



Austin Independent School District

AISD STRATEGIC PLAN:

2010 Scorecard

Office of Planning and Community Relations
Department of Program Evaluation

Revised
November 9, 2010



BACKGROUND

The AISD Strategic Plan for 2010-2015 was developed through extensive stakeholder input from over 3,000 sources. This input included perspectives from members of the previous Strategic Plan Task Force, recommendations from the District Advisory Council, community forums, focus group discussions, surveys, individual interviews, and online, email, and written comments. Development of the Strategic Plan was guided by the stated aspirations of the Board relating to educational philosophy, student achievement, fiscal management, district operations, and performance monitoring. Drafting of the Strategic Plan was assisted by a new Strategic Plan Task Force consisting of broad community representation.

The AISD Strategic Plan was formally approved by the Board on December 14, 2009. The Strategic Plan will be used by the district to align all other district planning efforts and to inform budgetary development and decision-making. The same high levels of stakeholder engagement and transparency of process demonstrated in development of the Strategic Plan will serve as guiding principles during its implementation. The Strategic Plan Scorecard is an important part of this commitment.

On an annual basis, the Strategic Plan Scorecard reports on the metrics included in the Strategic Plan. Specifically, the Strategic Plan Scorecard assesses the progress of Strategic Plan implementation by comparing actual performance results to established targets, and by comparing current and previous performance results to determine whether improvement has occurred. The Strategic Plan Scorecard is part of an overall “reporting rhythm” related to the Strategic Plan, including the Start of School Year Report, Annual Report, State of the District Address, and End of School Year Report. In addition, the Strategic Plan Scorecard informs the annual review of the Strategic Plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2010 Strategic Plan Scorecard consists of 20 Exhibits, with performance indicators arranged according to the four goals of the Strategic Plan:

- Goal 1 (Exhibits 1-5) – All students will perform at or above grade level.
- Goal 2 (Exhibits 1-5) – Achievement gaps among all student groups will be eliminated.
- Goal 3 (Exhibits 6-18) – All students will graduate ready for college, career, and life in a globally competitive economy.
- Goal 4 (Exhibits 19-20) – All schools will meet or exceed state accountability standards, and the district will meet federal standards and exceed state standards.

Each Exhibit includes 2009 and 2010 actual performance results and the 2010 target and, through the use of symbols, each Exhibit answers the questions, “Did we meet or exceed our 2010 target?” and “Did our performance improve?” Each Exhibit also includes a brief verbal evaluation of the visual presentation. Exhibits 1-5 deal with results for the various TAKS subject areas. Exhibits 1-5 also answer the question, “Did we narrow the gaps?”

Reflective of the Strategic Plan, Exhibits 1-5 are also divided into two student cohorts: those who have been in AISD for at least three consecutive years (Cohort A), and those who have not (Cohort B). Based on historical and current performance data, students in Cohort A perform at higher levels than students in Cohort B. As a result, targets for Cohort A are correspondingly higher than those for Cohort B. In addition, targets are set higher for TAKS Reading, Writing, and Social Studies than for Math and Science, based on historical and current performance data.



Also reflective of the Strategic Plan, TAKS Reading and Math (Exhibits 1 and 2) do not include Grades 3 and 4, and TAKS Writing (Exhibit 3) does not include Grade 4. Although these grades are normally included in data presentations related to these TAKS subject areas, the reason for not including them in the Strategic Plan and the Scorecard is that students in Grades 3 and 4 have not yet had three years of TAKS testing experience.

Some of the major points that can be taken away from the 2010 Strategic Plan Scorecard are:

