



Austin Independent School District

AISD STRATEGIC PLAN:

2011 Scorecard

*Last Revised
September 27, 2011*



BACKGROUND

The AISD Strategic Plan for 2010-2015 was developed with 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 plan was guided by the aspirations of the Board relating to educational philosophy, student achievement, fiscal management, district operations, and performance monitoring. Strategic Plan development was assisted by a Strategic Plan Task Force consisting of broad community representation.

The AISD Strategic Plan was formally approved by the Board December 2009 and updated January 2011. The plan is used by the district to align district planning efforts and to inform budgetary development and decision-making. The same high levels of stakeholder engagement and transparency 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 progress of the plan metrics. The Scorecard assesses the level of implementation by comparing performance results to established targets, and by comparing current and previous results to determine whether improvement has occurred. The Scorecard is part of an overall “reporting rhythm” of the district that includes the Start of School Year Report, Annual Report, State of the District Address, and End of School Year Report. It is important to note that in most cases the targets set in the Strategic Plan far exceed those set for the district under state and federal accountability criteria. For example, the state “passing” standard for TAKS Reading is 70% while the 2010-2011 AISD targets (see Exhibits 1 and 2) for Cohorts A and B (i.e., “All Students”) are 93% and 83%, respectively.

Data for 2011 reflect the revised Strategic Plan measurable outcomes and include results for students in grades 3-11. 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 results, 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. The complete annual scorecard will be provided in fall 2011 when data are available for all the goals and strategies.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2011 Strategic Plan Scorecard consists of 23 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 19-23) – All schools will meet or exceed state accountability standards, and the district will meet federal standards and exceed state standards.



Overall, the results show real progress toward the targets of the AISD Strategic Plan. For example, Exhibits 1-5 include 80 outcome measures and associated targets that reflect the key performance measures included in the plan for the five “core” curriculum areas. In 2010-2011, gains were achieved on 60 of the 80 indicators (or the target for 2014-2015 was already achieved). For 10 additional outcomes, the performance level remained unchanged in 2010-2011. In addition, the 2011 targets were achieved for 50 of the 80 academic indicators.

For Goal 3 and 4, gains were achieved for many additional outcomes. For example, the graduation and completion rates both increased by nearly one percentage point, and the district-wide attendance rate increased by 0.5%, increasing revenue to the district by nearly \$2.5 million. The percentage of students reporting that they applied to a four-year college increased to 72% as did the percentage reporting that they visited a college campus (57%); ninety-one percent (91%) of the seniors said that they intend to attend college, and the percentage indicating that they completed a FAFSA (financial aid) application increased by five percentage points to 57%.

Nearly one in ten students in grades 11-12 participated in either band or orchestra for three consecutive years, and 20% participated in athletics for three consecutive years. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the exiting seniors said that their high school prepared them “well” or “somewhat well” to solve problems, and the large majority reported that their school prepared them to think creatively (91%). Eighty-six percent (86%) said their high school helped them develop knowledge and skills in technology, and 83% said that their school helped them develop knowledge and skills related to health and fitness.

At the elementary and middle school levels, students reported being more engaged in their school, and students at all three levels on average reported have higher academic self-confidence compared to the previous year (see Exhibit 16). Overall, more than 70% of the AISD students passed the district’s cardiovascular test.

In regard to Goal 4, however, as a result of the state and federal accountability changes, relatively few of the 2011 AISD targets were met. For example, at the state level AISD again achieved the state accountability rating of “academically acceptable” but the district failed to achieve the federal AYP target for the third consecutive year. In addition, the number of campuses rated exemplary decreased at the middle and elementary levels and the number of campuses rated recognized decreased at the middle and high school levels. As the number of exemplary and recognized campuses decline, the number of campuses rated as academically acceptable increased at the high school and elementary school level. However, it should be noted that again in 2010-2011, no AISD elementary schools were rated academically unacceptable (see Exhibits 19-20).



