

# Stockdale Independent School District



## District Improvement Plan 2010-2011

Stockdale ISD Board Approved on December 13, 2010.

## **2010-2011 Stockdale ISD Board of Trustees**

President	Salvador Urrabazo, Jr.
Vice President	Rick Rutland
Secretary	Teri Wolff
Member	Patricia Donsbach
Member	Teri Dugi
Member	Barry Osborne II
Member	Leroy Sanchez

### **Stockdale Independent School District Mission Statement**

The mission of Stockdale Independent School District, in partnership with the community, is to prepare all students to be contributing members of society and function independently in a quality manner by providing a challenging, caring learning environment.

**2010 – 2011 Stockdale ISD Site-Based Committee  
Districtwide Educational Improvement Committee**

**Superintendent**

Paul Darilek

**Administrators**

Roxanne Seidel – Board Designee (SCE)  
Sharon Dunn – Non-classroom Professional

**Counselor**

Sonya Pruski – High School

**Special Education**

Barbara Freasier – Elementary

**Librarian**

Ginger Jackson

**Paraprofessional**

Susan Washburn

**Business**

Sharon West

**Teachers**

Jennifer Heerssen – Junior High  
Amanda Driffill – Teacher (GT)  
Eryn Larrison – High School  
Barbara Koehler – Elementary  
Rochelle Lopez – Junior High  
Brigit Lucas – Elementary  
Venicia Monita – Elementary (ESL)

**Elementary Parent**

Barbara Elmore

**Junior High Parent**

**High School Parent**

Teri Covington

**Community**

Mary Denson

## **Stockdale ISD Needs Assessment 2010 – 2011**

Information used in order to identify district goals, objectives and strategies included the following:

- 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) Data
- 2010 Accountability Information
- Standard Accountability Decisions for 2010 and Beyond
- 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 (preliminary) AYP Data
- 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 Student Attendance Rates
- 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 Student Dropout Rates
- Classes of 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 Student Graduation Rates
- 2010-2011 At-Risk Data
- 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 Highly Qualified Data
- Title I School Improvement
- STaR Chart Data
- School Board Priorities
- DEIC Recommendations
- 2010 Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) Special Education

# **Public Education Mission, Objectives, and Goals**

## **MISSION OF TEXAS PUBLIC EDUCATION**

[Texas Education Code Sec. 4.001 (a)]

The mission of the public education system of this state is to ensure that all Texas children have access to a quality education that enables them to achieve their potential and fully participate now and in the future in the social, economic, and educational opportunities of our state and nation. That mission is grounded on the conviction that a general diffusion of knowledge is essential for the welfare of this state and for the preservation of the liberties and rights of citizens. It is further grounded on the conviction that a successful public education system is directly related to a strong, dedicated, and supportive family and that parental involvement in the school is essential for the maximum educational achievement of a child.

## **OBJECTIVES OF TEXAS PUBLIC EDUCATION**

[Texas Education Code Sec. 4.001 (b)]

The objectives of public education are:

OBJECTIVE 1: Parents will be full partners with educators in the education of their children.

OBJECTIVE 2: Students will be encouraged and challenged to meet their full educational potential.

OBJECTIVE 3: Through enhanced dropout prevention efforts, all students will remain in school until they obtain a high school diploma.

OBJECTIVE 4: A well-balanced and appropriate curriculum will be provided to all students.

OBJECTIVE 5: Educators will prepare students to be thoughtful, active citizens who have an appreciation for the basic values of our state and national heritage and who can understand and productively function in a free enterprise society.

OBJECTIVE 6: Qualified and highly effective personnel will be recruited, developed, and retained.

OBJECTIVE 7: The state's students will demonstrate exemplary performance in comparison to national and international standards.

OBJECTIVE 8: School campuses will maintain a safe and disciplined environment conducive to student learning.

OBJECTIVE 9: Educators will keep abreast of the development of creative and innovative techniques in instruction and administration using those techniques as appropriate to improve student learning.

OBJECTIVE 10: Technology will be implemented and used to increase the effectiveness of student learning, instructional management, staff development, and administration.

## **PUBLIC EDUCATION ACADEMIC GOALS**

[Texas Education Code, Sec. 4.002]

To serve as a foundation for a well-balanced and appropriate education:

GOAL 1: The students in the public education system will demonstrate exemplary performance in the reading and writing of the English language.

GOAL 2: The students in the public education system will demonstrate exemplary performance in the understanding of mathematics.

GOAL 3: The students in the public education system will demonstrate exemplary performance in the understanding of science.

GOAL 4: The students in the public education system will demonstrate exemplary performance in the understanding of social studies.

### **No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Goals (Public Law 107-110)**

PERFORMANCE GOAL 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and math.