- 2010 is the first year of a new, five-year Strategic Plan and is therefore a building year for the district. Improvements are needed, but an upward trajectory is expected in all performance areas in subsequent years.
- Although TAKS gains were made in Cohort B, it is important to note that the actual TAKS performance of students in Cohort B is at a lower level than Cohort A. Correspondingly, targets for Cohort B are on average almost 11 percentage points lower than targets for Cohort A across all TAKS subject areas in Exhibits 1-5.
- For both Cohort A and Cohort B combined, of the five TAKS subject areas in Exhibits 1-5, the most targets that were met or exceeded were in Science and Social Studies, and the fewest targets that were met were in Reading and Writing.
- For both Cohort A and Cohort B combined, the student group that met or exceeded the fewest targets was Special Education, followed closely by Limited English Proficiency.
- For both Cohort A and Cohort B combined, of the 30 total achievement gaps monitored in Exhibits 1-5 (between White students and their African American and Hispanic peers, and between Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged students), 57% of the gaps were narrowed and 17% stayed the same.
- As a result of vertical scaling by the state, passing scores for students were increased in Reading in Grades 6 and 8.
- Under Goal 3, Exhibits 6-18 were recently approved by the Board of Trustees on September 27, 2010, and are now included in the Strategic Plan. The information presented in several of these new tables is incomplete, due to the unavailability of applicable data at this time. In subsequent Strategic Plan Scorecards, more complete information will be provided.
- Of the tables in Exhibits 6-18 with complete information, the most targets that were met or exceeded were in student participation in fine arts and athletics (Exhibit 14), and the fewest targets that were met were in student perceptions of how well their school developed their knowledge and skills in certain areas (Exhibit 7).
- For accountability at the district level (Exhibit 19), the district met the target of “Acceptable” under the state system, but did not meet the target of “Met AYP” under the federal system.
- For accountability at the campus level (Exhibit 20), the district reduced the number of Academically Unacceptable (AU) schools from 8 in 2009 to just 1 in 2010, although the target was for no AU schools at any level. Except for this 1 AU rating, the relatively few cases of not meeting or exceeding targets is countered by more schools achieving higher ratings under the state accountability system.
- With upcoming changes in the state accountability system, certain metrics related to the Strategic Plan may also need to change.



GOAL 1 AND GOAL 2 INDICATORS

EXHIBIT 1: TAKS READING PASSING RATES (Grades 5-11)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	90%	88%	92%	X	●	N/A
African American	85%	83%	88%	X	●	●
Hispanic	85%	83%	88%	X	●	●
White	98%	98%	98%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	68%	64%	75%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	84%	81%	88%	X	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	97%	97%	97%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	82%	78%	86%	X	●	N/A

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	78%	82%	79%	✓	●	N/A
African American	76%	81%	77%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	72%	75%	75%	✓	●	●
White	91%	94%	92%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	61%	56%	67%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	73%	75%	75%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	86%	93%	87%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	71%	76%	74%	✓	●	N/A

¹Between White students and their African-American and Hispanic peers, and between Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged students

*Reflective of the Strategic Plan, Exhibits 1-5 are divided into two student cohorts: those who have been in AISD for at least three consecutive years (Cohort A), and those who have not (Cohort B). Based on historical and current performance data, students in Cohort A perform at higher levels than students in Cohort B. As a result, targets for Cohort A are correspondingly higher than those for Cohort B. In addition, targets are set higher for TAKS Reading, Writing, and Social Studies than for Math and Science, based on historical and current performance data.

Evaluation

- In Cohort A, targets were met or exceeded in 2 out of 8 student groups; in Cohort B, targets were met or exceeded in 7 out of 8 student groups
- In Cohort A, performance was unimproved in 6 out of 8 student groups; in Cohort B, performance improved in 7 out of 8 student groups
- None of the ethnic or economic gaps narrowed in Cohort A; in Cohort B, ethnic and economic gaps narrowed in 1 out of 3 student groups identified
- Although gains were made in Cohort B, it is important to note that the actual TAKS Reading performance of students in Cohort B is at a lower level than Cohort A, and targets for Cohort B are on average 12 percentage points lower than targets for Cohort A
- As a result of vertical scaling by the state, passing scores for students were increased in Reading in Grades 6 and 8.