GOAL 1 AND GOAL 2 INDICATORS

EXHIBIT 1: TAKS READING PASSING RATES (Grades 3-11)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	89%	88%	89%	93%	X	●	N/A
African American	84%	83%	84%	91%	X	●	●
Hispanic	85%	83%	85%	92%	X	●	●
White	98%	98%	98%	98%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	75%	73%	74%	85%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	84%	82%	83%	91%	X	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	97%	97%	97%	98%	X	●	N/A
Special Education	82%	79%	81%	91%	X	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort A

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort A (+1). However, the targets were met or exceeded in 1 of 8 groups.
- Gains were achieved in 6 of the 8 student groups, and an additional group has already achieved the 2015 target.
- The largest gains were achieved by the Hispanic (+2) and Special Education (+2) student groups.
- Small reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by all three student groups (see footnote 1).

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	80%	83%	84%	83%	✓	●	N/A
African American	76%	82%	82%	79%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	75%	77%	78%	78%	✓	●	●
White	92%	95%	96%	94%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	65%	64%	63%	75%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	75%	77%	78%	78%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	89%	94%	95%	90%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	71%	78%	81%	77%	✓	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort B

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort B (+1), and the targets were met or exceeded by 7 of the 8 student groups.
- Gains were achieved 6 of the 8 student groups. Achievement remained the same for one group.
- The largest gains were achieved by the Special Education (+3) student group.
- The achievement gaps for all 3 groups either remained the same or became slightly larger (see footnote 1).

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



EXHIBIT 2: TAKS MATH PASSING RATES (Grades 3-11)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	80%	82%	85%	83%	✓	●	N/A
African American	66%	72%	74%	75%	X	●	●
Hispanic	74%	77%	81%	81%	✓	●	●
White	95%	95%	96%	96%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	68%	72%	75%	76%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	72%	75%	79%	77%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	92%	93%	94%	94%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	70%	69%	76%	77%	X	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort A

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort A (+3), and the targets were met or exceeded by 5 of 8 student groups.
- Gains in mathematics were achieved by all 8 student groups.
- The largest gains were achieved by the Hispanic (+4), Economically Disadvantaged (+4), and Special Education (+7) student groups.
- Reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by all three student groups (see footnote 1).

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	66%	76%	79%	75%	✓	●	N/A
African American	53%	64%	72%	68%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	61%	71%	74%	74%	✓	●	●
White	83%	89%	91%	88%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	56%	65%	66%	69%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	60%	69%	73%	70%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	77%	87%	89%	80%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	54%	62%	72%	68%	✓	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort B

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort B (+3), and the targets were met or exceeded by 7 of the 8 student groups.
- Gains in mathematics were achieved by all 8 student groups.
- The largest gains were achieved by the African American (+8), Economically Disadvantaged (+4), and Special Education (+10) student groups.
- Reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by all three student groups (see footnote 1).

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



EXHIBIT 3: TAKS WRITING PASSING RATES (Grades 4 & 7)

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	90%	91%	92%	93%	X	●	N/A
African American	86%	88%	87%	92%	X	●	●
Hispanic	87%	88%	90%	92%	X	●	●
White	97%	97%	98%	98%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	82%	85%	86%	91%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	85%	87%	89%	92%	X	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	97%	97%	97%	98%	X	●	N/A
Special Education	70%	80%	78%	83%	X	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort A

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort A (+1). However, the targets were met or exceeded by 1 of 8 groups.
- Gains were achieved in 4 of the 8 student groups. An additional group has already achieved the 2015 target while the performance by two groups declined.
- The largest gains were achieved by the Hispanic (+2) and Economically Disadvantaged (+2) student groups.
- Small reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by 2 of the 3 student groups (see footnote 1).

