

Stockdale Independent School District



District Improvement Plan 2011-2012

Approved by Stockdale ISD Board on July 11, 2011.

Revised 7-11-11

2011-2012 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.

**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

Gennie Rangel

High School Parent

Teri Covington

Community

Mary Denson

Stockdale ISD Needs Assessment 2011 – 2012

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
- 2011 Accountability Information
- Standard Accountability Decisions for 2011 and Beyond
- 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 (preliminary) AYP Data
- 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 Student Attendance Rates
- 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 Student Dropout Rates
- Classes of 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 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

Summary of Priority Needs

Campus	Demographics	Student Achievement	School Culture and Climate	Staff Quality, Recruitment and Retention	Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment	Family and Community Involvement	School Context and Organization	Technology
Elementary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *additional staff could be needed at certain grades levels if enrollment increases *Software to support transition of students in and out of school *At-risk population requires differentiated instruction *increased efforts of SHAC to help with health problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *increased achievement across the campus in writing (targeting 4th grade) *teach parents how to help their children with academics at home *increase knowledge of intervention strategies/curriculum for teachers *increase support for teachers through pull-out programs like learning lab/intervention *software to increase data disaggregation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *bullying prevention *drug/alcohol awareness *increase outside activities that build relationships among faculty *increase involvement of parents in the school *updated Emergency Operations Plan with practice drills *Character education campus-wide implemented by faculty *peer mediation for conflict-resolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *more trade days for staff development opportunities *opportunities during the school year for staff development based on data disaggregation *teacher training in Response to Intervention techniques/curriculum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *data disaggregation software to guide instructional focus *teachers trained in Response to Intervention (RTI) techniques/curriculum *computerized software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *coordinator/liaison for parent involvement activities and home visits *training for parents as teachers at home – help with homework, etc. *increase participation in volunteer program at school *strengthen PTO or boosters to provide support for campus needs (fundraisers) *parent education classes in computer skills, parenting, and homework assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *financial opportunities for staff to further their own education *increased opportunities for teacher input and ideas at the district level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *updated computers in computer lab *increased training in integrating technology in instruction *data disaggregation software to drive instructional focus and track student progress *streamline administrative procedures with computerized software *improve and update campus website and teacher web pages
Junior High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *reduce number of at risk students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *increase math scores for all grade levels *close learning gaps among campuses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *incorporate curriculum on bullying for all grade levels *increase monitoring of building and campus appearance regularly *increase positive attitudes and build school spirit among staff and students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *staff development for individual math/other content areas *variety of teaching styles, presentation styles *highly structured classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *differentiate instruction for all grade levels and subjects *hands on activities, engaged learners *ongoing assessments per nine weeks/semester in all subject areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *increase parental involvement in academic areas *increase parental support groups *parent volunteers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *continuous staff development for all teachers in subject area/discipline *increase communication among all campuses *incorporate small groups for positive social behaviors, attitudes and family concerns *increase RTI awareness among staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *staff development on utilization of equipment *increase awareness of lesson presentation for students *increase staff awareness with district technology requirements (attendance, grades, ARDS, etc.)
High School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *offer more advanced courses *look at ways/strategies to improve attendance rate *look at struggling/thinking of dropping out and work on staying in school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *knowledge of the students identified as economically disadvantaged and target instruction to help in the areas of math and science *teachers will post ACT/SAT testing information *tutoring available during school hours to address sub-population needs in math/science/ELA *form a class for local credit to address study skills with students with chronic failure and not earning credits *look for strategies to mentor students *look for opportunities to offer evening ACT/SAT prep 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *post or announce mission and vision statements for the school *look at curriculum and courses to assess challenge levels *increase participation in extracurricular participation *more attention to cleaning and maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *we spend time, effort and money hiring staff, and then training them to use our technology, so they can be more effective teachers *maintain technology training for teachers who are behind and encourage new training for teachers who are on track *stronger requirement for teacher use of technology in the classroom *classroom learning is more effective with the certified teacher present *teachers need to continue to attend workshops that give them a better understanding of student learning, and teaching in their individual subject areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *books are dated in several core areas waiting for adoptions to come *more vertical alignment with junior high *provide teachers SAT/ACT data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *getting parents involved in their children's academics *communicating with parents who speak Spanish using the automated phone system *documenting the implementations of the GT students' lessons by teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *finding opportunities for the staff to collaborate and work as one unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *need specific training once a month for teaching *talk with junior high on what technology skills we want the students to have entering high school teachers

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.

