both teachers and students.

● Further focus will be on utilizing the scholarly research bank to target instructional strategies that align with questioning sequences.

● More process oriented than goal oriented. We have to master the day to day, and be intentional about ***how question sequences are aligned with priority standards and aimed at developing independent research from students***, while helping students explore how objectives build upon one another, and how all activities align with the instructional philosophy of the campus. Then, campus administrators must work alongside

teachers to help build reflective practices aimed at improving instructional capacity.

● I believe that our teachers are doing a great job of delivering information, however, I still see a struggle with utilizing questioning sequences to add depth and rigor across the board, which is resulting in engagement issues. In theory, I believe that utilizing PLC times to work on cross-curricular work, coupled with development of questioning sequences, aligned with priority standards, and true, authentic reflective practices will move the academic needle.

Needs:

● AP's will have to be trained and collaboration must occur to ensure this is inserted campus-wide. ● We will need the focus on the FHS instructional coach to be on questioning sequences in the classroom.

● This will be our own form of RBIS, since the state has nothing for High Schools at this time. ● We will need the above resources (book & JSTOR) to get started.

Links Below

● **Options within the phases of a questioning sequence**
● **Stems for Detail Questions**
● **Stems for Category Questions**
● **Helping Students Understand Text Structures**
● **Text Structure Questions**
● **Evidence Collecting Template**
● **Rating Scale for Evidence**

Administrative Documents:

● **Instructional Model Checks**
● **What the classroom should look like as a result**

6

Reflective Practies

Four Stages of Self-Reflective Stages. From the text, *Teach, Reflect, Learn,* and subsequent related peer-reviewed journals in education.

● **Descriptors:**
○ ***The Unaware Stage:*** "teachers who have not yet learned about certain teaching strategies, aren't yet attuned to the finer details of the class and students, and do not yet reflect deeply about their particular responsibilities." (p. 46)
○ **The Conscious Stage:** "teachers that may find themselves struggling to implement their knowledge into solid, transformative action." (p. 71). Knowing-doing gap
○ **The Action Stage:** " a stage used to describe teachers who are proficient in the science of teaching but need to connect it with the art of making necessary altercations. In the action stage, we learn when to respond, how to tweak, what specific adjustments to make, and why it's okay to

modify at a specific moment in time." (p. 97)

○ **The Refinement Stage:** "this stage is used to describe teachers who think critically throughout the day, continuously reflect on their practice, and dial in to the learning that is taking place in each moment of every day. These teachers are highly motivated, knowledgeable about best-practice strategies, and adept at turning the science of teaching into a beautiful art." (p. 123)

● **Implementation at FHS:** Four concepts will surround this! (how aware am I of my students, the content and pedagogy?, How intentionally do I plan and deliver all aspects of my teaching, How do I know whether my actions affect student learning?, How effectively do I respond to the results of ongoing assessments? **could move faster if we are doing well.

○ Will be accomplished one day a week at FHS during PLC times, and then one Friday a month, campus-wide.

○ **First six week period:** Wednesday PLC times (for those who have them)...working through the Unaware Stage.

■ **Goal:** become more aware about oneself, students, content, teaching methods, and professional responsibilities.

■ **Key components:** Observe, think intentionally, notice learning, make changes, practice reflections.

○ **Second six-week period:** Build from first, and into Conscious stage. Wednesday PLC times and then one Friday a month, campus-wide.

■ **Goal:** to develop intrinsic motivation and bring consistency into the teachers application of knowledge. Busting through the knowledge-doing gap.

■ **Key components**: noting cause and effect relationships, planning with intentionality, recognizing the results of actions, responding to needs that are observed, committing to reflection each day.

○ **Third six-week period: Build from Conscious stage and into Action.** Wednesday PLC times (for those who have them)...working through the conscious Stage.

■ **Goal:** build experience and strengthen expertise through the development of deeper reflective habits." (p. 105) "...bring the art and science together in teaching - building confidence around new strategies and insights into students so that the teacher will know when to introduce one to the other in order to maximize student learning." (p. 105).

■ **Key components**: zoom in on details, strategize, consider student thinking as the teacher assesses (utilizing formative and summative assessments and

linking in questioning sequences), responding in the moment developing a pattern of reflection.

○ **Fourth six–week period: build from action towards refinement. The remainder of the year will be revisiting 1-3, and improving refinement.**

■ **Goal:** encouraging long-term growth and continual reflection, aimed at increasing instructional capacity and student engagement & achievement.

■ **Key component:** bringing all the variables together, move beyond strategy to design, assess with a purpose, trusting intuition, making reflection a priority.

The end goal at FHS would be to utilize the building of teacher capacity in reflective practices, specifically those within adding questioning sequences into their daily routine and evaluating the effectiveness of instructional methods. ○

Sample PLC Weekly agenda: One of the planning days would be replaced on days of CUA, data-analysis.

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
Planning for week ahead. ● Alignment of instruction to level of priority TEKS. ● Intentional development of questioning sequences based upon point of Unit.	Questioning Sequences PD. ● Working on book study, implementation of detail, category, elaboration, evidence part of sequence. ● Evaluation of alignment of questioning sequence to level of objective.	Reflective practices ● Pre-set, short goals and development of reflective sequences each grading period. ● Aligning reflective practices through modeled questioning to evaluate instructional impact of questioning sequences.	Planning for the week ahead

8

9
10

Dr. Jason T. Wallen
Educational Philosophy

Guiding philosophy in educational-instructional decisions at FHS for the 2025-2026 school year.

Core Capital Development:

● ***Human Capital***: The accumulation of knowledge, skills and health developed through rigorous academic programming in literacy, numeracy, inquiry and physical wellness. This foundational capacity empowers students to become more productive and adaptable members of society.