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	83%	88%	89%	84%	✓	●	N/A
African American	77%	83%	87%	79%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	80%	86%	86%	80%	✓	●	●
White	92%	95%	96%	94%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	73%	82%	80%	78%	✓	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	78%	85%	86%	79%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	94%	97%	96%	95%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	72%	75%	80%	77%	✓	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort B

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort B (+1), and the targets were met or exceeded by all 8 student groups.
- Gains were achieved 5 of the 8 student groups. Achievement remained the same for one group while the performance of two groups declined.
- The largest gains were achieved by the African American (+4) Special Education (+5) student group.
- Reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by 2 of the 3 student groups (see footnote 1).

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



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

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	77%	80%	81%	81%	✓	●	N/A
African American	62%	67%	69%	74%	X	●	●
Hispanic	67%	73%	74%	77%	X	●	●
White	95%	96%	96%	96%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	46%	56%	54%	65%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	63%	70%	71%	73%	X	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	90%	93%	93%	93%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	59%	57%	59%	72%	X	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort A

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort A (+1). However, the targets were met or exceeded by 3 of 8 groups.
- Gains were achieved in 5 of the 8 student groups, while the performance of two groups remained the same and one group declined.
- The largest gains were achieved by the African American (+2) Special Education (+2) student group.
- Small reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by all three student groups (see footnote 1).

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	59%	72%	74%	70%	✓	●	N/A
African American	49%	65%	63%	64%	X	●	●
Hispanic	49%	62%	67%	64%	✓	●	●
White	85%	92%	92%	89%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	39%	45%	51%	60%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	49%	61%	66%	64%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	75%	89%	88%	82%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	42%	51%	61%	61%	✓	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort B

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort B (+2), and the targets were met or exceeded by 6 of the 8 student groups.
- Gains were achieved 5 of the 8 student groups. Achievement remained the same for one group and one group has already met the 2015 target.
- The largest gains were achieved by the Hispanic (+5), LEP (+6), Economically Disadvantaged (+5), and Special Education (+10) student groups.
- Reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by 2 of the 3 student groups (see footnote 1).

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



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

Cohort A: Students in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	93%	94%	94%	94%	✓	●	N/A
African American	87%	88%	90%	92%	X	●	●
Hispanic	89%	91%	92%	93%	X	●	●
White	99%	99%	99%	99%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	69%	79%	77%	83%	X	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	87%	90%	90%	89%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	98%	98%	98%	96%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	88%	76%	77%	89%	X	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort A

- Overall, achievement remain unchanged in Cohort A (+0), and the targets were met or exceeded in 4 of 8 groups.
- Gains were achieved in 3 of the 8 student groups, two additional groups stayed the same, and two groups have already achieved the 2015 target.
- The largest gains were achieved by the African American (+2) student group.
- Small reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by 2 of the 3 student groups (see footnote 1).

Cohort B: Students NOT in AISD for at Least Three Consecutive Years (AISD Performance Targets)

Student Group	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?	Did We Narrow the Gaps? ¹
All Students	79%	89%	91%	83%	✓	●	N/A
African American	73%	86%	85%	78%	✓	●	●
Hispanic	74%	85%	88%	78%	✓	●	●
White	94%	98%	97%	95%	✓	●	N/A
Limited English Proficiency	64%	74%	79%	75%	✓	●	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	72%	84%	86%	77%	✓	●	●
Not Economically Disadvantaged	89%	96%	96%	93%	✓	●	N/A
Special Education	66%	68%	77%	75%	✓	●	N/A

Evaluation – Cohort B

- Overall, gains were achieved in Cohort B (+2), and the targets were met or exceeded by all 8 student groups.
- Gains were achieved 5 of the 8 student groups, while the performance of two groups declined.
- The largest gains were achieved by the Hispanic (+3), LEP (+5), and Special Education (+9) student groups.
- Reductions in achievement gaps were achieved by 2 of the 3 student groups (see footnote 1).