2011 – 2012 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 2011 – 2012

		2007	2008	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Goals	2011 Prelim.	Met Goal?	Change 2010 To 2011	2012 Goals
Reading/ ELA	All Students	96%	94%	96%	93%	95%	89%	No	-4%	80%
	African American	88%	>99%	88%	89%	95%	*			80%
	Hispanic	93%	94%	95%	92%	95%	88%	No	-4%	80%
	White	97%	95%	97%	95%	98%	90%	No	-5%	80%
	Male	94%	93%	95%	94%	98%	87%	No	-7%	80%
	Female	98%	96%	97%	93%	98%	92%	No	-1%	80%
	Special Ed	91%	82%	81%	86%	90%	*			80%
	Econ Disadv	94%	93%	95%	91%	95%	88%	No	-3%	80%
	LEP	>99%	*	*	83%	*	*			80%
	At Risk	90%	86%	91%	86%	90%	79%	No	-7%	80%
Mathematics	All Students	83%	87%	82%	83%	90%	80%	No	-3%	80%
	African American	50%	71%	50%	56%	90%	*			80%
	Hispanic	76%	82%	76%	80%	90%	75%	No	-5%	80%
	White	88%	92%	87%	86%	90%	83%	No	-3%	80%
	Male	85%	88%	82%	85%	90%	79%	No	-6%	80%
	Female	80%	86%	81%	81%	90%	81%	No	0%	80%
	Special Ed	50%	76%	67%	69%	90%	*			80%
	Econ Disadv	76%	82%	77%	78%	90%	73%	No	-5%	80%
	LEP	86%	*	*	50%	*	*			80%
	At Risk	64%	69%	60%	66%	90%	62%	No	-4%	80%
Writing	All Students	99%	92%	92%	88%	95%	82%	No	-6%	80%
	African American	*	*	*	*	*	*	No		80%
	Hispanic	97%	90%	92%	89%	95%	79%	No	-10%	80%
	White	>99%	94%	92%	88%	95%	83%	No	-5%	80%
	Male	98%	95%	88%	87%	95%	76%	No	-11%	80%
	Female	>99%	88%	96%	89%	95%	92%	No	+3%	80%
	Special Ed	*	60%	*	94%	95%	*			80%
	Econ Disadv	98%	84%	93%	84%	90%	80%	No	-4%	80%
	LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*			80%
	At Risk	97%	78%	81%	78%	90%	59%	No	-19%	80%

		2007	2008	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Goals	2011 Prelim.	Met Goal?	Change 2010 To 2011	2012 Goals
Science	All Students	74%	82%	77%	86%	90%	86%	No	0%	80%
	African American	*	*	*	50%	*	*			80%
	Hispanic	58%	78%	71%	84%	90%	80%	No	-4%	80%
	White	83%	86%	82%	90%	95%	90%	No	0%	80%
	Male	79%	82%	82%	85%	90%	88%	No	+3%	80%
	Female	68%	82%	72%	87%	90%	84%	No	-3%	80%
	Special Ed	35%	55%	45%	67%	90%	*			80%
	Econ Disadv	67%	82%	77%	79%	90%	82%	No	+3%	80%
	LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*			80%
	At Risk	49%	68%	62%	70%	90%	71%	No	+1%	80%
Social Studies	All Students	87%	96%	92%	93%	98%	93%	No	0%	80%
	African American	*	*	*	80%	*	*			80%
	Hispanic	81%	97%	93%	97%	99%	91%	No	-6%	80%
	White	91%	96%	91%	92%	95%	93%	No	+1%	80%
	Male	89%	95%	91%	93%	95%	96%	Yes	+3%	80%
	Female	83%	98%	92%	94%	98%	88%	No	-6%	80%
	Special Ed	50%	50%	78%	79%	90%	*			80%
	Econ Disadv	81%	95%	88%	88%	90%	88%	No	0%	80%
	LEP	*	*	*	*	*	*			80%
At Risk	76%	92%	83%	84%	90%	83%	No	-1%	80%	

Above data are TAKS Met Standard (Sum of all grades tested, includes TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alt.)
2011 Preliminary Data averaged from District Reports received May & June 2011

Stockdale ISD Budgetary Resources for 2011 – 2012

Cafeteria Fund		\$381,775
Career and Technology (Carl Perkins)	SSA with La Vernia ISD	\$TBD
Career and Technology (regular)		\$142,737
Construction Fund		\$2,730,877
Debt Service Fund		\$563,693
Education of Jobs Fund		\$154,303
ESL (English as a Second Language)		\$5,082
GT (Gifted and Talented)		\$7,799
High School Allotment		\$59,950
IDEA B (Formula)	SSA with GSEC	\$TBD
Regular State Aid/Local Tax Revenue (General Operating Fund)		\$6,491,889
Special Education (state)		\$629,102
State Compensatory Education		\$297,284
Title I, Part A Schoolwide (Improving Basic Programs)		\$158,273
Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting)		\$51,704

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 STAAR performance over the previous year’s TAKS results.

Objective #2: Achieve a recognized or exemplary rating for 2011 – 2012.