● ***Social Capital:*** The networks and relationships that promote collaboration, belonging, and civic engagement. Developed through school partnerships, extracurricular involvement, and community service, social capital supports strong interpersonal and institutional connections.

● ***Financial Capital:*** The economic capacity of individuals, cultivated by access to career pathways, technical certifications, college readiness, and financial literacy education. It prepares students to contribute meaningfully to the workforce and achieve long term stability.

Focus of FHS Academic Planning:

High school education must consolidate students' learning and elevate it through authentic, deeper learning experiences that emphasize critical thinking, collaboration, and real-world application. According to Martinez & McGrath (2018), deeper learning enables students to develop mastery of core academic content while simultaneously building the cognitive, intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies required for success in college, careers, and civic life.

Instruction at this stage should integrate project-based learning, sustained inquiry, and reflective problem-solving. Classrooms should become communities of practice where students work collaboratively, ask meaningful questions, engage in iterative thinking, and take ownership of their learning. These learning experiences should be connected to life beyond high school through strategic partnerships with higher education, industry, and the military.

Opportunities such as dual-credit courses, internships, and industry certifications provide applied learning environments that align with deeper learning competencies. Co- and extracurricular programs must also be leveraged to reinforce student agency, leadership, and teamwork, ensuring graduates are equipped with the skills to thrive in a rapidly evolving world.

Conclusion

This educational philosophy reflects a commitment to equity, rigor, and relevance. It recognizes that student achievement and long-term success are the results of intentional system design, visionary leadership, and sustained investment in the whole child. Every student must be seen, supported, and prepared not only to succeed in school, but to thrive in life.

Texas Education Agency

2025 STAAR Performance

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Calculation Report

STAAR Performance	Reading/Language Arts (RLA)	Mathe S		Socia l		s
Total Tests	485	222	199	205	1,111	
Approaches GL or Above	319	168	179	193	859	77%
Meets GL or Above	224	60	93	129	506	46%
Masters GL	25	17	23	68	133	12%
Total Percentage Points						135%
Component Score						**45**

Texas Education Agency

2025 STAAR Performance

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Data Table: Accountability Groups

Accountability Groups									
	All Students	African Ame			American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	High Focus^
All Subjects									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	77%	78%	73%	81%	*	*	*	94%	74%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	44%	38%	53%	*	*	*	53%	39%
At Masters GL Standard	12%	0%	10%	15%	*	*	*	12%	9%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	859	7	410	420	*	*	*	16	653
At Meets GL Standard or Above	506	4	212	277	*	*	*	9	342
At Masters GL Standard	133	0	54	76	*	*	*	2	83
Total Tests	1,111	9	561	518	*	*	*	17	887
Reading/Language Arts (RLA)									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	66%	*	59%	73%	-	-	*	100%	60%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	*	37%	56%	-	-	*	60%	39%

At Masters GL Standard	5%	*	4%	6%	-	-	*	0%	4%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	319	*	145	166	-	-	*	5	232
At Meets GL Standard or Above	224	*	92	127	-	-	*	3	152
At Masters GL Standard	25	*	11	14	-	-	*	0	14
Total Tests	485	*	247	228	-	-	*	5	387
Mathematics									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	76%	*	76%	74 %	-	*	*	*	73%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	27%	*	23%	29 %	-	*	*	*	23%
At Masters GL Standard	8%	*	7%	8%	-	*	*	*	8%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	168	*	91	70	-	*	*	*	135
At Meets GL Standard or Above	60	*	27	28	-	*	*	*	42
At Masters GL Standard	17	*	8	8	-	*	*	*	14
Total Tests	222	*	119	95	-	*	*	*	184
Science									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	90%	*	89%	90 %	*	-	*	*	89%

Accountability Groups

	All Students	African Ame			American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	High Focus^
At Meets GL Standard or Above	47%	*	40%	54%	*	-	*	*	40%
At Masters GL Standard	12%	*	10%	14%	*	-	*	*	8%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	179	*	89	83	*	-	*	*	148
At Meets GL Standard or Above	93	*	40	50	*	-	*	*	67
At Masters GL Standard	23	*	10	13	*	-	*	*	14
Total Tests	199	*	100	92	*	-	*	*	166
Social Studies									
Percent of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	94%	*	89%	98%	*	-	-	100%	92%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	63%	*	56%	70%	*	-	-	80%	54%
At Masters GL Standard	33%	*	26%	40%	*	-	-	40%	27%
Number of Tests									
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	193	*	85	101	*	-	-	5	138
At Meets GL Standard or Above	129	*	53	72	*	-	-	4	81
At Masters GL Standard	68	*	25	41	*	-	-	2	41
Total Tests	205	*	95	103	*	-	-	5	150

Texas Education Agency

2025 STAAR Performance

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Data Table: Additional Student Groups

Additional Student Groups														
All Subjects														
Percent of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	77%	74%	86%	96 %	70%	70%	57%	84%	81%	71%	53%	*	43%	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	40%	60%	82 %	28%	29%	18%	56%	51%	36%	12%	*	7%	-
At Masters GL Standard	12%	9%	18%	45 %	6%	7%	5%	28%	13%	10%	0%	*	0%	-
Number of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	859	584	275	47	233	243	107	21	578	281	9	*	6	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	506	314	192	40	93	101	33	14	365	141	2	*	1	-
At Masters GL Standard	133	75	58	22	21	26	9	7	93	40	0	*	0	-
Total Tests	1,111	791	320	49	335	347	188	25	717	394	17	*	14	-
Reading/Language Arts (RLA)														
Percent of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	66%	60%		%)%	53%	53%	36%	73%	72%	55%	29%	*	17%	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	40%	61%	95 %	25%	26%	18%	45%	52%	36%	0%	*	0%	-
At Masters GL Standard	5%	3%	9%	45 %	2%	3%	4%	18%	6%	4%	0%	*	0%	-