PERFORMANCE GOAL 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

PERFORMANCE GOAL 3: All students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

PERFORMANCE GOAL 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.

PERFORMANCE GOAL 5: All students will graduate from high school.

## 2010 – 2011 Stockdale ISD Goals

1. STUDENT PERFORMANCE
  - a. Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment
  - b. Look beyond test. scores-soft data
  - c. Meeting needs of students (College, technical, school, student choice)
2. FACILITIES
  - a. Continued maintenance & improvement
3. KEY PERSONNEL
  - a. Recognizing staff
  - b. Recruit & retain
  - c. Right seat on the bus
4. FINANCE
  - a. Conservative spending & efficient
  - b. Balance in spending
  - c. Partnership opportunities (grants)
5. LEADERSHIP
  - a. Partnerships
  - b. Innovation
  - c. Communication
  - d. Community Relationship

### Stockdale ISD Measurable Performance Objectives for AEIS Ratings in Grades 3 – 11 for 2010 – 2011

		2007	2008	2009 Actual	*2010 Actual	Change 2009 to 2010	2011 Goals
Reading/ ELA	All Students	96%	94%	96%	93%	-3%	95%
	African American	88%	>99%	88%	89%	+1%	95%
	Hispanic	93%	94%	95%	92%	-3%	95%
	White	97%	95%	97%	95%	-2%	98%
	Male	94%	93%	95%	94%	-1%	98%
	Female	98%	96%	97%	93%	-4%	98%
	Special Ed	91%	82%	81%	86%	+5%	90%
	Econ Disadv	94%	93%	95%	91%	-4%	95%
	LEP	>99%	*	*	83%		
At Risk	90%	86%	91%	86%	-5%	90%	
Mathematics	All Students	83%	87%	82%	83%	+1%	90%
	African American	50%	71%	50%	56%	+5%	90%
	Hispanic	76%	82%	76%	80%	+4%	90%
	White	88%	92%	87%	86%	-1%	90%
	Male	85%	88%	82%	85%	+3%	90%
	Female	80%	86%	81%	81%	0%	90%
	Special Ed	50%	76%	67%	69%	+2%	90%
	Econ Disadv	76%	82%	77%	78%	+1%	90%
	LEP	86%	*	*	50%		
At Risk	64%	69%	60%	66%	+6%	90%	
Writing	All Students	99%	92%	92%	88%	-4%	95%
	African American	*	*	*	*		
	Hispanic	97%	90%	92%	89%	-3%	95%
	White	>99%	94%	92%	88%	-4%	95%
	Male	98%	95%	88%	87%	-1%	95%
	Female	>99%	88%	96%	89%	-7%	95%
	Special Ed	*	60%	*	94%		95%
	Econ Disadv	98%	84%	93%	84%	-9%	90%
	LEP	*	*	*	*		
At Risk	97%	78%	81%	78%	-3%	90%	

		2007	2008	2009 Actual	*2010 Actual	Change 2009 to 2010	2011 Goals
Science	All Students	74%	82%	77%	86%	+9%	90%
	African American	*	*	*	50%		
	Hispanic	58%	78%	71%	84%	+13%	90%
	White	83%	86%	82%	90%	+8%	95%
	Male	79%	82%	82%	85%	+3%	90%
	Female	68%	82%	72%	87%	+15%	90%
	Special Ed	35%	55%	45%	67%	+22%	90%
	Econ Disadv	67%	82%	77%	79%	+2%	90%
	LEP	*	*	*	*		
	At Risk	49%	68%	62%	70%	+8%	90%
Social Studies	All Students	87%	96%	92%	93%	+1%	98%
	African American	*	*	*	80%		
	Hispanic	81%	97%	93%	97%	+4%	99%
	White	91%	96%	91%	92%	+1%	95%
	Male	89%	95%	91%	93%	+2%	95%
	Female	83%	98%	92%	94%	+2%	98%
	Special Ed	50%	50%	78%	79%	+1%	90%
	Econ Disadv	81%	95%	88%	88%	0%	90%
	LEP	*	*	*	*		
At Risk	76%	92%	83%	84%	+1%	90%	

Above data are TAKS Met Standard (Sum of all grades tested, includes TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alt.)