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. Align curriculum in core subject areas	Local	Administrators Core Teachers	August 2011	Sign-In
B. Disaggregate student data to identify weaknesses in curriculum and student performance	TEKS/STAAR	Teachers	August 2011	Summary of Results
C. Implement scientific-research based programs to increase student performance (Accelerated Reading & Math, Read Naturally, Study Island, Nova Net, WebCCAT, Brain Pop)	State and Local	Teachers	2011 – 2012	Spring 2012 Assessment Data
D. Schedule and hold department meetings	Local	Department Heads	2011 – 2012	Sign-In Sheets with Agenda
E. Tutoring sessions will be offered for all core subject areas.	SCE	Classroom Teachers	Spring 2012	Tutoring Attendance Sheets
F. Pull-out students who need additional instruction in reading and math.	Title I, Part A 3 FTE	Title I Staff SSI Staff	Fall 2011 Spring 2012	List of Students
G. Provide opportunities for all students to attend presentations. (Red Ribbon Rally, Bustin’ Bullies, Hempstead Program, etc.)	State and Local	Programs Coordinator Principals	2011 – 2012	Attendance
H. Encourage teachers to receive training that will allow them to teach Pre-AP and/or AP advanced classes. (Reading at junior high; Math & Science at high school)	Title II, Part A	Teachers	2011 – 2012	Certificates of Attendance
I. Teach SAT/ACT skills and concepts to all students.	Local	Principal Counselor	2011 – 2012	SAT/ACT Student Performance/Participation
J. Encourage all students to participate in Career and Technology Education classes to increase enrollment	CATE Local	Principal Counselor	2011 – 2012	Enrollment Numbers
K. 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.)	CATE Local	Regular Teachers CATE Teachers Counselor	2011 – 2012	Course Evaluation Results

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
L. 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	2011 – 2012	Sign-In Sheet
M. District staff will communicate with parents concerning excessive absences.	Local	Principals	December 2011 May 2012	Attendance Rates
N. Provide summer TAKS academy for students who are at-risk of dropping out due to not passing EXIT Level TAKS	SCE	Principal	Summer 2012	TAKS Data Results
O. Provide additional intensive summer instruction <u>STAAR Academy @ Junior High</u>	SCE	Principals Teachers	Summer 2012	Attendance Sheets
P. G/T students in grades K – 12 will be served by classroom teachers in regular classroom and with opportunities to meet for group project that will be presented at a GT Showcase	Local	Classroom Teachers GT Coordinator	2011 – 2012	Lesson Plans Sign-In Sheets GT Showcase
Q. 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
R. Provide opportunities for parental involvement (open house, parent-teacher conferences, etc.)	Local	Principals	2011 – 2012	Attendance Sheets
S. Provide important information to parents in a language that they understand.	Local	Translators	2011 – 2012	Written Information Translated
T. Implement software program	State and Local	Programs Coordinator	August 2011	Software data reports
U. Provide training for eduphoria! to administrators and lead teachers	Local	Region 20 consultant	August 2011	Sign-In Sheet
V. Provide training for eduphoria! to staff	Local	Administrators Lead Teachers	August 2011	Sign-In Sheet
W. Tutoring for intensive instruction during school day	Local	Principals Teachers	2011 – 2012	Class Rosters
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	Fall 2011 Spring 2012	Verification of correct assessment taken
Z. Include language development in RtI process for 6 – 11 year olds for speech	Personnel	RtI Committee Administrators	May 2012	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
BB. Offer incentives for perfect attendance	Local	Administrators	End of each Nine weeks	Perfect Attendance List
CC. Incorporate curriculum on bully prevention, character education, and peer mediation for conflict resolution	Local	Counselors	Fall 2011 Spring 2012	Lessons presented
DD. Post mission and vision statements for school	Local	Administrators	August 2011	View posted statements
EE. Provide support to teachers, students, and parents in increasing awareness of issues regarding sexual abuse of children, including knowledge of warning signs, actions a child should take to obtain assistance and available counseling options	Local	Programs Coordinator Counselors	August 2011 – May 2012	Sign-in sheets from meetings
FF. Provide support in violence prevention, conflict resolution, dating violence & prevention, discipline management and suicide prevention/intervention activities	Local	Programs Coordinator Counselors	August 2011 – May 2012	Sign-in sheets from meetings

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. Repainting of facilities	Local	Custodial Staff Maintenance Staff	Summer 2011	Project Completion
C. Build new tennis courts	Local	Superintendent	Fall 2011	Completed courts
D. Build new Ag building	Bond	Superintendent	October 2011	Completed building
E. Build new cafeteria	Bond	Superintendent	Fall 2011	Completed building
F. Review Safety Audit and make changes as needed	Local	Programs Coordinator	September 2011	Completed list of changes