✓ = Yes
 X = No
 ● = Improved
 ● = Stayed the Same
 ● = Did Not Improve
● = Already at or Exceeding 2015 Target



EXHIBIT 2: TAKS MATH PASSING RATES (Grades 5-11)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	79%	81%	81%	✓	●	N/A
African American	63%	69%	69%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	72%	75%	76%	X	●	●
White	94%	95%	95%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	59%	64%	66%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	69%	73%	73%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	90%	92%	92%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	61%	65%	67%	X	●	N/A

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	66%	73%	71%	✓	●	N/A
African American	51%	61%	59%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	60%	66%	67%	X	●	●
White	85%	88%	87%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	52%	56%	60%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	59%	65%	64%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	77%	85%	79%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	54%	57%	61%	X	●	N/A

¹Between White students and their African-American and Hispanic peers, and between Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged students

*Reflective of the Strategic Plan, Exhibits 1-5 are divided into two student cohorts: those who have been in AISD for at least three consecutive years (Cohort A), and those who have not (Cohort B). Based on historical and current performance data, students in Cohort A perform at higher levels than students in Cohort B. As a result, targets for Cohort A are correspondingly higher than those for Cohort B. In addition, targets are set higher for TAKS Reading, Writing, and Social Studies than for Math and Science, based on historical and current performance data.

Evaluation

- In both Cohort A and Cohort B, targets were met or exceeded in 5 out of 8 student groups
- In both Cohort A and Cohort B, performance improved in all 8 student groups
- All ethnic and economic gaps narrowed in Cohort A; in Cohort B, ethnic and economic gaps narrowed in 2 out of 3 student groups identified
- Although gains were made in Cohort B, it is important to note that the actual TAKS Math performance of students in Cohort B is at a lower level than Cohort A, and targets for Cohort B are on average almost 9 percentage points lower than targets for Cohort A



EXHIBIT 4: TAKS SCIENCE PASSING RATES (Grades 5, 8, 10, and 11)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	77%	80%	79%	✓	●	N/A
African American	62%	67%	68%	X	●	●
Hispanic	67%	73%	72%	✓	●	●
White	95%	96%	95%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	46%	56%	56%	✓	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	63%	70%	68%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	90%	93%	92%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	59%	57%	65%	X	●	N/A

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	59%	72%	64%	✓	●	N/A
African American	49%	65%	57%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	49%	62%	57%	✓	●	●
White	85%	92%	87%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	39%	45%	49%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	49%	61%	57%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	75%	89%	78%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	42%	51%	51%	✓	●	N/A

¹Between White students and their African-American and Hispanic peers, and between Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged students

*Reflective of the Strategic Plan, Exhibits 1-5 are divided into two student cohorts: those who have been in AISD for at least three consecutive years (Cohort A), and those who have not (Cohort B). Based on historical and current performance data, students in Cohort A perform at higher levels than students in Cohort B. As a result, targets for Cohort A are correspondingly higher than those for Cohort B. In addition, targets are set higher for TAKS Reading, Writing, and Social Studies than for Math and Science, based on historical and current performance data.

Evaluation

- In Cohort A, targets were met or exceeded in 6 out of 8 student groups; in Cohort B, targets were met or exceeded in 7 out of 8 student groups
- In Cohort A, performance improved in 7 out of 8 student groups; in Cohort B, performance improved in all 8 student groups
- All of the ethnic and economic gaps narrowed in Cohort A; in Cohort B, ethnic and economic gaps narrowed in 2 out of 3 student groups identified
- Although gains were made in Cohort B, it is important to note that the actual TAKS Science performance of students in Cohort B is at a lower level than Cohort A, and targets for Cohort B are on average almost 12 percentage points lower than targets for Cohort A



EXHIBIT 5: TAKS SOCIAL STUDIES PASSING RATES (Grades 8, 10, and 11)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	93%	94%	94%	✓	●	N/A
African American	87%	88%	90%	X	●	●
Hispanic	89%	91%	91%	✓	●	●
White	99%	99%	99%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	69%	79%	76%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	87%	90%	88%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	98%	98%	97%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	88%	76%	89%	X	●	N/A

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years*

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	79%	89%	79%	✓	●	N/A
African American	73%	86%	75%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	74%	85%	76%	✓	●	●
White	94%	98%	94%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	64%	74%	69%	✓	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	72%	84%	75%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	89%	96%	91%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	66%	68%	71%	X	●	N/A

¹Between White students and their African-American and Hispanic peers, and between Economically Disadvantaged and Not Economically Disadvantaged students

*Reflective of the Strategic Plan, Exhibits 1-5 are divided into two student cohorts: those who have been in AISD for at least three consecutive years (Cohort A), and those who have not (Cohort B). Based on historical and current performance data, students in Cohort A perform at higher levels than students in Cohort B. As a result, targets for Cohort A are correspondingly higher than those for Cohort B. In addition, targets are set higher for TAKS Reading, Writing, and Social Studies than for Math and Science, based on historical and current performance data.