## Stockdale ISD Alternative Funding Sources for 2010 – 2011

Career and Technology (Carl Perkins)	SSA with La Vernia ISD	\$9,358
High School Allotment		\$59,788
IDEA B (Formula)	SSA with GSEC	\$TBD
IDEA B (Stimulus) (Formula)	SSA with GSEC	\$13,259
IDEA B (Stimulus) Pre-K		\$3,196
State Compensatory Education		\$493,922
Student Success Initiative		\$5,501
Title I, Part A Schoolwide (Improving Basic Programs) plus roll forward		\$172,780 \$TBD
Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting) plus roll forward		\$47,316 \$TBD
Title XIV ARRA Stabilization (Stimulus)		\$241,002
SALE of Bonds		\$3, 250,000

**District Goal #1: Student Performance: a) Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment; b) Look beyond test scores—soft data; c) Meeting needs of students (college, technical, student choice).**

**Objective #1:** All student groups will improve TAKS performance over the previous year’s results.

**Objective #2:** Achieve a recognized or exemplary rating for 2010 – 2011.

**Objective #3:** Strengthen all high quality instruction in core curricular areas along with all electives that lead to higher academic success, college preparedness, and/or advanced certification for high skilled/high wage occupations with increased options for high school credit at the junior high.

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
A. Disaggregate student data to identify weaknesses in curriculum and student performance	TEKS/TAKS	Teachers	August 2010	Summary of Results
B. Implement scientific-research based programs to increase student performance (Sharon Wells, Accelerated Reading & Math, Read Naturally, Study Island, Nova Net, WebCCAT, Brain Pop)	State and Local \$24,836	Teachers	2010 – 2011	Spring 2011 TAKS Data
C. Schedule and hold department meetings	Local	Department Heads	2010 – 2011	Sign-In Sheets with Agenda
D. Tutoring sessions will be offered for all core subject areas.	SCE \$25,000	Classroom Teachers	Spring 2011	Tutoring Attendance Sheets
E. Pull-out students who need additional instruction in reading and math.	Title I, Part A 3 FTE \$168,530	Title I Staff SSI Staff	Fall 2010 Spring 2011	List of Students
F. Provide opportunities for all students to attend presentations. (Red Ribbon Rally, Bustin’ Bullies, Hempstead Program, etc.)	State and Local \$932	Programs Coordinator Principals	2010 – 2011	Attendance
G. Encourage teachers to receive training that will allow them to teach Pre-AP and/or AP advanced classes.	Title II, Part A	Teachers	2010 – 2011	Certification
H. Teach SAT/ACT skills and concepts to all students.	Local	Principal Counselor	2010 – 2011	SAT/ACT Student Performance/Participation
I. Encourage all students to participate in Career and Technology Education classes to increase enrollment	CATE Local	Principal Counselor	2010 – 2011	Enrollment Numbers
J. Students in grades K – 8 will be provided information for career awareness in regular classes. (Grades 9-12 students will take CATE classes-4 year plan. Bridges and/or Kuder will be in grades 6-8.)	CATE Local	Regular Teachers CATE Teachers Counselor	2010 – 2011	Course Evaluation Results

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
K. Conduct information sessions about the following: 1) higher education admissions and financial aid opportunities; 2) the TEXAS grant program and the Teach for Texas grant program established under Chapter 56; 3) the need for students to make informed curriculum choices to be prepared for success beyond high school; 4) and sources of information on higher education admissions and financial aid.	Local	Counselor	2010 – 2011	Sign-In Sheet
L. District staff will communicate with parents concerning excessive absences.	Local	Principals	December 2010 May 2011	Attendance Rates
M. Provide summer TAKS academy for students who are at-risk of dropping out due to not passing EXIT Level TAKS	SCE \$7,500	Principal	Summer 2011	TAKS Data Results
N. Provide additional intensive summer instruction	SCE \$10,000	Principals Teachers	Summer 2011	Attendance Sheets
O. G/T students in grades K – 12 will be served in a pull-out program on a weekly basis.	Local 1FTE \$37,800	GT Teacher	2010 – 2011	Lesson Plans
P. ESL students will be provided instruction by a certified ESL instructor in a pullout setting for grades K – 5 and a class period for grades 6 – 12.	State and Local	ESL Teachers	Each 9 weeks	Promotion/final report card
Q. Provide opportunities for parental involvement (open house, parent-teacher conferences, PTO meetings, etc.)	Local	Principals	2010 – 2011	Attendance Sheets
R. Provide important information to parents in a language that they understand.	Local	Translators	2010 – 2011	Written Information Translated
S. Investigate software programs for data driven instructional decisions	State and Local	Vendors Programs Coordinator	January 2011	Variety of vendor information
T. Implement software program	State and Local	Programs Coordinator	February 2011	Software data reports
U. Train math teachers in differentiated instruction	State and Local	ESC Staff Programs Coordinator	January – April 2011	Certificates of Attendance
V. Math teachers incorporate differentiated instruction strategies to help students be successful on state assessment to meet AYP on math performance	Personnel	Math Teachers Administrators	January – May 2011	Lesson plans and increased number of students passing state assessment in math