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	Staff	2011 – 2012	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	2011 – 2012	Staff Development Certificates
C. Require all teachers to receive the initial 30 hours GT training or 6 hour GT refresher.	GT Co-Op	Teachers	December 2011 May 2012	Staff Development Certificates
D. Conduct Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training refreshers to trained staff.	IDEA B State and Local	GSEC Staff	August 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	August 2011	Certificate of Completion
F. Utilize a class size reduction teacher at 5 th grade for ELA.	Title II, Part A 1 FTE	Principal	2011 – 2012	Staff List
G. Provide opportunities for staff to participate in wellness programs	Local	Programs Coordinator	October 2010 April 2011	Number of staff completing wellness programs
H. Provide substitute teacher training	Local	Programs Coordinator	August 2011	Sign-In Sheet
I. RtI process consistent across campuses	Local	Administrators	August 2011	Guidelines for RtI
J. Provide technology training on maintaining website, teacher webpages, utilize equipment etc.	Local	Administrators Technology Director	Once per month September – May	Sign-In Sheets
K. Recognize staff birthdays	Local	Programs Coordinator	Every Staff birthday	Cards distributed
L. Recognize staff for years of service at SISD and in public education	Local	Programs Coordinator	August 2011 May 2012	Certificates distributed
M. Implement teacher of the month on each campus	Local	Administrators	Once per month	Recognize at campus meetings as an agenda item

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	January 2012	List of Needs
C. Central office review of all District needs.	All district funds	Business Manager Superintendent	February 2012	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	Monthly	Board Meeting Minutes
E. Research and locate possible grant opportunities with other organizations	Grant database	District staff	Ongoing	Number of new partnerships
F. Write Safe Schools Healthy Students Grant	Local	District staff	Fall 2011	Submitted grant

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	2011 – 2012	Signed Agreement.
B. Continue partnership with Floresville ISD (Student Transportation Services (STS), and SODEXO).	State, Local, and Federal	Superintendent Business Manager	2011 – 2012	Signed Agreement.
C. Begin shared service agreement with La Vernia ISD with Carl Perkins Grant	Carl Perkins	Superintendent Business Manager	2011 – 2012	Signed Agreement
D. Continue agreement with Nixon-Smiley CISD to transport our students to DAEP in Floresville	State and Local	Superintendent Business Manager	2011 – 2012	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, parent volunteers, etc.)	Personnel	Superintendent Business Manager	2011 – 2012	List of ways supported
F. Collaborate with Wilson County Office of Emergency Management to prepare and plan for emergencies	Personnel	Superintendent	2011 – 2012	Meeting attendance
G. Maintain updated website	Local	Technology Director Staff	2011 – 2012	Current webpage information
H. Collaborate with SHAC (Student Health Advisory Committee) to plan and organize a district health fair	Local	SHAC committee Programs Coordinator	Spring 2012	Health Fair
I. Update Emergency Operation Plan	Local	Programs Coordinator	Fall 2011	Updated Plan
J. Provide open communications with parents through district-level parent meetings to encourage parental involvement	Local	Programs Coordinator	August 2011 – May 2012	Sign-in sheets from meetings

APPENDIX

Student Group	2007 Reading-3	2008 Reading-3		2009 Reading-3		2010 Reading-3		2011 Reading-3		2007 Reading-4		2008 Reading-4		2009 Reading-4		2010 Reading-4		2011 Reading-4		2007 Reading-5	2008 Reading-5		2009 Reading-5		2010 Reading-5		2011 Reading-5		
	Percent Met Standard	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	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	**Percent Met Standard	***Percent Commended
All Students	88	84	22	80	34	90	37	90	34	98	44	82	30	93	33	92	26	87	29	95	89	45	91	38	91	49	95	53	
Male	93	100	19	75	41	87	33	89	39	100	43	81	35	95	26	100	29	84	34	92	89	44	88	44	86	55	97	62	
Female	82	73	23	88	25	95	41	90	30	97	45	83	25	93	37	81	22	91	22	97	89	46	95	30	96	44	92	42	
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Black, non-Hispanic	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	
White, non-Hispanic	86	96	29	85	45	88	31	93	43	100	48	86	39	100	43	97	25	88	42	95	89	50	92	44	100	59	97	66	
Hispanic	90	73	15	74	17	92	40	86	25	95	40	77	18	88	25	86	28	86	18	94	92	42	90	30	83	38	92	38	
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	67	11	*	*	*	*	*	*	100	20	60	20	100	14	*	*	*	*	*	80	20	---	---	86	43	40	20	
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	92	81	19	75	29	92	23	86	24	96	32	77	20	88	21	86	19	84	23	93	85	38	93	33	84	32	94	39	
At-Risk	86	76	0	70	7	85	24	89	19	100	26	71	11	90	14	87	3	58	0	80	74	17	80	10	86	38	91	36	
GT	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	*	*	100	100	*	*	*	*
Title I	79	67	0	61	11	90	37	90	34	100	27	71	14	89	11	92	26	87	29	70	57	14	73	0	91	49	95	53	