Evaluation

- In Cohort A, targets were met or exceeded in 5 out of 8 student groups; in Cohort B, targets were met or exceeded in 7 out of 8 student groups
- In Cohort A, performance improved in 5 out of 8 student groups; in Cohort B, performance improved in all 8 student groups
- All of the ethnic and economic gaps narrowed in both Cohort A and Cohort B
- Although gains were made in Cohort B, it is important to note that the actual TAKS Social Studies performance of students in Cohort B is at a lower level than Cohort A, and targets for Cohort B are on average almost 12 percentage points lower than targets for Cohort A



GOAL 3 INDICATORS

EXHIBIT 6: COLLEGE READINESS

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Graduation Rate	75.6%	N/A ¹	76.9%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
English/Language Arts College Readiness	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	63%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Math College Readiness	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	65.7%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Post-Secondary Enrollment	66%	N/A ¹	65.3%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Advanced Course/ Dual Enrollment Completion	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	24.8%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Advanced Placement Test Scores at or above Criterion	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	54.3%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Enrollment in Advanced Placement Courses	50%	N/A ¹	51.6%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹

¹Data not available to determine at this time; subsequent Scorecards will provide more information, but will lag one year behind for these indicators

Evaluation

- Although performance improvements and meeting or exceeding 2010 targets cannot be determined at this time, Exhibit 6 has been included to verify that these indicators are being monitored during Strategic Plan implementation

EXHIBIT 7: KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Indicator (High School Exit Survey)	Actual 2009 ¹	Actual 2010 ¹	Target 2010 ¹	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Team Work	88%	89%	89%	✓	●
Creative Thinking	92%	90%	93%	X	●
Problem Solving	92%	92%	93%	X	●
Conflict Resolution	84%	84%	86%	X	●
Personal Health/Fitness	81%	81%	82%	X	●
Time Management	81%	83%	83%	✓	●
Technology	84%	84%	86%	X	●

¹Percentages indicate the number of students who responded “Well” or “Somewhat Well” to the High School Exit Survey question, “How well did your high school help you actively develop knowledge and skills in the following areas?”

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 2 out of 7 areas
- Performance improved in 2 out of 7 areas, and stayed the same in 4 areas

✓ = Yes
 X = No
 ● = Improved
 ● = Stayed the Same
 ● = Did Not Improve
● = Already at or Exceeding 2015 Target



EXHIBIT 8: LANGUAGE AND COMPUTER SKILLS

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Completion of 3 Years of the Same Language	41%	42%	44%	X	●
Proficiency in computer skills (Grade 5)	51%	52%	59%	X	●
Proficiency in computer skills (Grade 8)	57%	64%	63%	✓	●

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 2 out of 3 areas
- Performance improved in all 3 areas

EXHIBIT 9: COLLEGE INTENTION

Indicator (High School Exit Survey)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Visited a College	56%	53%	59%	X	●
Attended a College/ Career Fair	45%	49%	49%	✓	●
Submitted Transcripts	48%	46%	55%	X	●
Submitted a College Application (Any Type of College)	65%	70%	70%	✓	●
Submitted a College Application (2-Year College)	42%	50%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	●
Submitted a College Application (4-Year College)	63%	64%	68%	X	●
Submitted a College Application (Career College)	14%	11%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	●

¹Campus-level targets only

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 2 out of 5 applicable areas
- Performance improved in 4 out 7 areas