W. AM/PM tutoring for intensive instruction	SCE	Principals Teachers	2010 – 2011	Sign-In Sheets
X. Plan to revise 2011 – 2012 master schedule to have time for flexible scheduling	Master Schedule	Administrators	August 2011	Revised Master Schedule
Y. Monitor ARD decision making to ensure appropriate assessments are given to students	Personnel	Administrators	Ongoing	Verification of correct assessment taken
Z. Include language development in RtI process for 6 – 11 year olds for speech	Personnel	RtI Committee Administrators	Ongoing	Fewer speech referrals
AA. Investigate and determine which current employees need to become a certified reading specialist to help with interventions for 6 – 11 year olds for speech	Personnel State and Local	Teacher Administrator	August 2011	SBEC reading specialist certificate added to current certificate and fewer speech referrals

**District Goal #2: Facilities: Continued maintenance and improvement.**

**Objective #4:** Provide well-maintained, attractive, safe, accessible facilities and prepare for future facility needs through proper long range planning.

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
A. Custodial and Maintenance will work with administration to maintain facilities.	Local	Custodial Staff Maintenance Staff Superintendent	Ongoing	Improvements and Upkeep will be noted by Viewing
B. Prepare and hold bond election for new agriculture building and secondary cafeteria	Local	Superintendent Board of Trustees	November 2010	Passing of Bond Election
C. Sell bonds for new agriculture building and secondary cafeteria	Bond	Financial Advisors Superintendent Board of Trustees	February 2011	SALE of bonds
D. Develop plans for new agriculture building and secondary cafeteria	Bond	Architect Firm	January 2011	Completed Plans
E. Select Contractor for new agriculture building and secondary cafeteria	Bond	Superintendent Board of Trustees	March 2011	Chosen Contractor

**District Goal #3 Key Personnel:** a) recognizing staff; b) recruit and retain; c) right seat on the bus.

**District Objective #5:** Retain talented and highly effective staff by continuing to recognize achievements that promote collaboration and a positive work environment.

**Objective #6:** Strive to lower student to teacher ratio.

**Objective #7:** Continue to offer high-quality, on-going staff development that results in professional growth for all staff.

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
A. Staff will be afforded opportunities to attend staff development that is beneficial in their teaching/work area.	Title I, Part A Title II, Part A \$13,655	Staff	2010 – 2011	Staff Development Certificates
B. Provide training opportunities for general education teachers regarding individual students with disabilities in their classrooms.	IDEA B State and Local	GSEC Staff	2010 – 2011	Staff Development Certificates
C. Encourage all teachers to receive the initial 30 hours GT training or 6 hour GT refresher.	GT Co-Op \$3,050	Teachers	2010 – 2011	Staff Development Certificates
D. Conduct Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training refreshers to trained staff.	IDEA B State and Local	GSEC Staff	Fall 2010 Spring 2011	Staff Development Certificates
E. Instructional classroom paraprofessionals will receive training to meet requirements of NCLB, if any are in need of training.	Title I, Part A Title II, Part A	ESC Staff	2010 – 2011	Certificate of Completion
F. Motivational speaker presentation (Vicki Sanderson)	Title I Stimulus \$4,000	Programs Coordinator	August 2010	Attendance
G. Utilize a class size reduction teacher at 5 <sup>th</sup> grade for ELA.	Title II, Part A 1 FTE \$33,490	Principal	2010 – 2011	Staff List
H. Provide opportunities for staff to participate in wellness programs	Local	Programs Coordinator	October 2010 April 2011	Number of staff completing wellness programs

**District Goal #4: Finance: a) conservative spending and efficient; b) balance in spending; c) partnership opportunities (grants).**

**Objective #8:** Maintain financial integrity of the District while achieving an appropriate balance between financial stability and meeting student needs based on the annual audit at the end of each budget year.

**Objective #9:** The District will maintain a Superior Achievement rating by the Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST).

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
A. Campus administrators continue to work with central office to address instructional needs in a fiscally responsible manner.	All district funds	Campus Administrators Business Manager Superintendent	Monthly	Budget Review
B. All administrators submit their annual budget needs to central office.	All district funds	Campus Administrators Business Manager Superintendent	March 2011	List of Needs
C. Central office review of all District needs.	All district funds	Business Manager Superintendent	March 2011	Proposed Budget
D. Business manager continues to discuss financial report with school board prior to “discuss and consider paying Stockdale ISD bills” in regular board meetings.	Local	Business Manger School Board	August 2011	Board Meeting Minutes
E. Research and locate possible grant opportunities with other organizations	Grant database	District staff	Ongoing	Number of new partnerships