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.
 June 2011 Report...Cumulative *May 2011 Report...Primary

Student Group	2007 Reading-6		2008 Reading-6		2009 Reading-6		2010 Reading-6		2011 Reading-6		2007 Reading-7		2008 Reading-7		2009 Reading-7		2010 Reading-7		2011 Reading-7		2007 Reading-8		2008 Reading-8		2009 Reading-8		2010 Reading-8		2011 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	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	83	40	88	19	86	41	91	39	88	29	79	28	91	46	94	49	88	51	89	44	98	47	
Male	92	69	96	54	100	54	89	44	73	38	82	18	88	41	86	29	81	19	79	28	89	41	91	31	88	46	83	40	96	46	
Female	94	61	100	59	97	65	83	39	92	42	100	21	84	40	96	50	92	36	79	29	93	52	100	88	88	58	96	50	100	47	
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	97	75	97	62	100	65	84	48	71	52	88	16	93	50	88	41	94	32	88	33	94	55	96	54	88	41	91	45	97	45	
Hispanic	86	57	100	44	96	56	89	32	90	33	90	24	73	23	100	38	83	23	65	20	87	35	95	48	86	41	88	44	100	48	
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	56	22	*	*	63	0	*	*	67	0	33	0	*	*	*	*	38	0	*	*	100	14	
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	
Economically Disadvantaged	82	45	97	43	100	60	85	30	81	32	84	16	81	30	85	23	85	28	76	31	92	19	92	46	78	41	87	30	100	46	
At-Risk	75	50	88	50	100	27	73	14	68	23	76	4	65	18	67	0	69	15	68	5	82	18	77	23	63	11	62	0	96	31	
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	83	40	77	12	67	11	56	0	88	29	79	28	80	16	73	18	47	0	89	44	98	47	

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.
 June 2011 Report...Cumulative *May 2011 Report...Primary

Student Group	2007 Reading-9		2008 Reading-9		2009 Reading-9		2010 Reading-9		2011 Reading-9		2007 ELA-10		2008 ELA-10		2009 ELA-10		2010 ELA-10		2011 ELA-10		2007 ELA-11		2008 ELA-11		2009 ELA-11		2010 ELA-11		2011 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	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	21	94	2	95	19	93	23	96	4	81	12	96	25	98	13	91	22	98	34	95	30	
Male	100	33	88	44	91	11	96	28	90	27	90	0	91	17	90	21	94	6	83	10	93	27	96	18	85	19	100	45	96	22	
Female	95	18	90	38	100	21	96	23	100	14	100	5	100	20	96	25	100	0	77	15	100	23	100	6	100	26	96	26	94	41	
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	
White, non-Hispanic	100	26	83	44	93	7	94	30	94	21	92	0	95	19	94	19	93	0	84	12	100	25	100	21	90	20	96	37	95	32	
Hispanic	96	26	96	37	95	25	100	19	94	19	96	4	95	18	92	28	100	10	71	10	91	22	95	5	92	24	100	30	95	29	
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	71	0	*	*	63	0	---	---	---	---	*	*	50	0	*	*	50	0	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	
Economically Disadvantaged	100	21	85	26	91	23	92	19	95	10	90	5	95	10	96	13	100	4	75	11	86	0	95	5	90	20	100	42	91	23	
At-Risk	95	9	72	8	75	0	91	18	81	6	91	0	100	6	81	5	95	0	65	13	91	4	96	12	88	6	95	14	92	0	
GT	100	40	100	73	100	43	*	*	100	13	*	*	100	20	100	75	100	20	*	*	100	75	*	*	100	40	100	73	100	60	
Title I							96	27	94	21							96	4	81	12							98	34	95	30	

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Math-3		2008 Math-3		2009 Math-3		2010 Math-3		2011 Math-3		2007 Math-4		2008 Math-4		2009 Math-4		2010 Math-4		2011 Math-4		2007 Math-5		2008 Math-5		2009 Math-5		2010 Math-5		2011 Math-5			
	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command	Percent Met	Percent Command		
All Students	80	18	88	20	72	28	83	31	81	19	96	34	88	27	83	35	92	30	88	37	93	56	87	44	92	54	89	39	95	43		
Male	93	25	90	19	83	37	84	42	83	20	100	36	93	33	85	25	94	32	82	38	96	62	85	41	96	59	86	48	97	56		
Female	65	9	86	21	57	13	83	17	79	17	94	32	84	20	82	43	88	27	96	35	91	52	89	47	87	48	92	32	92	25		
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	86	24	96	30	86	37	77	31	90	23	94	48	93	25	86	38	97	31	85	41	95	58	86	49	93	59	90	48	94	47		
Hispanic	73	9	80	12	52	13	89	33	71	14	100	11	83	29	81	35	86	29	90	34	94	59	88	38	90	48	88	29	96	33		
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	76	13	96	18	81	25	81	27	89	25	82	33	91	41	83	40	91	47	88	24	91	34		
At-Risk	67	0	74	4	48	14	76	15	76	13	89	11	80	13	73	17	83	7	64	14	80	20	67	13	83	38	81	19	86	19		
GT	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100	83	*	*	100	100	*	*	*	*	
Title I	72	0	65	6	50	17	83	31	81	19	87	7	89	14	78	17	92	30	88	37	60	0	57	14	76	29	89	39	95	43		