EXHIBIT 10: COLLEGE INTENTION

Indicator (Student Climate and High School Exit Surveys)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Planning to Attend College (Grade 6)	72%	75%	69%	✓	●
Planning to Attend College (Grade 7)	70%	71%	70%	✓	●
Planning to Attend College (Grade 8)	71%	73%	74%	X	●
Planning to Attend College (Grade 9)	71%	73%	69%	✓	●
Planning to Attend College (Grade 10)	75%	76%	73%	✓	●
Planning to Attend College (Grade 11)	77%	79%	74%	✓	●
Planning to Attend College (Grade 12)	93%	91%	94%	X	●
Completed ACC ¹ Application	82%	76%	85%	X	●
Completed ACC ¹ Assessment	43%	37%	45%	X	●
Received ACC ¹ Advising	38%	33%	41%	X	●
Enrolled in ACC ¹ College Start	25%	28%	29%	X	●

¹Austin Community College

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 5 out of 11 areas
- Performance improved in 7 out 11 areas

EXHIBIT 11: SCHOLARSHIPS AND FINANCIAL AID

Indicator (High School Exit Survey and Student Self-Reporting)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Submitted a FAFSA ¹ Application	49%	50%	54%	X	●
Submitted a Scholarship Application	40%	40%	45%	X	●
Scholarship Awards Reported	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²

¹Free Application for Federal Student Aid

²Data not available to determine at this time; subsequent Scorecards will provide more information

Evaluation

- Targets were not met or exceeded in either of the 2 applicable areas
- Performance improved in 1 of the 2 applicable areas, and stayed the same in the other



EXHIBIT 12: BUSINESS, CAREER, AND VOCATIONAL PREP

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Participation in CTE ¹ (Category 1)	40%	38%	N/A ²	N/A ²	●
Participation in CTE ¹ (Category 2)	11%	8%	N/A ²	N/A ²	●
Participation in CTE ¹ (Category 3)	4%	4%	N/A ²	N/A ²	●
Participation in CTE ¹ (All Categories)	55%	49%	N/A ²	N/A ²	●
Eligible for College Credit	19%	19%	20%	X	●
Number Attaining Industry Certification or License	537	523	525	X	●

¹ Career and Technology Education; Category 1 is participation in a CTE course; Category 2 is participation in a coherent sequence of CTE courses earning 3 or more credits; and Category 3 is Tech-Prep program participation
² Campus-level targets only

Evaluation

- Targets were not met or exceeded in either of the 2 applicable areas
- Performance did not improve in any of the 6 areas, but stayed the same in 2

EXHIBIT 13: GRADUATION PORTFOLIO

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Completion of Career Plan ¹	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Number of Elementary Schools Served by Dual Language Program ³ :					
Pre-K	N/A ²	10	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
K	N/A ²	10	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Grade 1	N/A ²	10	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Grade 2	N/A ²	0	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Grade 3	N/A ²	0	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Grade 4	N/A ²	0	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Grade 5	N/A ²	0	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²

¹ With specific goals, strategies, and action steps
² Data not available to determine at this time; subsequent Scorecards will provide more information
³ One-Way and/or Two-Way Dual Language

Evaluation

- Although performance improvements and meeting or exceeding 2010 targets cannot be determined at this time, Exhibit 13 has been included to verify that these indicators are being monitored during Strategic Plan implementation
- 2010 is a pilot year for the Dual Language, and the program will be expanded beyond the 10 schools currently being served



EXHIBIT 14: FINE ARTS AND ATHLETICS

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Band/Orchestra	7%	7%	8%	X	●
Choir/Chorus	3%	3%	3%	✓	●
Drama	2%	3%	2%	✓	●
Art	4%	6%	5%	✓	●
Dance/Drill Team	4%	5%	4%	✓	●
Athletics ¹	19%	21%	20.3%	✓	●

¹Football, basketball, baseball, softball, volleyball, soccer, track, cross country, golf, swimming, wrestling, tennis

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 4 out of 6 areas
- Performance improved in 4 out of 6 areas, and stayed the same in the other 2

EXHIBIT 15: NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve? ¹
Reading (Grade 4)	32%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Math (Grade 4)	38%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Reading (Grade 8)	30%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Math (Grade 8)	39%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	N/A ¹

¹NAEP was conducted in 2009 and is conducted every other year, so there are no results for 2010; subsequent Scorecards will provide more information