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



GOAL 3 INDICATORS

EXHIBIT 6: COLLEGE READINESS

Indicator	Class of 2009	Class of 2010	Class of 2011	Target 2010	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Graduation Rate (Class of)	75.6%	78.6%	N/A ¹	79.4%	X	●
Post-Secondary Enrollment	66%	62%	N/A ¹	67.7%	X	●

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2009	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2009 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
English/Language Arts College Readiness (Class of)	62%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	63.0%	X	●
Math College Readiness (Class of)	63%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	65.7%	X	●
Advanced Course/ Dual Enrollment Completion	24.5%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	24.8%	X	●
Advanced Placement Test Scores at or above Criterion	52.4%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	54.3%	X	●
Enrollment in Advanced Placement Courses	50%	43%	47% ²	53% ²	X	●

Evaluation – College Readiness

- Class of 2010 graduation rate increased (+3), but did not meet the target.
- Based on data from the National Student Clearinghouse, the post-secondary enrollment rate declined.
- Both the official graduation data and the Clearinghouse data lag one year behind other indicators.
- Class of 2011 AP enrollment increased (+4), but did not meet the target².

¹ Data not available to determine at this time; Targets for most recent year available have been used.

² For AP enrollment, the target does not lag one year; the target is for 2010-2011.

EXHIBIT 7: MEASURES OF SELF CONFIDENCE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL

Indicator (High School Exit Survey)	Actual 2009 ¹	Actual 2010 ¹	Actual 2011 ¹	Target 2011 ¹	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Team Work	88%	89%	91%	90.0%	✓	●
Creative Thinking	92%	90%	91%	91.5%	X	●
Problem Solving	92%	92%	92%	94.0%	X	●
Conflict Resolution	84%	84%	84%	87.5%	X	●
Personal Health/Fitness	81%	81%	83%	83.5%	X	●
Time Management	81%	83%	83%	84.5%	X	●
Technology	84%	84%	86%	87.5%	X	●

Evaluation – Self Confidence and Attitudes toward School (87% response rate)

- While the majority of the seniors responded favorably to all seven questions (83-92%), only 1 target was achieved.
- For 4 of the 7 areas, the responses were more favorable in 2011; results for the other 3 areas remaining the same.
- The largest gains were in relation to “team work” (+2), “personal health and fitness” (+2), and “technology” (+2).

¹ indicate the percentage 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?”



EXHIBIT 8: LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND COMPUTER PROFICIENCY

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Completion of 3 Years of the Same Language	41%	42%	42%	47%	X	●
Proficiency in computer skills (Grade 5)	51%	52%	91% ¹	66%	✓	●
Proficiency in computer skills (Grade 8)	57%	64%	87% ¹	70%	✓	●

Evaluation – World and Computer Language Proficiency

- The percentage of high school students completing three years of a world language remained the same, and the 2011 target was not met.
- At the 5th and 8th grade level, performance on the Tech Literacy Assessment improved dramatically.

EXHIBIT 9: COLLEGE INTENTION

Indicator (High School Exit Survey) ²	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Visited a College	57%	55%	57%	62%	X	●
Attended a College/ Career Fair	47%	51%	47%	52%	X	●
Submitted Transcripts	49%	48%	54%	62%	X	●
Submitted a College Application (Any Type of College)	83%	85%	84%	86%	X	●
Submitted a College Application (2-Year College)	51%	57%	62%	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ³
Submitted a College Application (4-Year College)	70%	69%	72%	78%	X	●
Submitted a College Application (Career College)	19%	15%	12%	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ³

Evaluation – College Intentions

- The large the majority of the seniors responded that they had applied to “any type of college” (84%); however, that percentage was a slight decrease from the previous year and below the 2010-11 target.
- The % reporting that they attended a college/career fair declined (47%), and none of the 5 targets in Exhibit 9 were achieved.
- Conversely, gains were achieved on 3 of the 5 indicators with gains in the percentage of students indicating that they visited a college (57%), submitted transcripts (54%), and submitted an application to a 4-year college (72%).