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.
 June 2011 Report...Cumulative *May 2011 Report...Primary

Student Group	2007 Math-6		2008 Math-6		2009 Math-6		2010 Math-6		2011 Math-6		2007 Math-7		2008 Math-7		2009 Math-7		2010 Math-7		2011 Math-7		2007 Math-8		2008 Math-8		2009 Math-8		2010 Math-8		2011 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	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	67	4	92	15	83	26	83	19	74	11	58	8	72	25	88	16	83	20	74	19	85	7
Male	78	41	79	50	73	12	78	22	58	4	88	18	83	32	82	18	73	8	66	7	70	22	89	20	79	21	73	13	82	7
Female	65	40	88	34	74	35	59	23	76	4	100	7	83	17	85	19	75	13	48	9	73	27	87	7	91	18	75	25	88	6
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	*	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	--	--	*	*	*	*	--	--	*	*	*	*	--	--	--	--	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	80	46	95	49	84	32	68	29	67	5	92	8	88	33	82	18	83	14	68	9	77	26	93	11	85	27	76	15	93	7
Hispanic	67	33	69	25	63	19	72	11	66	3	95	24	73	14	88	19	66	3	39	6	64	23	86	24	82	9	81	31	79	7
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	38	0	*	*	14	0	*	*	33	0	20	0	*	*	*	*	29	0	--	--	67	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	--	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	*	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged	56	12	73	27	66	22	66	13	60	3	88	12	69	4	73	23	70	8	54	4	56	12	84	12	70	7	52	13	81	11
At-Risk	47	7	38	13	48	4	43	5	38	0	84	0	41	0	44	0	52	0	40	0	38	0	67	0	47	0	23	0	68	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	67	4	85	0	47	0	33	0	74	11	58	8	42	4	64	0	38	0	74	19	85	7

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.
*June 2011 Report...Cumulative **May 2011 Report...Primary

Student Group	2007 Math-9		2008 Math-9		2009 Math-9		2010 Math-9		2011 Math-9		2007 Math-10		2008 Math-10		2009 Math-10		2010 Math-10		2011 Math-10		2007 Math-11		2008 Math-11		2009 Math-11		2010 Math-11		2011 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	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	85	27	76	4	63	12	61	9	75	8	68	18	82	18	79	17	75	25	88	19	93	21
Male	83	25	76	30	74	24	76	31	83	27	71	3	68	5	67	11	74	12	73	24	93	24	73	20	69	27	95	19	92	24
Female	76	24	59	17	75	44	73	8	86	27	83	6	57	19	56	7	79	0	60	8	70	11	89	11	83	22	81	19	94	17
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	86	27	75	28	81	30	71	31	85	24	80	0	70	20	71	13	81	4	73	23	94	27	81	22	84	26	93	18	95	23
Hispanic	74	22	58	19	71	33	81	5	81	38	71	8	57	4	48	4	75	15	58	11	65	4	76	10	68	24	80	20	90	20
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	17	0	*	*	14	0	---	---	*	*	*	*	0	0	---	---	20	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	72	11	59	15	61	22	59	9	70	15	74	5	57	5	57	5	71	8	48	6	69	8	74	9	68	21	84	16	90	10
At-Risk	59	0	29	0	25	0	53	6	63	6	55	0	41	0	16	0	42	0	38	4	57	0	65	8	60	0	74	4	75	0
GT	100	80	100	73	100	100	*	*	100	13	*	*	100	40	100	25	100	60	*	*	100	50	*	*	100	60	100	64	100	100
Title I	---	---	---	---	---	---	76	23	85	27	---	---	---	---	---	---	75	8	68	18	---	---	---	---	---	---	88	19	93	21