Number of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	319	209	110	20	81	85	27	8	220	99	2	*	1	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	224	139	85	19	38	41	13	5	159	65	0	*	0	-
At Masters GL Standard	25	12	13	9	3	4	3	2	18	7	0	*	0	-
Total Tests	485	346	139	20	154	159	74	11	304	181	7	*	6	-
Mathematics														
Percent of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	76%	74%	80%	85 %	76%	76%	50%	83%	77%	74%	*	*	*	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	27%	23%	38%	46 %	18%	18%	8%	50%	32%	18%	*	*	*	-
At Masters GL Standard	8%	8%	5%	0%	8%	8%	5%	17%	7%	9%	*	*	*	-
Number of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	168	123	45	11	55	55	20	5	112	56	*	*	*	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	60	39	21	6	13	13	3	3	46	14	*	*	*	-
At Masters GL Standard	17	14	3	0	6	6	2	1	10	7	*	*	*	-
Total Tests	222	166	56	13	72	72	40	6	146	76	*	*	*	-
Science														
Percent of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	90%	89%		% %	90%	90%	78%	100%	89%	91%	*	*	*	-

Texas Education Agency

2025 STAAR Performance

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Additional Student Groups

At Meets GL Standard or Above	47%	42%	62%	86%	31%	33%	20%	67%	51%	40%	*	*	*	-
At Masters GL Standard	12%	8%	22%	71%	3%	7%	4%	33%	14%	9%	*	*	*	-
Number of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	179	133	46	7	53	55	35	6	104	75	*	*	*	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	93	62	31	6	18	20	9	4	60	33	*	*	*	-
At Masters GL Standard	23	12	11	5	2	4	2	2	16	7	*	*	*	-
Total Tests	199	149	50	7	59	61	45	6	117	82	*	*	*	-
Social Studies														
Percent of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	94%	92%		%	88%	87%	86%	*	95%	93%	*	-	*	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	63%	57%		%	48%	49%	28%	*	67%	53%	*	-	*	-
At Masters GL Standard	33%	28%	41%	89%	20%	22%	7%	*	33%	35%	*	-	*	-
Number of Tests														
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	193	119	74	9	44	48	25	*	142	51	*	-	*	-
At Meets GL Standard or Above	129	74	55	9	24	27	8	*	100	29	*	-	*	-
At Masters GL Standard	68	37	31	8	10	12	2	*	49	19	*	-	*	-
Total Tests	205	130	75	9	50	55	29	*	150	55	*	-	*	-

- Indicates there are no students in the group.

* Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.
** When only one racial/ethnic group is masked, then the second smallest racial/ethnic group is masked regardless of size.
^ This is a new accountability group introduced in 2023; it includes students who are Econ Disadv, EB/EL (Current & Monitored), Special Ed (Current), or Highly Mobile.
★ This is an additional student group introduced in 2023; it includes students who are Foster, Homeless, or Migrant.

Texas Education Agency

2025 College, Career, and Military Readiness

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Calculation Report

	2024 Annual Graduates	
	Count Credit	Component Score
Total		
Total graduates	193	
Total credit for CCMR criteria	**128**	**66%**

Data Table

	2024 Annual Graduates	
	Count Credit	Percentage

College		
Texas Success Initiative (TSI) Criteria		
Met TSI criteria in both RLA and Mathematics	53	27.5%
Met TSI criteria in both RLA and Mathematics, excluding college prep courses	43	22.3%
TSI Criteria - Reading/Language Arts (RLA)		
Met TSI criteria for at least one indicator in RLA	81	42.0%
Met TSI criteria in RLA, excluding college prep courses	72	37.3%
Met TSI assessment criteria	63	32.6%
Met ACT criteria	0	0.0%
Met SAT criteria	52	26.9%
Earned credit for a college prep course	11	5.7%
TSI Criteria - Mathematics		
Met TSI criteria for at least one indicator in Mathematics	57	29.5%
Met TSI criteria in Mathematics, excluding college prep courses	47	24.4%
Met TSI assessment criteria	45	23.3%
Met ACT criteria	0	0.0%
Met SAT criteria	19	9.8%
Earned credit for a college prep course	11	5.7%
AP/IB Examination		
Met criterion score on an AP/IB exam in any subject	4	2.1%
Dual Course Credits		
Earned credit for at least 3 hours in RLA or Mathematics or 9 hours in any subject	48	24.9%
Associate Degree		
Earned an associate degree by August 31 immediately following high school graduation	21	10.9%

OnRamps Dual Enrollment Course		
Completed an OnRamps course and qualified for at least 3 hours of university or college credit in any subject	1	0.5%
Special Ed with Advanced Diploma Plan		
Received special education services and earned an advanced diploma	18	9.3%
Career		
Industry-Based Certifications (IBC)		
Earned an IBC and received credit for an aligned level two or higher course	90	46.6%
Earned at least one sunsetting IBC and did not meet any other CCMR criteria	5	2.6%
Earned only a sunsetting IBC and are not included due to IBC cap*	0	0.0%
Level I or Level II Certificate		
Earned a level I or level II certificate in any workforce education area	0	0.0%
Graduate with Completed IEP and Workforce Readiness		

Texas Education Agency

2025 College, Career, and Military Readiness

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

	2024 Annual Graduates	
	Count Credit	**Percentage**
Received graduation type code of 04, 05, 54, or 55	3	1.6%
Military		
U.S. Armed Forces		
Enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces	4	2.1%

* Beginning with 2023 ratings, a campus may not earn CCMR credit for more than five graduates, or 20 percent of graduates, whichever is higher, who only meet CCMR criteria via a sunsetting IBC.