¹ The computer proficiency assessment changed in 2011 to include multiple categories. According to the publisher, the Strategic plan targets and prior year performance generally correspond to the level of Basic on the new 21st Century Skills Assessment.

² Results for 2009 and 2010 from the High School Exit Survey were revised to match the methodology used in 2011.

³ Campus-level targets only



EXHIBIT 10: COLLEGE PLANNING AND PREPARATIONS

Indicator (Student Climate and High School Exit Surveys)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Planning to Attend College-Grade 6	72%	75%	75%	79%	X	●
Planning to Attend College-Grade 7	70%	71%	75%	76%	X	●
Planning to Attend College-Grade 8	71%	73%	74%	76%	X	●
Planning to Attend College-Grade 9	71%	73%	73%	76%	X	●
Planning to Attend College-Grade 10	75%	76%	75%	79%	X	●
Planning to Attend College-Grade 11	77%	79%	77%	79%	X	●
Planning to Attend College-Grade 12	93%	92%	91%	94%	X	●
Completed ACC ¹ Application	82%	76%	81%	88%	X	●
Completed ACC ¹ Assessment	43%	37%	43%	48%	X	●
Received ACC ¹ Advising	38%	33%	40%	45%	X	●
Enrolled in ACC ¹ College Start	25%	28%	29%	32%	X	●

Evaluation – College Planning and Preparation

- While 91% of 12th grade students said they plan to attend college, none of the 7 grade level targets were met.
- While the percentages of students at grades 6-9 indicating that they planned to attend college either increased or remained the same, percentages for grades 10-12 decreased slightly.
- In regard to the four ACC indicators, the percentages increased for all four indicators, though none of the targets was met.

¹Austin Community College

EXHIBIT 11: SCHOLARSHIPS AND FINANCIAL AID

Indicator (High School Exit Survey and Student Self-Reporting)	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Submitted a FAFSA ¹ Application	50%	52%	57%	59%	X	●
Submitted a Scholarship Application	40%	40%	44%	49%	X	●
Awarded Scholarship	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²	N/A ²

Evaluation – College Scholarships and Financial Aid

- The percentage of seniors reporting that they completed a FAFSA (+5) and scholarship application (+4) increased.
- The targets were not achieved, however, even though progress was made.

¹Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

²Data are not available for this indicator at this time; self-report data.



EXHIBIT 12: BUSINESS, CAREER, AND VOCATIONAL PREP

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Participation in CTE ¹ : Category 1	40%	38%	N/A ²	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ²
Participation in CTE ¹ : Category 2	11%	8%	N/A ²	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ²
Participation in CTE ¹ : Category 3	4%	4%	N/A ²	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ²
Participation in CTE ¹ : All Categories	55%	49%	N/A ²	N/A ³	N/A ³	N/A ²
Eligible for College Credit	19%	19%	N/A ²	22%	N/A ²	N/A ²
Number Attaining Industry Certification or License	537	523	N/A ²	549	N/A ²	N/A ²

Evaluation – CTE Participation, College Credit, and Certifications/Licenses

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 Data are not yet available for 2010-11

³ Campus-level targets only

EXHIBIT 13: GRADUATION PORTFOLIO, CAREER PLAN, DUAL LANGUAGE, and PUBLIC SPEAKING

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 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	N/A ²

Evaluation – Graduation Portfolios and Career Plans

¹ Career plans must have specific goals, strategies, and action steps

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

Indicator	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Number of Elementary Schools served by Dual Language programs ¹					
Pre-K	0	14	6	✓	●
K	0	14	6	✓	●
Grade 1	0	14	6	✓	●
Grade 2	0	0	0	✓	●
Grade 3	0	0	0	✓	●
Grade 4	0	0	0	✓	●
Grade 5	0	0	0	✓	●

Evaluation – Dual Language Implementation

- One- way Dual Language pilot programs were introduced at 10 elementary schools, and two-way dual language was introduced at 4 elementary schools in 2010-2011.
- All the dual language implementation targets were met in 2010-2011.