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Writing-4		2008 Writing-4		2009 Writing-4		2010 Writing-4		2011 Writing-4		2007 Writing-7		2008 Writing-7		2009 Writing-7		2010 Writing-7		2011 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	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	100	45	90	38	85	37	80	8	70	5	98	29	90	37	93	49	92	33	94	33
Male	100	24	96	35	80	25	82	3	55	6	97	19	92	36	86	41	88	27	96	29
Female	100	60	83	42	88	46	77	15	91	4	100	50	87	39	100	58	95	38	92	38
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	100	50	89	43	81	52	78	9	69	8	100	26	90	39	91	49	91	47	97	33
Hispanic	100	39	91	32	88	25	82	7	69	3	95	35	90	33	94	56	97	21	89	32
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	60	40	86	14	*	*	*	*	---	---	57	0	*	*	100	0	80	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	100	33	83	37	83	21	75	6	66	0	96	22	79	21	92	38	87	32	93	32
At-Risk	100	25	82	21	75	14	68	0	31	0	95	9	67	13	78	11	84	4	86	5
GT	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100	80	100	50	*	*	*	*
Title I	100	7	82	25	83	11	80	8	70	5	96	13	71	6	67	11	92	33	94	33

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Science-5		2008 Science-5		2009 Science-5		2010 Science-5		2011 Science-5		2007 Science-8		2008 Science-8		2009 Science-8		2010 Science-8		2011 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	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	97	60	97	53	94	57	98	57	100	62	71	17	74	22	71	23	79	37	77	25
Male	100	76	100	57	96	67	100	64	100	73	77	23	71	29	74	36	73	43	81	35
Female	94	48	94	50	92	46	96	52	100	48	65	12	80	7	65	0	86	27	74	18
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	100	62	94	64	97	60	100	68	100	74	90	23	78	22	76	29	85	38	80	30
Hispanic	88	59	100	38	90	52	96	46	100	44	45	9	71	24	59	14	73	33	75	18
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	83	0	100	20	100	57	*	*	---	---	*	*	38	0	*	*	40	20
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	97	42	97	47	94	48	96	52	100	47	56	4	72	12	64	7	57	24	72	17
At-Risk	89	11	96	20	92	36	95	43	100	41	50	0	50	0	33	6	20	0	48	12
GT	100	100	---	---	100	100	*	*	*	*	100	45	100	80	*	*	100	71	*	*
Title I	89	22	87	7	82	18	98	57	100	62	43	0	45	0	29	0	79	37	77	25

Student Group	2007 Science-10		2008 Science-10		2009 Science-10		2010 Science-10		2011 Science-10		2007 Science-11		2008 Science-11		2009 Science-11		2010 Science-11		2011 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	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	
All Students	63	10	63	9	62	4	75	19	72	20	90	9	85	4	87	11	92	20	95	20	
Male	65	13	73	14	79	7	76	21	80	25	100	10	82	7	85	12	95	32	92	23	
Female	61	6	52	5	44	0	71	14	60	12	78	7	89	0	89	11	89	11	100	17	
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	
White, non-Hispanic	72	12	60	10	74	6	81	23	79	21	97	15	96	8	90	10	93	21	100	18	
Hispanic	54	8	65	9	46	0	70	15	55	10	78	0	70	0	84	12	90	19	90	24	
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	17	0	74	17	25	0	*	*	---	---	*	*	40	0	*	*	
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	58	11	62	5	71	5	67	13	63	11	71	0	81	0	75	10	95	10	91	18	
At-Risk	32	0	35	0	40	0	53	0	52	7	80	0	71	0	81	6	83	13	85	8	
GT	*	*	100	60	100	17	100	80	*	*	100	38	*	*	100	60	100	55	100	60	
Title I	---	---	---	---	---	---	75	19	72	20	---	---	---	---	---	---	92	20	95	20	

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 TAKS District and Campus Reports.

Student Group	2007 Social Studies-8		2008 Social Studies-8		2009 Social Studies-8		2010 Social Studies-8		2011 Social Studies-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
All Students	82	18	92	28	86	18	84	31	92	21
Male	84	20	89	31	86	24	86	34	96	37
Female	81	15	100	20	87	9	82	27	88	9
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	93	24	96	30	86	24	85	33	90	27
Hispanic	68	9	86	24	86	9	87	27	93	17
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	75	0	*	*	83	17
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	75	13	88	24	75	4	67	14	86	22
At-Risk	63	0	67	8	67	0	40	0	84	8
GT	100	45	100	80	*	*	100	71	*	*
Title I	59	0	64	9	64	0	84	31	92	21

Student Group	2007 Social Studies-10		2008 Social Studies-10		2009 Social Studies-10		2010 Social Studies-10		2011 Social Studies-10		2007 Social Studies-11		2008 Social Studies-11		2009 Social Studies-11		2010 Social Studies-11		2011 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	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	98	25	95	23	93	42	96	43	88	32	97	47	100	23	100	25	100	42	98	48
Male	97	30	95	27	93	57	94	43	95	45	100	61	100	27	100	32	100	67	96	46
Female	100	17	95	19	93	26	100	43	77	12	93	30	100	17	100	16	100	22	100	50
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	100	40	90	15	94	45	93	59	88	38	100	53	100	30	100	26	100	41	100	55
Hispanic	96	9	100	30	92	38	100	20	86	19	91	35	100	14	100	24	100	43	95	38
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	67	0	*	*	44	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	94	17	95	19	95	38	96	28	83	22	93	36	100	17	100	16	100	20	95	41
At-Risk	95	0	94	6	85	15	90	35	73	13	92	24	100	8	100	6	100	26	92	38
GT	*	*	100	80	100	83	100	100	*	*	100	75	*	*	100	60	100	100	100	100
Title I							96	43	88	32							100	42	98	48