Texas Education Agency

2025 Graduation Rate

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Calculation Report

Graduation Rate	All Students
Class of 2024, 4-year	97.9
Class of 2023, 5-year	98.2
Class of 2022, 6-year	98.3
Annual Dropout*	
Component Score	**98.3**

* Used only if 4-, 5-, or 6-year value is not available.

Data Table

	Accountability Groups									Additional Student Groups								
	All Students	African Ame			American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	High Focus^									
4-Year Graduation Rate (Gr 9-12): Class of 2024																		
% Graduated	97.9%	*		% %	-	*	-	*	97.7 %	98.3 %		% %	96.6%	93.8%	*	-	*	-
# Graduated	185	*	74	104	-	*	-	*	130	115	70	7	28	30	*	-	*	-
Total in Class	189	*	77	105	-	*	-	*	133	117	72	7	29	32	*	-	*	-
5-Year Extended Graduation Rate (Gr 9-12): Class of 2023																		

% Graduated	98.2%	*	10 9		*	*	-	*	97.7 %	99.1 %		% %	100.0%	92.0%	*	-	*	-
# Graduated	168	*	68	93	*	*	-	*	127	116	52	6	27	23	*	-	*	-
Total in Class	171	*	68	95	*	*	-	*	130	117	54	6	27	25	*	-	*	-
6-Year Extended Graduation Rate (Gr 9-12): Class of 2022																		
% Graduated	98.3%	100.0%	10 9		*	-	-	*	97.5 %	97.4 %		% %	100.0%	100.0 %	*	*	*	-
# Graduated	173	5	67	99	*	-	-	*	119	112	61	8	18	22	*	*	*	-
Total in Class	176	5	67	102	*	-	-	*	122	115	61	8	18	22	*	*	*	-
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 9-12): SY 2023-24																		
% Dropped Out	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0 %	*	*	*	0.0 %	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	-
% Dropped Out - Conversion	99.0%																	
# Dropped Out	1	0	1	0	*	*	*	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	*	0	-
# of Students	904	7	365	500	*	*	*	26	674	601	303	46	180	143	18	*	16	-

Texas Education Agency

2025 Graduation Rate

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

+ Ever HS EB/ELs are included in the graduation rate. Annual Dropouts are current EB/ELs only.
- Indicates there are no students in the group.
* Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.
** When only one racial/ethnic group is masked, then the second smallest racial/ethnic group is masked regardless of size.
^ This is a new accountability group introduced in 2023; it includes students who are Econ Disadv, EB/EL (Current & Monitored), Special Ed (Current), or Highly Mobile.
★ This is an additional student group introduced in 2023; it includes students who are Foster, Homeless, or Migrant.

Texas Education Agency

2025 Closing the Gaps

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Calculation Report

Component	Total Earned Poi	Total Possible Point	Component Points	Weight	Total Points

	nts	s			
Academic Achievement	16	32	50.0	50.0 %	25.0
Graduation Status	13	16	81.3	10.0 %	8.1
ELP Status	0	4	0.0	10.0 %	0.0
School Quality Status	8	16	50.0	30.0 %	15.0
Closing the Gaps Score					**48**

Texas Education Agency

2025 Closing the Gaps

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Data Table: Accountability Groups

Accountability Groups											
	All Students	**African Ar H**		**White**	**American Indian**	**Asian**	**Pacific Islander**	**Two or More Races**	**High Focus^**	**Total Earned Points**	**Total Possible Points**
Groups to be evaluated based on 2024 accountability	✓		✓	✓					✓		
Academic Achievement Status											
Reading/Language Arts (RLA) 2025 Target	**44%**	**32%**	**36%**	**62%**	**43%**	**74%**	**45%**	**58%**	**32%**		
RLA Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**53%**	**43%**	**47%**	**68%**	**53%**	**78%**	**54%**	**65%**	**43%**		
RLA Long Term Target (2037-38)	**72%**	**66%**	**68%**	**81%**	**72%**	**87%**	**73%**	**79%**	**66%**		
Points Earned	**3**		**3**	**1**					**3**		
2025 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	*	37%	56%	-	-	*	60%	39%		

2025 # at Meets GL Standard or Above	224	*	92	127	-	-	*	3	152		
2025 Total Tests (Adjusted)	485	*	247	228	-	-	*	5	387		
2024 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	--	37%	54%	-	-	-	55%	41%		
Mathematics 2025 Target	**38%**	**26%**	**35%**	**48%**	**37%**	**72%**	**41%**	**44%**	**31%**		
Mathematics Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**48%**	**38%**	**46%**	**57%**	**48%**	**77%**	**51%**	**53%**	**43%**		
Mathematics Long Term Target (2037-38)	**69%**	**63%**	**68%**	**74%**	**69%**	**86%**	**71%**	**72%**	**66%**		
Points Earned	**2**		**2**	**1**					**1**		
2025 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	27%	*	23%	29%	-	*	*	*	23%		
2025 # at Meets GL Standard or Above	60	*	27	28	-	*	*	*	42		
2025 Total Tests (Adjusted)	222	*	119	95	-	*	*	*	184		
2024 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	20%	--	15%	23%	-	-	-	--	20%		
Total Points										**16**	**32**
Academic Growth Status											
RLA 2025 Target	**69%**	**65%**	**66%**	**72%**	**68%**	**81%**	**70%**	**72%**	**64%**		
RLA Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**78%**	**75%**	**76%**	**80%**	**77%**	**85%**	**78%**	**80%**	**74%**		
RLA Long Term Target (2037-38)	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**94%**		
Points Earned	**2**		**1**	**2**					**3**		
2025 Academic Growth Score	67%	*	64%	70%	-	-	*	*	65%		
2025 Growth Points	245.50	*		0 0	-	-	*	*	185. 25		
2025 Total Tests	365	*	172	186	-	-	*	*	283		
2024 Academic Growth Score	63%	--	61%	64%	-	-	-	60%	61%		
Mathematics 2025 Target	**76%**	**74%**	**77%**	**73%**	**74%**	**87%**	**72%**	**73%**	**75%**		
Mathematics Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**82%**	**81%**	**83%**	**80%**	**81%**	**90%**	**80%**	**80%**	**82%**		