**District Goal #5: Leadership: a) Partnerships; b) Innovation; c) Communication; d) Community Relationships.**

**Objective #10:** The District will collaborate with others in the community.

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
A. Continue partnership with Goliad Special Education Cooperative (GSEC).	IDEA B	Superintendent Business Manager	2010 – 2011	Signed Agreement.
B. Continue partnership with Floresville ISD (Student Transportation Services (STS), and SODEXO).	State, Local, and Federal	Superintendent Business Manager	2010 – 2011	Signed Agreement.
C. Begin shared service agreement with La Vernia ISD with Carl Perkins Grant	Carl Perkins \$9,358	Superintendent Business Manager	2010 – 2011	Signed Agreement
D. Continue agreement with Nixon-Smilely CISD to transport our students to DAEP in Floresville	State and Local	Superintendent Business Manager	2010 – 2011	Signed Agreement
E. Allow area organizations to collaborate with Stockdale ISD by volunteering or other support (Chamber of Commerce Mini-Grants, Anti-Drug Coalition of Stockdale, Neighbor Helping Neighbor,,etc.)	Personnel	Superintendent Business Manager	2010 – 2011	List of ways supported
F. Collaborate with Wilson County Office of Emergency Management to prepare and plan for emergencies	Personnel	Superintendent	2010 – 2011	Meeting attendance
G. Maintain updated website	Local	Technology Director Staff	2010 – 2011	Current webpage information
H. Partnership with ICP Industries for the high school gym sound system	Donations Local	Superintendent IPC, Industries	2010 – 2011	Installation of System

## APPENDIX

Student Group	2007 Reading-3		2008 Reading-3		2009 Reading-3		2010 Reading-3		2007 Reading-4		2008 Reading-4		2009 Reading-4		2010 Reading-4		2007 Reading-5		2008 Reading-5		2009 Reading-5		2010 Reading-5	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	Percent Met Standard	Percent Committed	
All Students	88	84	22	80	34	90	37	98	44	82	30	93	33	92	26	95	89	45	91	38	91	49		
Male	93	100	19	75	41	87	33	100	43	81	35	95	26	100	29	92	89	44	88	44	86	55		
Female	82	73	23	88	25	95	41	97	45	83	25	93	37	81	22	97	89	46	95	30	96	44		
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---		
Black, non-Hispanic	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	---	---	*	*		
White, non-Hispanic	86	96	29	85	45	88	31	100	48	86	39	100	43	97	25	95	89	50	92	44	100	59		
Hispanic	90	73	15	74	17	92	40	95	40	77	18	88	25	86	28	94	92	42	90	30	83	38		
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	67	11	*	*	*	*	100	20	60	20	100	14	*	*	*	80	20	---	---	86	43		
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	
Economically Disadvantaged	92	81	19	75	29	92	23	96	32	77	20	88	21	86	19	93	85	38	93	33	84	32		
At-Risk	86	76	0	70	7	85	24	100	26	71	11	90	14	87	3	80	74	17	80	10	86	38		
GT	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	*	*	100	100	*	*		
Title I	79	67	0	61	11	90	37	100	27	71	14	89	11	92	26	70	57	14	73	0	91	49		

*Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.*

Student Group	2007 Reading-6		2008 Reading-6		2009 Reading-6		2010 Reading-6		2007 Reading-7		2008 Reading-7		2009 Reading-7		2010 Reading-7		2007 Reading-8		2008 Reading-8		2009 Reading-8		2010 Reading-8		
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	
	All Students	93	67	98	57	98	60	86	42	88	19	86	41	91	39	88	29	91	46	94	49	88	51	89	44
Male	92	69	96	54	100	54	89	44	82	18	88	41	86	29	81	19	89	41	91	31	88	46	83	40	
Female	94	61	100	59	97	65	83	39	100	21	84	40	96	50	92	36	93	52	100	88	88	58	96	50	
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	
White, non-Hispanic	97	75	97	62	100	65	84	48	88	16	93	50	88	41	94	32	94	55	96	54	88	41	91	45	
Hispanic	86	57	100	44	96	56	89	32	90	24	73	23	100	38	83	23	87	35	95	48	86	41	88	44	
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	63	0	*	*	67	0	*	*	*	*	38	0	*	*	
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	82	45	97	43	100	60	85	30	84	16	81	30	85	23	85	28	92	19	92	46	78	41	87	30	
At-Risk	75	50	88	50	100	27	73	14	76	4	65	18	67	0	69	15	82	18	77	23	63	11	62	0	
GT	*	*	100	100	100	100	*	*	*	*	100	80	100	50	*	*	100	73	100	80	*	*	100	57	
Title I	71	29	91	9	88	0	86	42	77	12	67	11	56	0	88	29	80	16	73	18	47	0	89	44	