¹ One-Way and/or Two-Way Dual Language



EXHIBIT 14: FINE ARTS AND ATHLETICS (participation for three consecutive years)

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Band/Orchestra	10%	10%	9%	11.3%	X	●
Choir/Chorus	3%	3%	3%	3.7%	X	●
Drama	2%	3%	2%	2.7%	X	●
Art	4%	5%	5%	6.0%	X	●
Dance/Drill Team	5%	6%	5%	5.7%	X	●
Athletics ¹	18%	18%	20%	20.7%	X	●

Evaluation – Fine Arts and Athletics

- The only “course” with increased enrollment in 2010-2011 was athletics, while participation in art and choir/chorus remained unchanged.
- None of the fine arts and athletics targets were achieved.

¹ Athletics with course codes including football, basketball, baseball, softball, volleyball, soccer, track, cross country, golf, swimming, wrestling, and tennis.

EXHIBIT 15: NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve? ¹
Reading-Grade 4	32%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	34.7%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Math-Grade 4	38%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	42.7%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Reading-Grade 8	30%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	36.0%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹
Math-Grade 8	39%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	43.7%	N/A ¹	N/A ¹

¹ NAEP was conducted in 2009 and is conducted every other year, so there are no results for 2010; subsequent Scorecards will provide more information. 2011 results will become available starting in November 2011.

EXHIBIT 16: ACADEMIC SELF-CONFIDENCE

Indicator (Student Climate Survey) ¹	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Overall Self-Confidence ² Elementary School	3.56	3.54	3.59	3.60	X	●
Overall Self-Confidence ² Middle School	3.26	3.26	3.30	3.36	X	●
Overall Self-Confidence ² High School	3.15	3.19	3.20	3.26	X	●

Evaluation – Academic Self-Confidence

- Gains were achieved on 3 of the 3 academic self-confidence indicators, with the largest gains at the elementary and middle school levels.
- However, none of the 3 targets were achieved in 2010-2011.

¹ Survey participation ranges from 88% for elementary students to 72% at the middle school level and 59% at the high school level.

² Aggregate score of several Student Climate Survey items related to Academic Self-Confidence, with 4 being the highest score.



EXHIBIT 17: STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Indicator (Student Climate Survey) ¹	Actual 2009 ³	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Student Engagement ² Elementary School	N/A ²	3.26	3.28	3.33	X	●
Student Engagement ² Middle School	N/A ²	2.75	2.76	2.84	X	●
Student Engagement ² High School	N/A ²	2.77	2.74	2.87	X	●

Evaluation – Student Engagement

- Gains were achieved on 2 of the 3 student engagement indicators, while the rating declined slightly at the high school level.
- However, none of the 3 targets were achieved in 2010-2011.

¹Survey participation ranges from 88% for elementary students to 72% at the middle school level and 59% at the high school level.

²Aggregate score of several Student Climate Survey items related to Student Engagement, with 4 being the highest score

³Not all of the related items on the survey were included in 2009.

EXHIBIT 18: HEALTH AND FITNESS

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Passed Cardiovascular Test- Elementary School	78%	79%	73% ²	81%	X	●
Passed Cardiovascular Test- Middle School	59%	68%	72% ²	75%	X	●
Passed Cardiovascular Test- High School	45%	45%	68% ²	47%	✓	●
Healthy BMI ¹ - Elementary School	57%	56%	57%	54%	✓	●
Healthy BMI ¹ - Middle School	57%	59%	59%	59%	✓	●
Healthy BMI ¹ - High School	65%	66%	66%	66%	✓	●

Evaluation – Health and Fitness

- For 5 of the 6 health and fitness indicators, performance improved or remained the same in 2010-2011.
- Large gains (+23) were achieved at the middle school level on the cardiovascular criteria (aerobic capacity), while performance at the elementary level declined (-6).
- The targets were met for 4 of the 6 indicators.