Mathematics Long Term Target (2037-38)	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**		
Points Earned	**3**		**3**	**2**					**3**		

Texas Education Agency

2025 Closing the Gaps

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Accountability Groups											
	All Students	**African Ame**			**American Indian**	**Asian**	**Pacific Islander**	**Two or More Races**	**High Focus^**	**Total Earned Points**	**Total Possible Points**
2025 Academic Growth Score	79%	*	84%	72%	-	-	*	*	78%		
2025 Growth Points	108.50	*	62.00	42.00	-	-	*	*	93.00		
2025 Total Tests	137	*	74	58	-	-	*	*	120		
2024 Academic Growth Score	53%	--	53%	51%	-	-	-	--	54%		
Total Points										**19**	**32**
Federal Graduation Rate Status											
2025 Target	**90.0%**	**86.3%**	**88.1%**	**93.8%**	**87.4%**	**96.7%**	**88.3%**	**90.8%**	**86.5%**		
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**92.7%**	**90.2%**	**91.4%**	**95.2%**	**90.9%**	**97.1%**	**91.5%**	**93.2%**	**90.3%**		
Long Term Target (2037-38)	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**		
Points Earned	**3**		**3**	**4**					**3**		
2024 % Graduated	97.9%	*	96.2%	99.1%	-	*	-	*	97.8%		
2024 # Graduated	187	*	75	105	-	*	-	*	132		
2024 Total in Class	191	*	78	106	-	*	-	*	135		

2023 % Graduated	95.4%	--	97.1%	94.8 %	--	--	-	--	93.9 %		
Total Points										**13**	**16**
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (EB/EL Current)											
2025 Target									**34%**		
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)									**36%**		
Long Term Target (2037-38)									**40%**		
Points Earned									**0**		
2025 TELPAS Progress Rate									24%		
2025 TELPAS Progress									42		
2025 TELPAS Total									174		
2024 TELPAS Progress Rate									32%		
Total Points										**0**	**4**
Student Success (Student Achievement Domain Score (STAAR Component Only))											
2025 Target	**47**	**36**	**42**	**58**	**45**	**74**	**47**	**56**	**39**		
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**57**	**46**	**52**	**68**	**55**	**81**	**57**	**66**	**49**		
Long Term Target (2037-38)	**77**	**66**	**72**	**88**	**75**	**95**	**77**	**86**	**69**		
Points Earned	**0**		**1**	**1**					**3**		
2025 STAAR Component Score	45	41	40	50	*	*	*	53	41		
2025 % at Approaches GL Standard or Above	77%	78%	73%	81%	*	*	*	94%	74%		
2025 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	44%	38%	53%	*	*	*	53%	39%		
2025 % at Masters GL Standard	12%	0%	10%	15%	*	*	*	12%	9%		
2025 Total Tests	1,111	9	561	518	*	*	*	17	887		

2025 Closing the Gaps

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Accountability Groups											
	All Students	African Ame			American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	High Focus^	Total Earned Points	Total Possible Points
2024 STAAR Component Score	45	42	39	48	-	--	--	49	41		
Total Points										**5**	**16**
School Quality (College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance)											
2025 Target	**63%**	**47%**	**60%**	**71%**	**58%**	**84%**	**51%**	**63%**	**56%**		
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**73%**	**57%**	**70%**	**79%**	**68%**	**88%**	**61%**	**73%**	**66%**		
Long Term Target (2037-38)	**93%**	**77%**	**90%**	**95%**	**88%**	**95%**	**81%**	**93%**	**86%**		
Points Earned	**3**		**0**	**2**					**3**		
2024 % Students Meeting CCMR	66%	*	58%	70%	-	*	-	100 %	65%		
2024 # Students Meeting CCMR	129	*	46	76	-	*	-	5	91		
2024 Total Students	196	*	79	109	-	*	-	5	139		
2023 % Students Meeting CCMR	66%	-	66%	67%	--	--	-	--	66%		
Total Points										**8**	**16**
Participation 2024-25											
Target	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**		
RLA											
% Participation	99%	*	100%	99%	-	-	*	100 %	99%		
# Participants	591	*	334	246	-	-	*	6	486		
Total Students	594	*	335	248	-	-	*	6	489		
Mathematics											

% Participation	98%	*	100%	96%	-	*	*	100 %	99%		
# Participants	244	*	135	100	-	*	*	5	204		
Total Students	248	*	135	104	-	*	*	5	207		

Data Table: Additional Groups

Additional Groups														
Academic Achievement Status														
Reading/Language Arts (RLA) 2025 Target	**44%**	**33%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**20%**	**13%**	**30%**	**46%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
RLA Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**53%**	**44%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**33%**	**28%**	**42%**	**55%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
RLA Long Term Target (2037-38)	**72%**	**67%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**60%**	**57%**	**65%**	**73%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2025 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	40%	61%	95%	25%	26%	18%	45%	52%	36%	0%	*	0%	-

Additional Groups														
2025 # at Meets GL Standard or Above	224	139	85	19	38	41	13	5	159	65	0	*	0	-
2025 Total Tests (Adjusted)	485	346	139	20	154	159	74	11	304	181	7	*	6	-
2024 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	42%	55%		30%	32%	15%	47%	52%	36%	30%	-	30%	-