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Reading-9		2008 Reading-9		2009 Reading-9		2010 Reading-9		2007 ELA-10		2008 ELA-10		2009 ELA-10		2010 ELA-10		2007 ELA-11		2008 ELA-11		2009 ELA-11		2010 ELA-11	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	98	26	89	41	94	14	96	26	94	2	95	19	93	23	96	4	96	25	98	13	91	22	98	34
Male	100	33	88	44	91	11	96	28	90	0	91	17	90	21	94	6	93	27	96	18	85	19	100	45
Female	95	18	90	38	100	21	96	23	100	5	100	20	96	25	100	0	100	23	100	6	100	26	96	26
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	100	26	83	44	93	7	94	30	92	0	95	19	94	19	93	0	100	25	100	21	90	20	96	37
Hispanic	96	26	96	37	95	25	100	19	96	4	95	18	92	28	100	10	91	22	95	5	92	24	100	30
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	71	0	*	*	63	0	---	---	*	*	50	0	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	100	21	85	26	91	23	92	19	90	5	95	10	96	13	100	4	86	0	95	5	90	20	100	42
At-Risk	95	9	72	8	75	0	91	18	91	0	100	6	81	5	95	0	91	4	96	12	88	6	95	14
GT	100	40	100	73	100	43	*	*	*	*	100	20	100	75	100	20	100	75	*	*	100	40	100	73
Title I							96	27							96	4							98	34

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Math-3		2008 Math-3		2009 Math-3		2010 Math-3		2007 Math-4		2008 Math-4		2009 Math-4		2010 Math-4		2007 Math-5		2008 Math-5		2009 Math-5		2010 Math-5	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	80	18	88	20	72	28	83	31	96	34	88	27	83	35	92	30	93	56	87	44	92	54	89	39
Male	93	25	90	19	83	37	84	42	100	36	93	33	85	25	94	32	96	62	85	41	96	59	86	48
Female	65	9	86	21	57	13	83	17	94	32	84	20	82	43	88	27	91	52	89	47	87	48	92	32
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	86	24	96	30	86	37	77	31	94	48	93	25	86	38	97	31	95	58	86	49	93	59	90	48
Hispanic	73	9	80	12	52	13	89	33	100	11	83	29	81	35	86	29	94	59	88	38	90	48	88	29
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	75	25	*	*	*	*	*	*	43	0	63	0	*	*	*	*	33	17	*	*	83	17
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	70	15	80	16	71	32	89	21	96	18	81	25	81	27	89	25	91	41	83	40	91	47	88	24
At-Risk	67	0	74	4	48	14	76	15	89	11	80	13	73	17	83	7	80	20	67	13	83	38	81	19
GT	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100	83	*	*	100	100	*	*
Title I	72	0	65	6	50	17	83	31	87	7	89	14	78	17	92	30	60	0	57	14	76	29	89	39

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Math-6		2008 Math-6		2009 Math-6		2010 Math-6		2007 Math-7		2008 Math-7		2009 Math-7		2010 Math-7		2007 Math-8		2008 Math-8		2009 Math-8		2010 Math-8	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	74	40	84	41	73	25	69	22	92	15	83	26	83	19	74	11	72	25	88	16	83	20	74	19
Male	78	41	79	50	73	12	78	22	88	18	83	32	82	18	73	8	70	22	89	20	79	21	73	13
Female	65	40	88	34	74	35	59	23	100	7	83	17	85	19	75	13	73	27	87	7	91	18	75	25
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	80	46	95	49	84	32	68	29	92	8	88	33	82	18	83	14	77	26	93	11	85	27	76	15
Hispanic	67	33	69	25	63	19	72	11	95	24	73	14	88	19	66	3	64	23	86	24	82	9	81	31
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	14	0	*	*	33	0	*	*	*	*	29	0	---	---
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	56	12	73	27	66	22	66	13	88	12	69	4	73	23	70	8	56	12	84	12	70	7	52	13
At-Risk	47	7	38	13	48	4	43	5	84	0	41	0	44	0	52	0	38	0	67	0	47	0	23	0
GT	*	*	100	83	100	80	*	*	*	*	100	80	100	0	*	*	100	55	100	60	*	*	100	29
Title I	41	6	27	0	22	0	69	22	85	0	47	0	33	0	74	11	42	4	64	0	38	0	74	19

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Math-9		2008 Math-9		2009 Math-9		2010 Math-9		2007 Math-10		2008 Math-10		2009 Math-10		2010 Math-10		2007 Math-11		2008 Math-11		2009 Math-11		2010 Math-11	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	80	24	68	24	74	30	75	23	76	4	63	12	61	9	75	8	82	18	79	17	75	25	88	19
Male	83	25	76	30	74	24	76	31	71	3	68	5	67	11	74	12	93	24	73	20	69	27	95	19
Female	76	24	59	17	75	44	73	8	83	6	57	19	56	7	79	0	70	11	89	11	83	22	81	19
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	86	27	75	28	81	30	71	31	80	0	70	20	71	13	81	4	94	27	81	22	84	26	93	18
Hispanic	74	22	58	19	71	33	81	5	71	8	57	4	48	4	75	15	65	4	76	10	68	24	80	20
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	17	0	*	*	14	0	*	*	*	*	0	0	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	72	11	59	15	61	22	59	9	74	5	57	5	57	5	71	8	69	8	74	9	68	21	84	16
At-Risk	59	0	29	0	25	0	53	6	55	0	41	0	16	0	42	0	57	0	65	8	60	0	74	4
GT	100	80	100	73	100	100	*	*	*	*	100	40	100	25	100	60	100	50	*	*	100	60	100	64
Title I							76	23							75	8							88	19