¹Body Mass Index

²Cardiovascular (Aerobic Capacity) criteria changed in 2010-11.



GOAL 4 INDICATORS

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

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Estimated 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
District Rating under State Accountability System ¹	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	✓	●
District Rating under Federal Accountability System ²	Did Not Meet AYP	Did Not Meet AYP	Did Not Meet AYP	Met AYP	X	●

Evaluation – District Level Accountability (State and Federal)

- AISD achieved the state accountability rating of academically acceptable, the same rating achieved in 2009-2010.
- AISD did not achieve the federal AYP target for the third consecutive year.
- As a result of exceeding the 3% cap for students with disabilities, over 1,100 passing scores could not be counted. (The cap applies when the number of passers who took either the TAKS-M or TAKS-Alt exceeds 3% of the tested population.)

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

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

EXHIBIT 20: CAMPUS-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY (State System)

Indicator	Actual 2009	Actual 2010	Estimated 2011 ¹	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Number of Campuses with Exemplary Ratings:						
High Schools	1	1	2	1	✓	●
Middle Schools	0	1	0	1	✓	●
Elementary Schools	23	30	21	40	X	●
Number of Campuses with Recognized Ratings:						
High Schools	0	4	1	3	X	●
Middle Schools	1	6	2	6	X	●
Elementary Schools	29	26	30	25	✓	●
Number of Campuses with Acceptable Ratings:						
High Schools	7	7	9	9	✓	●
Middle Schools	12	12	10	12	X	●
Elementary Schools	26	22	28	13	✓	●
Number of Campuses with Academically Unacceptable Ratings:						
High Schools	3	1	2	0	X	●
Middle Schools	5	0	6	0	X	●
Elementary Schools	0	0	0	0	✓	●



Evaluation – Campus Level Accountability (State)

- As a result of the state’s elimination of TPM, the number of campuses rated exemplary decreased at the middle and elementary levels, and the number of campuses rated recognized decreased at the middle and high school levels.
- As the number of exemplary and recognized campuses decline, the number of campuses rated as academically acceptable increased at the high school and elementary school level. As a result, overall 5 of the 12 targets were achieved.
- It should be noted that again in 2010-2011, no AISD elementary schools were rated as academically unacceptable.

Note. For Exemplary, Recognized, and Acceptable ratings, an increase in the number of schools is considered an improvement; for Academically Unacceptable ratings, and increase in the number is not considered an improvement. Revisions to the Strategic Plan are necessary in 2011-12 due to the changing number of schools rated each year.

¹In 2011, Rosedale was rated for the first time, received a rating of Acceptable.

EXHIBIT 21: ATTENDANCE RATES

Indicator	2009 Baseline	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2011	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2011 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Elementary Schools						
All Students	96.4%	96.1%	96.1%	96.3%	X	●
African American	95.6%	95.3%	95.3%	96.3%	X	●
Hispanic	96.5%	96.2%	96.2%	97.3%	X	●
White	96.5%	96.1%	96.3%	97.3%	X	●
Economically Disadvantaged	96.3%	96.0%	96.0%	96.3%	X	●
Middle Schools						
All Students	94.7%	94.7%	95.1%	95.7%	X	●
African American	93.5%	93.5%	94.1%	94.3%	X	●
Hispanic	94.3%	94.3%	94.8%	94.7%	✓	●
White	95.6%	95.6%	95.8%	96.7%	X	●
Economically Disadvantaged	93.9%	93.9%	94.6%	94.7%	X	●
High Schools						
All Students	90.0%	90.7%	91.7%	92.0%	X	●
African American	88.3%	88.8%	90.1%	90.0%	✓	●
Hispanic	88.1%	89.1%	90.5%	90.0%	✓	●
White	93.0%	93.3%	93.9%	95.0%	X	●
Economically Disadvantaged	88.1%	89.1%	91.3%	90.0%	✓	●