Mathematics 2025 Target	**38%**	**32%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**31%**	**15%**	**33%**	**40%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Mathematics Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**48%**	**43%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**43%**	**29%**	**44%**	**50%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Mathematics Long Term Target (2037-38)	**69%**	**66%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**66%**	**58%**	**67%**	**70%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2025 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	27%	23%	38%	46%	18%	18%	8%	50%	32%	18%	*	*	*	-
2025 # at Meets GL Standard or Above	60	39	21	6	13	13	3	3	46	14	*	*	*	-
2025 Total Tests (Adjusted)	222	166	56	13	72	72	40	6	146	76	*	*	*	-
2024 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	20%	21%	17%		10%	13%	16%	--	19%	21%	--	-	--	-
Academic Growth Status														
RLA 2025 Target	**69%**	**65%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**60%**	**45%**	**63%**	**70%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
RLA Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**78%**	**75%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**70%**	**55%**	**73%**	**78%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
RLA Long Term Target (2037-38)	**95%**	**95%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**90%**	**75%**	**93%**	**95%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2025 Academic Growth Score	67%	66%	70%	70%	60%	62%	50%	81%	69%	65%	*	-	*	-
2025 Growth Points		00	77.50	14.00	59.25	62.25	30.75	6.50	164.50	81.00	*	-	*	-
2025 Total Tests	365	255	110	20	98	101	62	8	240	125	*	-	*	-
2024 Academic Growth Score	63%	63%	64%		61%	63%	32%	54%	69%	52%	--	-	--	-
Mathematics 2025 Target	**76%**	**75%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**77%**	**64%**	**73%**	**77%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Mathematics Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**82%**	**82%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**83%**	**74%**	**80%**	**83%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Mathematics Long Term Target (2037-38)	**95%**	**95%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**95%**	**94%**	**95%**	**95%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2025 Academic Growth Score	79%	77%	88%	*	82%	82%	72%	*	77%	83%	*	-	*	-
2025 Growth Points	108.50	83.00	25.50	*	42.00	42.00	23.75	*	67.75	40.75	*	-	*	-
2025 Total Tests	137	108	29	*	51	51	33	*	88	49	*	-	*	-

2024 Academic Growth Score	53%	53%	51%		48%	49%	54%	--	51%	55%	--	-	--	-
Federal Graduation Rate Status														
2025 Target	**90.0%**	**86.7%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**80.0%**	**79.7%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**92.7%**	**90.5%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**86.0%**	**85.8%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Long Term Target (2037-38)	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**98.0%**	**98.0%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2024 % Graduated	97.9%	98.3%		%	100.0%	96.6%	93.8%				*	*	*	-
2024 # Graduated	187	117	70	7	27	28	30				*	*	*	-

Texas Education Agency

2025 Closing the Gaps

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Additional Groups														
2024 Total in Class	191	119	72	7	27	29	32				*	*	*	-
2023 % Graduated	95.4%	95.0%	96.3%		96.2%	96.3%	87.5%				--	--	--	-
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (EB/EL Current)														
2025 Target					**34%**									
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)					**36%**									
Long Term Target (2037-38)					**40%**									
2025 TELPAS Progress Rate					24%									
2025 TELPAS Progress					42									

2025 TELPAS Total					174									
2024 TELPAS Progress Rate					32%									
Student Success (Student Achievement Domain Score (STAAR Component Only))														
2025 Target	**47**	**38**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**38**	**23**	**43**	**49**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**57**	**48**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**48**	**33**	**53**	**59**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Long Term Target (2037-38)	**77**	**68**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**68**	**53**	**73**	**79**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2025 STAAR Component Score	45	41	55	74	35	35	27	56	48	39	22	*	17	-
2025 % at Approaches GL Standard or Above	77%	74%	86%	96%	70%	70%	57%	84%	81%	71%	53%	*	43%	-
2025 % at Meets GL Standard or Above	46%	40%	60%	82%	28%	29%	18%	56%	51%	36%	12%	*	7%	-
2025 % at Masters GL Standard	12%	9%	18%	45%	6%	7%	5%	28%	13%	10%	0%	*	0%	-
2025 Total Tests	1,111	791	320	49	335	347	188	25	717	394	17	*	14	-
2024 STAAR Component Score	45	42	50		34	35	28	38	48	39	32	-	32	-
School Quality (College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance)														
2025 Target	**63%**	**56%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**51%**	**64%**	**45%**	**67%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Next Interim Target (2027-28 through 2031-32)	**73%**	**66%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**61%**	**74%**	**55%**	**76%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
Long Term Target (2037-38)	**93%**	**86%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**81%**	**94%**	**75%**	**95%**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**n/a**
2024 % Students Meeting CCMR	66%	65%	68%	100 %	57%	68%	55%	*	76%	43%	100%	-	100%	-
2024 # Students Meeting CCMR	129	80	49	7	17	23	21	*	103	26	5	-	5	-
2024 Total Students	196	124	72	7	30	34	38	*	136	60	5	-	5	-
2023 % Students Meeting CCMR	66%	66%	66%		61%	61%	62%	--	69%	58%	--	-	--	-
Participation 2024-25														
Target	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**	**95%**
RLA														

% Participation	99%	99%	100 %	100 %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	*	100%	-
# Participants	591	417	174	21	236	241	90	12	350	241	11	*	8	-

Texas Education Agency

2025 Closing the Gaps

WH FORD H S (116908001) - QUINLAN ISD - HUNT COUNTY

Additional Groups

Total Students	594	420	174	21	236	241	90	12	350	244	11	*	8	-
Mathematics														
% Participation	98%	98%	99%	100 %	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	98%	100%	*	*	-
# Participants	244	178	66	13	86	86	45	6	149	95	5	*	*	-
Total Students	248	181	67	13	86	86	45	6	151	97	5	*	*	-

* Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.