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Writing-4		2008 Writing-4		2009 Writing-4		2010 Writing-4		2007 Writing-7		2008 Writing-7		2009 Writing-7		2010 Writing-7	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	100	45	90	38	85	37	80	8	98	29	90	37	93	49	92	33
Male	100	24	96	35	80	25	82	3	97	19	92	36	86	41	88	27
Female	100	60	83	42	88	46	77	15	100	50	87	39	100	58	95	38
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	100	50	89	43	81	52	78	9	100	26	90	39	91	49	91	47
Hispanic	100	39	91	32	88	25	82	7	95	35	90	33	94	56	97	21
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	60	40	86	14	*	*	---	---	57	0	*	*	100	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	100	33	83	37	83	21	75	6	96	22	79	21	92	38	87	32
At-Risk	100	25	82	21	75	14	68	0	95	9	67	13	78	11	84	4
GT	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100	80	100	50	*	*
Title I	100	7	82	25	83	11	80	8	96	13	71	6	67	11	92	33

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Science-5		2008 Science-5		2009 Science-5		2010 Science-5		2007 Science-8		2008 Science-8		2009 Science-8		2010 Science-8	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	97	60	97	53	94	57	98	57	71	17	74	22	71	23	79	37
Male	100	76	100	57	96	67	100	64	77	23	71	29	74	36	73	43
Female	94	48	94	50	92	46	96	52	65	12	80	7	65	0	86	27
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	100	62	94	64	97	60	100	68	90	23	78	22	76	29	85	38
Hispanic	88	59	100	38	90	52	96	46	45	9	71	24	59	14	73	33
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	83	0	100	20	100	57	---	---	*	*	38	0	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	97	42	97	47	94	48	96	52	56	4	72	12	64	7	57	24
At-Risk	89	11	96	20	92	36	95	43	50	0	50	0	33	6	20	0
GT	100	100	---	---	100	100	*	*	100	45	100	80	*	*	100	71
Title I	89	22	87	7	82	18	98	57	43	0	45	0	29	0	79	37

Student Group	2007 Science-10		2008 Science-10		2009 Science-10		2010 Science-10		2007 Science-11		2008 Science-11		2009 Science-11		2010 Science-11	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	63	10	63	9	62	4	75	19	90	9	85	4	87	11	92	20
Male	65	13	73	14	79	7	76	21	100	10	82	7	85	12	95	32
Female	61	6	52	5	44	0	71	14	78	7	89	0	89	11	89	11
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	72	12	60	10	74	6	81	23	97	15	96	8	90	10	93	21
Hispanic	54	8	65	9	46	0	70	15	78	0	70	0	84	12	90	19
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	17	0	74	17	*	*	---	---	*	*	40	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	58	11	62	5	71	5	67	13	71	0	81	0	75	10	95	10
At-Risk	32	0	35	0	40	0	53	0	80	0	71	0	81	6	83	13
GT	*	*	100	60	100	17	100	80	100	38	*	*	100	60	100	55
Title I							75	19							92	20

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Social Studies-8		2008 Social Studies-8		2009 Social Studies-8		2010 Social Studies-8	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	82	18	92	28	86	18	84	31
Male	84	20	89	31	86	24	86	34
Female	81	15	100	20	87	9	82	27
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	93	24	96	30	86	24	85	33
Hispanic	68	9	86	24	86	9	87	27
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	75	0	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	75	13	88	24	75	4	67	14
At-Risk	63	0	67	8	67	0	40	0
GT	100	45	100	80	*	*	100	71
Title I	59	0	64	9	64	0	84	31

Student Group	2007 Social Studies-10		2008 Social Studies-10		2009 Social Studies-10		2010 Social Studies-10		2007 Social Studies-11		2008 Social Studies-11		2009 Social Studies-11		2010 Social Studies-11	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	98	25	95	23	93	42	96	43	97	47	100	23	100	25	100	42
Male	97	30	95	27	93	57	94	43	100	61	100	27	100	32	100	67
Female	100	17	95	19	93	26	100	43	93	30	100	17	100	16	100	22
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	100	40	90	15	94	45	93	59	100	53	100	30	100	26	100	41
Hispanic	96	9	100	30	92	38	100	20	91	35	100	14	100	24	100	43
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	67	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	94	17	95	19	95	38	96	28	93	36	100	17	100	16	100	20
At-Risk	95	0	94	6	85	15	90	35	92	24	100	8	100	6	100	26
GT	*	*	100	80	100	83	100	100	100	75	*	*	100	60	100	100
Title I	---	---	---	---	---	---	96	43	---	---	---	---	---	---	100	42