Evaluation – Attendance Rates

- Gains were achieved on all 10 attendance indicators at the secondary level although only 4 of the 10 targets were achieved.
- The largest gain was at the high school level where a 1.0 percentage point gain was achieved.
- At the elementary level, the attendance rates for “all students” and three of the student groups remained unchanged; and attendance for the fifth student group increased but none of the five targets were achieved at the elementary level.
- Overall, the 0.5 percentage point increase in ADA resulted in a \$2.46 million increase in revenue to the district.



EXHIBIT 22: FOUR-YEAR COMPLETION RATE

Indicator	Class of 2009 Baseline	Actual Class of 2010	Actual Class of 2011	Target Class of 2010 ¹	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
All Students	88.6%	89.8%	N/A ¹	90.7%	X	●
African American	85.7%	86.3%	N/A ¹	87.8%	X	●
Hispanic	84.9%	87.0%	N/A ¹	86.9%	✓	●
White	94.3%	95.0%	N/A ¹	95.9%	X	●
Limited English Proficiency	73.2%	77.1%	N/A ¹	75.5%	✓	●
Economically Disadvantaged	86.5%	89.4%	N/A ¹	88.7%	✓	●
Special Education	80.9%	81.7%	N/A ¹	82.9%	X	●

Evaluation – Attendance Rates

- The four-year completion rate increased for every student group with the “all students” rate increasing by 1.2 percentage points.
- The larger gains were achieved by the Hispanic (+2.1), LEP (+3.9), and Economically Disadvantage (+2.9) student groups and the targets were achieved for the three groups.
- Completion rates are included in the state accountability system.

¹ Completion rate data lag one year behind. Targets for the Class of 2010 are used for this indicator.

EXHIBIT 23: ANNUAL DROPOUT RATES

Indicator	2009 Baseline	Actual 2010	Actual 2011	Target 2010 ¹	Did We Meet or Exceed Our 2010 Target?	Did Our Performance Improve?
Grade 7-8						
All Students	0.30%	0.30%	N/A ¹	0.25%	X	●
African American	0.30%	0.20%	N/A ¹	0.25%	✓	●
Hispanic	0.40%	0.30%	N/A ¹	0.33%	✓	●
White	0.00%	0.10%	N/A ¹	0.00%	X	●
Limited English Proficiency	0.70%	0.40%	N/A ¹	0.58%	✓	●
Economically Disadvantaged	0.30%	0.30%	N/A ¹	0.25%	X	●
Special Education	0.50%	0.50%	N/A ¹	0.42%	X	●
Grade 9-12						
All Students	4.00%	4.00%	N/A ¹	3.43%	X	●
African American	4.80%	4.80%	N/A ¹	4.12%	X	●
Hispanic	5.40%	5.40%	N/A ¹	4.63%	X	●
White	1.70%	1.30%	N/A ¹	1.47%	✓	●
Limited English Proficiency	7.50%	7.00%	N/A ¹	6.43%	X	●
Economically Disadvantaged	3.10%	3.40%	N/A ¹	2.67%	X	●
Special Education	6.10%	6.60%	N/A ¹	5.23%	X	●

Evaluation – Annual Dropout Rates

- Overall, the annual dropout rates remained unchanged for the “all students” groups for grades 7-8 and grades 9-12. (Grades 7-8 are included in the state accountability system.)
- Performance on 11 of the 15 indicators either improved or remained unchanged, and the targets were met by four of the groups.
- The dropout rate increased for three student groups including the White student group at grades 7-8 and the Economically Disadvantaged and Special Education student groups at grades 9-12.

¹ Dropout rate data lag one year behind. Targets for 2009-2010 are used for this indicator.

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