** When only one racial/ethnic group is masked, then the second smallest racial/ethnic group is masked regardless of size.

+ Ever HS EB/ELs are included in the Federal Graduation Rate.

- Indicates there are no students in the group.

^ This is a new accountability group introduced in 2023; it includes students who are Econ Disadv, EB/EL (Current & Monitored), Special Ed (Current), or Highly Mobile.

★ This is an additional student group introduced in 2023; it includes students who are Foster, Homeless, or Migrant.

- - Indicates that the student group did not meet minimum size in the prior year.

W.H. Ford High School

2025-2026

Master Schedule

English

Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
J. Delzell (1303)	Eng I	Eng I Hon	Eng I	Eng I	Eng I Hon	PLC	Eng I	Conf
Manross (1311)	Eng II Hon	EOC REM (Eng 1 or 2)	Eng II	Eng II Hon	Eng II	PLC	Conf	Eng II

L. Geiger (1304)	**Eng III**	**Bus Eng**	**CP Eng**	**CP Eng**	**Conf**	**PLC**	**Bus Eng**	**CP Eng**
Waldrup (1312)	**Eng II**	**Eng II**	**Eng I**	**Eng I**	**Eng I**	**PLC**	**Eng II**	**Conf**
Ward (1305)	**Eng IV**	**D.C. Eng (2322/2323)**	**DC US Hist**	**D.C. Eng (1301/1302)**	**Conf**	**PLC**	**Eng IV**	**Eng IV**
Wilbanks (1307)	**EOC REM (Eng 1or 2)**	**Eng III**	**Conf**	**Eng III**	**Eng III**	**PLC**	**Eng III**	**Eng III**
Marshall (Library)							**Eng Lang Dev Acq**	**Eng Lang Dev Acq**

Science

Teacher	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
Mexia (2401)	**Bio**	**Conf**	**Bio**	**Bio**	**Bio**	**Bio**	**PLC**	**Bio**
Wallen (2404)	**Bio**	**Bio**	**Bio**	**Bio Hon**	**Bio Hon**	**Conf**	**PLC**	**Ath**
Hopkins (2409)	**SCRD**	**Conf**	**IPC**	**SCRD**	**SCRD**	**IPC**	**IPC**	**IPC**
Lewis (2406)	**Conf**	**Chem**	**Hon Chem**	**Chem**	**Chem**	**Hon Chem**	**Chem**	**Chem**
Barber (2402)	**Conf**	**FSCI**	**A&P**	**A&P**	**FSCI**	**FSCI**	**FSCI 2**	**Sr. Duties**
White (2408)	**TMS Ath**	**Conf**	**POT**	**POT**	**Physics**	**Physics**	**Physics**	**POT**

Math:

Teacher	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
Biggie (2307)	**Alg 1**	**Alg I**	**Alg I Hon**	**Conf**	**Alg I**	**Alg I**	**PLC**	**Alg I**

Shepperd (2303)	Geom	Geom	DC Math	Geom	Conf	Geom	Geom	PLC
Tambourine (2309)	Conf	Geom	Geom Hon	PreCal	Geom	Geom Hon	Alg II Hon	PLC
Manna (2304)	EOC Remediation	EOC Remediation	CP Math	CP Math	EOC Remediation	Conf	CP Math	HS G Ath
Carter (2306)	Math Apps	Fin Math	Fin Math	Fin Math	Math Apps	Conf	Fin Math	Belles
Wright (2305)	Alg II	Alg II	Conf	Alg I	Alg I	Alg II	PLC	Alg II

Social Studies

Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Seigler (2312)	USH	Conf	USH	USH	HS Ath	USH	USH	USH
Chase (2301)	TMS Ath	Conf	USH	W. Geo	W. Geo	W. Geo	W. Geo	HS G Ath
Lentz (2302)	W. Geo	W Hist Hon	Conf	W Geo Hon	W. Geo	PLC	W Hist Hon	W. Geo
Chambers (2310)	Econ/Gov	Gov	Gov	WH	HS Ath	Gov/Econ	Conf	WH
Renfro (2313)	9th Ath	Econ	Econ	W. Geo	Boys Ath	W. Geo	Conf	Gov/Econ
K. Wallace (2311)	9th Ath	WH	WH	Conf	Boys Ath	WH	WH	MS Ath

PE/Trainer

Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Rickman (Gym)	9th Ath	PE	PE	PE	HS Ath	PE	TMS PA	Conf
Walls (FH)	MS Ath	Trainer	Trainer	Sports Med	Trainer	Trainer	Trainer	HS Ath

ISS/Lab Coverage

Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Giles (ISS)	**MS Ath**	**Conf**	**DC in Commons & ISS**	**ISS**	**MS Athletics**	**ISS**	**ISS**	**MS Ath**
V. Hale (1123)	**9th Ath**	**Conf**	**Lab**	**Lab**	**Athletics**	**Lab**	**Lab**	**Lab**
	ISS in Library	**ISS in Library**			**ISS in Library**		**ISS in Library**	**ISS in Library**

Spanish

Teacher	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6	Period 7	Period 8
Rodarte (1306)	Spanish 1	Spanish 1	Spanish 2	Conference	Spanish 1	Spanish 1	Spanish 1	Spanish 1
Gardner (1310)	Spanish 2	Spanish 2	Spanish 3 & 4	Conference	Spanish 2	Spanish 2	Spanish 2	Spanish 2

Fine Arts

Teacher	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6	Period 7	Period 8
Art (1231) M. Moran	Art 1	Art 1	Art 1	Art 2	Art 3/4	Art 1	Conference	Art 2
Band (1212) Evans	TMS	TMS	Applied Music	Applied Music	Conference	Wind Ensemble	Symphonic Band	Color Guard
Band (1212) Filip	Admin	Admin	Admin	Admin	Conference	Wind Ensemble	Symphonic Band	Jazz Band
Band (1212) Edmonds	TMS	TMS	TMS	TMS	Conference	Wind Ensemble	Symphonic Band	Music Theory