Above data is taken from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, & 2011 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	2010-2011	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
All Students	99%	100%	100%	100%	TBD	100%	99%	100%	100%	TBD
African Am.	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD
Hispanic	98%	99%	99%	99%	TBD	99%	99%	99%	100%	TBD
White	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD
Eco. Disadv.	99%	100%	99%	100%	TBD	99%	100%	100%	100%	TBD
LEP	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD	100%	100%	100%	100%	TBD
Special Ed.	98%	100%	100%	100%	TBD	98%	100%	100%	100%	TBD

AYP Adequate Yearly Progress	Performance Reading/ELA (Grades 3 – 8 and 10)									
	Performance Standard					Met Standard				
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
All Students	60%	60%	67%	73%	TBD	95%	92%	93%	89%	TBD
African Am.						86%	100%	83%	88%	TBD
Hispanic						93%	90%	90%	86%	TBD
White						97%	92%	95%	91%	TBD
Eco. Disadv.						94%	91%	90%	84%	TBD
LEP						100%	67%	64%	67%	TBD
Special Ed.						95%	71%	73%	63%	TBD

AYP Adequate Yearly Progress	Performance Math (Grades 3 – 8 and 10)									
	Performance Standard					Met Standard				
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
All Students	50%	50%	58%	67%	TBD	85%	85%	79%	79%	TBD
African Am.						57%	75%	67%	50%	TBD
Hispanic						80%	80%	73%	76%	TBD
White						88%	89%	84%	83%	TBD
Eco. Disadv.						79%	80%	75%	75%	TBD
LEP						80%	44%	64%	33%	TBD
Special Ed.						79%	51%	54%	53%	TBD

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	2009 – 2010
All Students	97.0%	96.5%	96.5%	96.0%	TBD
Male	97.2%	96.6%	96.5%	95.8%	TBD
Female	96.9%	96.4%	96.4%	96.3%	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	---	*	*	TBD
Black, non-Hispanic	95.9%	94.6%	96.7%	94.7%	TBD
White, non-Hispanic	97.1%	96.7%	96.4%	96.0%	TBD
Hispanic	97.0%	96.3%	96.5%	96.1%	TBD
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	96.4%	95.7%	96.1%	95.3%	TBD
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	97.1%	97.4%	97.7%	97.7%	TBD
Economically Disadvantaged	96.6%	96.0%	95.8%	95.4%	TBD
At-Risk	96.5%	96.2%	95.6%	95.3%	TBD

Student Group	Student Graduation Rates					Student Dropout Rates (9-12)				
	Class of 2006	Class of 2007	Class of 2008	Class of 2009	Class of 2010	2005 – 2006	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2008-2009	2009 – 2010
All Students	95.3%	95.8%	93.1%	96.1%	TBD	0.4%	0.4%	1.6%	0.9%	TBD
Male	96.7%	91.7%	100.0%	93.9%	TBD	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	1.5%	TBD
Female	94.1%	100%	84.6%	100.0%	TBD	0.0%	1.0%	3.7%	0.0%	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	TBD	---	---	---	---	TBD
Black, non-Hispanic	---	*	*	---	TBD	0.0%	*	*	*	TBD
White, non-Hispanic	95.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	TBD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TBD
Hispanic	95.2%	90.0%	82.6%	90.9%	TBD	1.1%	1.0%	3.8%	1.9%	TBD
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	TBD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	TBD
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	---	---	---	TBD	*	---	*	*	TBD
Economically Disadvantaged	100.0%	91.7%	85.7%	93.8%	TBD	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.2%	TBD
At-Risk	93.5%	90.5%	80%	88.9%	TBD	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	2.9%	TBD

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	2011-2012	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
District Aggregate	100%	100%	100%	97.22%	100%	TBD	100%	100%	100%	97.50%	100%	TBD

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	2011-2012	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
District Aggregate	0%	0%	0%	2.78%	0%	TBD	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	TBD

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	2010 - 2011	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2008 – 2009	2009 – 2010	2010 - 2011
District	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Missed AYP Mathematics (Performance)	TBD	None	None	None	None	TBD
High School	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	TBD	None	None	None	None	TBD
Junior High	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	TBD	None	None	None	None	TBD
Elementary	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	TBD	None	None	None	None	TBD

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

NOTES:

- 1) **Meaning of Symbols:** # = 1st 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.