Evaluation

- Although performance improvements and meeting or exceeding 2010 targets are not applicable at this time, Exhibit 15 has been included to verify that these indicators are being monitored during Strategic Plan implementation



EXHIBIT 16: ACADEMIC SELF-CONFIDENCE

Indicator (Student Climate Survey)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Overall Self-Confidence ¹ (Elementary Schools)	3.54	3.51	3.57	X	●
Overall Self-Confidence ¹ (Middle Schools)	3.26	3.26	3.31	X	●
Overall Self-Confidence ¹ (High Schools)	3.17	3.22	3.22	✓	●

¹Aggregate score of several Student Climate Survey items related to Academic Self-Confidence, with 4 being the highest score

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 1 out of 3 areas
- Performance improved in 1 out of 3 areas, and stayed the same in one other

EXHIBIT 17: STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Indicator (Student Climate Survey)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Overall Student Engagement ¹ (Elementary Schools)	N/A ²	3.26	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Overall Student Engagement ¹ (Middle Schools)	N/A ²	2.75	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²
Overall Student Engagement ¹ (High Schools)	N/A ²	2.77	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²

¹Aggregate score of several Student Climate Survey items related to Student Engagement, with 4 being the highest score

²Not all of the related items on the survey were the same in 2009 and 2010; however, the survey items will be standardized and subsequent scorecards will provide more information

Evaluation

- Although performance improvements and meeting or exceeding 2010 targets are not applicable at this time, Exhibit 17 has been included to verify that these indicators are being monitored during Strategic Plan implementation



EXHIBIT 18: HEALTH AND FITNESS

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Passed Cardiovascular Test (Elementary Schools)	79%	N/A ²	83%	N/A ²	N/A ²
Passed Cardiovascular Test (Middle Schools)	59%	67%	66%	✓	●
Passed Cardiovascular Test (High Schools)	42%	N/A ²	52%	N/A ²	N/A ²
Healthy BMI ¹ (Elementary Schools)	58%	N/A ²	65%	N/A ²	N/A ²
Healthy BMI ¹ (Elementary Schools)	57%	60%	64%	X	●
Healthy BMI ¹ (Elementary Schools)	64%	N/A ²	70%	N/A ²	N/A ²

¹Body Mass Index

²Data not available to determine at this time; subsequent Scorecards will provide more information

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 1 out of 2 applicable areas
- Performance improved in both applicable areas

GOAL 4 INDICATORS

EXHIBIT 19: DISTRICT-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY (State and Federal Systems)

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
District Rating under State Accountability System ¹	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	✓	●
District Rating under Federal Accountability System ²	Did Not Meet AYP	Did Not Meet AYP	Met AYP	X	●

¹Possible ratings include Exemplary, Recognized, Acceptable, and Academically Unacceptable

²Possible ratings include Met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and Did Not Meet AYP

Evaluation

- The target for state accountability was met, but not for federal accountability
- Performance ratings stayed the same for both state and federal accountability



EXHIBIT 20: CAMPUS-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY (State System)

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Number of Campuses with Exemplary Ratings:					
High Schools	1	2 ¹	1	✓	●
Middle Schools	0	1 ¹	1	✓	●
Elementary Schools	23	30	30	✓	●
Number of Campuses with Recognized Ratings:					
High Schools	0	4	2	✓	●
Middle Schools	1	6	3	✓	●
Elementary Schools	29	26	29	X	●
Number of Campuses with Acceptable Ratings:					
High Schools	7	7	10	X	●
Middle Schools	12	12	15	X	●
Elementary Schools	26	22	19	✓	●
Number of Campuses with Academically Unacceptable Ratings:					
High Schools	3	1	0	X	●
Middle Schools	5	0	0	✓	●
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	✓	●

¹Includes Ann Richards School, both at the high school and middle school Levels

Evaluation

- Targets were met or exceeded in 8 out of 12 areas
- Performance was unimproved in only 2 out of 12 areas
- Except for the 1 Academically Unacceptable rating, the relatively few cases of not meeting or exceeding the 2010 target and not showing improvement are countered by more schools achieving higher ratings under the state accountability system