Choir (1223) Castolenia	Beginner Treble Choir	TMS	TMS	Beginner Tenor/Bass Choir	Advanced Treble Choir	Conference	Mixed Choir	Tenor/Bass Choir
Theater Arts S. Hyland (1208)	Theater Arts 1	Conference	Theater Arts 2	Th. Prod.	Tech Theater	Theater Arts 3-4	Theater Arts 1	Theater Arts 1

Life Skills/Special Education (2025-2026)

Teacher	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6	Period 7	Period 8
Chester (1408)	LS Eng	LS Eng	LS Math	LS Eng	LS Reading	Conference	LS Math	LS Math
M. Trosper (1403)	LS Eng 2, 3, 4 LS W Geo	Conference	LS Govt/Econ LS Eng 1, 2 LS US Hist	LS Func Living LS W Hist	LS Reading	LS Func Living	LS Science	LS Math
Walker (1401)	Conference	LS History	LS Science	LS Science	LS Reading	LS History	LS History	LS History
Burks (1309)	Career Prep 1 & 2		ST2INDCN/ GENEMPLSK	Career Prep 1 & 2		ST2INDCN	GENEMPLSK	Conference
King/ K. Gray/Wolfe/ K. Hanson/Scott/ Sandman	Inclusion	Inclusion	Inclusion	Inclusion	Inclusion	Inclusion	Inclusion	Inclusion
Vaughan (2404)						FHS Dyslexia	FHS Dyslexia	FHS Dyslexia

Career & Technology (2025-2026)

Teacher	Period 1	Period 2	Period 3	Period 4	Period 5	Period 6	Period 7	Period 8
Duncan Cosmetology (1427)	Intro to Cosmetology	Principles of Cosmetol	Cosmetology 2			Cosmetology 1		Conference

		ogy						
Watson Auto Tech (1422)	Auto Tech 1		Conference	Small Engine	Auto Basics	Auto Basics	Auto Tech Practicum/Auto Tech 2	
Reville Audio Visual (2314)	Video Game Design	Audio Visual 1	Audio Visual 2/ Practicum AV1/ Practicum AV2		Principles of Audio Visual	Conference	Principles of Audio Visual	Principles of Audio Visual
Z. Magee Health Science (1313)	Conference	Health Science Theory	Health Science Theory	Health Science Theory	Principles of Health Science/Medical Term	Principles of Health Science/Medical Term	Principles of Health Science/Medical Term	Principles of Health Science/Medical Term
R. Magee Health Science (1302)	DC Math on campus proctor	Conference	Prin of Diag Health (3rd Course)	A&P (Prin of Diag Health)	Prin of Diag Health (3rd Course)	Medical Assistant (4th course)	Pathophysiology (MA)	Medical Assistant (4th course)
???? (1301)								
D. Shores Business (1415)	**9th Ath**	Practicum in Entrepreneurship		Global Business/HR MGMT	HS Boys Athletics	Practicum in Entrepreneurship		Conf
Moore Business (1412)	Money Matters	Money Matters	Conference	Money Matters	Money Matters	Accounting 1	Accounting 2	Accounting 1
K. Harding Business (1414)	BIM 2	Conference	BIM 1	BIM 1	BIM 2	BIM 1	BIM 1	BIM 1
T. Matson Business (1413)	BIM 1	BIM 1	Fundamentals of Real Estate		BIM 1	Conference	Graphic Design 1 and 2	BIM 1
Roe (1416)	Ag. Mechanic	Ag. Mechanic	Ag. Equipment	Ag. Struc	Ag. Equipment	Prac 1 / Prac 2		Conference
Gibson Agriculture (1428)	Livestock	Conference	Wildlife	Advanced Animal Science	Principles of Agriculture	Wildlife	Vet Med	Small Animal/Equine

Library: Bronson

Lopez (Office), Roby (DIAG), Della (Para), Dominguez (Para), Strange (Para), Simmons, Jackson

Wolfe Gray Hanson Sandman King Scott

1st Athletics Math Apps- Carter (3x) English I- Delzell (4x) Algebra I-Biggie (4x) English III- Geiger (2x) Geometry- Shepperd (4x)

World Geo- Lentz (1x)

2nd Conference Algebra II- Wright (4x) English III- Wilbanks (2x) Algebra I- Biggie (4x) English II- Waldrup (3x) Geometry- Shepperd (4x)

3rd World History- Wallace (1x) Biology- Wallen (4x) English I- Delzell (4x) CP Math- Manna (2x) English II- Manross (3x) Conference English I- Waldrup (3x)

4th World Geo- Chase (2x) POT- White (1x) English I- Delzell (4x) Conference English I- Waldrup (3x) Geometry- Shepperd (4x) CP Eng- Geiger (1x) Alg 1-Wright (3x)

5th Athletics Conference English III- Wilbanks (3x) Algebra I- Biggie (4x) English II- Manross (4x) Math Apps- Carter (2x)

6th Algebra II- Wright (1x) IPC- Hopkins (2x) PLC Algebra I- Biggie (4x) PLC Geometry- Shepperd (4x) Geometry- Shepperd (3x)

7th English II- Waldrup (3x) English III- Wilbanks (2x) English I- Delzell (4x) PLC Conference Geometry- Shepperd (4x) PLC (2x)

Gov/Econ- Renfro (1x) Biology- Mexia (2x)

8th

English III- Wilbanks (1x) POT- White (1x) Conference Algebra I- Biggie (4x) English II- Manross (4x) PLC IPC- Hopkins (2x)

SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Schedule as of 8/8//2025