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

AYP Adequate Yearly Progress	Participation Rate (Grades 3 – 8 and 10)							
	Reading/ELA				Math			
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
All Students	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%
African Am.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hispanic	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%
White	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Eco. Disadv.	99%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%
LEP	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Special Ed.	98%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%

AYP Adequate Yearly Progress	Performance Reading/ELA (Grades 3 – 8 and 10)							
	Performance Standard				Met Standard			
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
All Students	60%	60%	67%	73%	95%	92%	93%	89%
African Am.					86%	100%	83%	88%
Hispanic					93%	90%	90%	86%
White					97%	92%	95%	91%
Eco. Disadv.					94%	91%	90%	84%
LEP					100%	67%	64%	67%
Special Ed.					95%	71%	73%	63%

AYP Adequate Yearly Progress	Performance Math (Grades 3 – 8 and 10)							
	Performance Standard				Met Standard			
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
All Students	50%	50%	58%	67%	85%	85%	79%	79%
African Am.					57%	75%	67%	50%
Hispanic					80%	80%	73%	76%
White					88%	89%	84%	83%
Eco. Disadv.					79%	80%	75%	75%
LEP					80%	44%	64%	33%
Special Ed.					79%	51%	54%	53%

Above data is taken from 2008 & 2009 (& 2010 Preliminary) District AYP Report.

Student Group	Student Attendance Rates			
	2005 – 2006	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2008 – 2009
All Students	97.0%	96.5%	96.5%	96.0%
Male	97.2%	96.6%	96.5%	95.8%
Female	96.9%	96.4%	96.4%	96.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	---	*	*
Black, non-Hispanic	95.9%	94.6%	96.7%	94.7%
White, non-Hispanic	97.1%	96.7%	96.4%	96.0%
Hispanic	97.0%	96.3%	96.5%	96.1%
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	96.4%	95.7%	96.1%	95.3%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	97.1%	97.4%	97.7%	97.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	96.6%	96.0%	95.8%	95.4%
At-Risk	96.5%	96.2%	95.6%	95.3%

Student Group	Student Graduation Rates				Student Dropout Rates (9-12)			
	Class of 2006	Class of 2007	Class of 2008	Class of 2009	2005 – 2006	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2008-2009
All Students	95.3%	95.8%	93.1%	96.1%	0.4%	0.4%	1.6%	0.9%
Male	96.7%	91.7%	100.0%	93.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	1.5%
Female	94.1%	100%	84.6%	100.0%	0.0%	1.0%	3.7%	0.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	*	*	---	0.0%	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	95.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic	95.2%	90.0%	82.6%	90.9%	1.1%	1.0%	3.8%	1.9%
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	---	---	---	*	---	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0%	91.7%	85.7%	93.8%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.2%
At-Risk	93.5%	90.5%	80%	88.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	2.9%

*Above data is taken from 2007-2008, 2008-2009 & 2009-2010 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) District Report.*

HQT Highly Qualified Teacher Report	Percentage of Classes Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers					Percentage of Highly Qualified Teachers				
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
District Aggregate	100%	100%	100%	97.22%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97.50%	100%

HQT Highly Qualified Teacher Report	Percentage of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers					Percentage of Teachers Teaching with Emergency or Provisional Credentials				
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
District Aggregate	0%	0%	0%	2.78%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*Above data is taken from 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, & 2010-2011 Highly Qualified Teachers Summary Report.*

Stockdale	Adequate Yearly Progress				Title I School Improvement			
	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2008 – 2009	2009 – 2010	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2008 – 2009	2009 – 2010
District	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Missed AYP Mathematics (Performance)	None	None	None	None
High School	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None	None
Junior High	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None	None
Elementary	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None	None

*Above data is taken from 2007, 2008 & 2009(& 2010 Preliminary) AYP reports.*

### **NOTES:**

- 1) **Meaning of Symbols:** # = 1<sup>st</sup> administration; n/a = data are not available or not applicable; --- = no students in group; \* = small numbers not reported to protect student confidentiality
- 2) There were not any students for migrant, Asian, or bilingual sub-populations, so they were not included in the tables.
- 3) There were not any drop-outs for grades 7 & 8, so the data tables were not included.
- 4) SISD is a single attendance area, so information for low-poverty and high-poverty school data tables were not included.