

# Stockdale Independent School District



## District Improvement Plan

2009-2010

Stockdale ISD Board Approved on December 14, 2009

Revised 12-14-09

## **2009-2010 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.

**2009 – 2010 Stockdale ISD Site-Based Committee  
Districtwide Educational Improvement Committee**

**Superintendent**

Vicki Wehmeyer

**Administrators**

Roxanne Seidel – Board Designee (SCE)

Sharon Dunn – Non-classroom Professional

**Counselor**

Sara Lyssy

**Special Education**

Kimberly Hierholzer

**Librarian**

Ginger Jackson

**Teachers**

Jennifer Heerssen – Junior High

Amanda Driffill – Teacher (GT)

Patricia Kaweck – High School

Barbara Koehler – Elementary

Rochelle Lopez – Junior High (Dyslexia & Title I)

Brigit Lucas – Elementary

Venicia Monita – Elementary (ESL)

**Parent**

Jo Ann Rodriguez

**Business**

Sharon West

**Community**

Beverly May

Jack May

## **Stockdale ISD Needs Assessment 2009 – 2010**

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

- 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) Data
- 2009 Accountability Information
- Standard Accountability Decisions for 2010 and Beyond
- 2007, 2008 and 2009 AYP Data
- 2007, 2008 and 2009 Title I School Improvement Data
- 2006, 2007 and 2008 Student Attendance Rates
- 2006, 2007 and 2008 Student Dropout Rates
- Classes of 2006, 2007 and 2008 Student Graduation Rates
- 2009-2010 At-Risk Data
- 2007, 2008 and 2009 Highly Qualified Data
- STaR Chart Data
- Survey of Needs for Special Education
- Survey of Needs for Facilities
- School Board Priorities
- DEIC recommendations

# **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.

# 2009 – 2010 Stockdale ISD Goals

## 1. Finance

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

## 2. High quality instruction, curriculum, increased course options

Achieve a recognized or exemplary rating for 2009 – 2010.

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.

## 3. Retention of staff/invest in current staff

Retain talented and highly effective staff by continuing to recognize achievements that promote collaboration and a positive work environment. Strive to lower student to teacher ratio. Continue to offer high-quality, on-going staff development that results in professional growth for all staff.

## 4. Facilities

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

## 5. Technology

Each grade level will address the appropriate technology TEKS during the school year that will prepare students to compete in a technologically advanced society through integration of technology within the classroom setting by increasing computer to student ratio.

**Stockdale ISD Measurable Performance Objectives for AEIS Ratings in Grades 3 – 11 for 2009 – 2010**

		2007	2008	2009 Actual	2009 With TPM	2010 Goals
Reading/ ELA	All Students	96%	94%	96%	98%	98%
	African American	88%	>99%	88%	>99%	98%
	Hispanic	93%	94%	95%	97%	98%
	White	97%	95%	97%	98%	98%
	Male	94%	93%	95%	98%	98%
	Female	98%	96%	97%	98%	98%
	Special Ed	91%	82%	81%	86%	90%
	Econ Disadv	94%	93%	95%	97%	98%
	LEP	>99%	*	*	*	*
	At Risk	90%	86%	91%	96%	98%
Mathematics	All Students	83%	87%	82%	90%	90%
	African American	50%	71%	50%	63%	75%
	Hispanic	76%	82%	76%	85%	90%
	White	88%	92%	87%	94%	90%
	Male	85%	88%	82%	91%	90%
	Female	80%	86%	81%	90%	90%
	Special Ed	50%	76%	67%	78%	80%
	Econ Disadv	76%	82%	77%	88%	90%
	LEP	86%	*	*	*	*
At Risk	64%	69%	60%	77%	80%	

		2007	2008	2009 Actual	2009 With TPM	2010 Goals
Writing	All Students	99%	92%	92%	98%	98%
	African American	*	*	*	*	*
	Hispanic	97%	90%	92%	97%	98%
	White	>99%	94%	92%	98%	98%
	Male	98%	95%	88%	95%	98%
	Female	>99%	88%	96%	>99%	98%
	Special Ed	*	60%	*	*	98%
	Econ Disadv	98%	84%	93%	98%	98%
	LEP	*	*	*	*	98%
	At Risk	97%	78%	81%	97%	98%
Science	All Students	74%	82%	77%	84%	90%
	African American	*	*	*	*	*
	Hispanic	58%	78%	71%	80%	90%
	White	83%	86%	82%	86%	90%
	Male	79%	82%	82%	84%	90%
	Female	68%	82%	72%	83%	90%
	Special Ed	35%	55%	45%	50%	75%
	Econ Disadv	67%	82%	77%	84%	90%
	LEP	*	*	*	*	*
	At Risk	49%	68%	62%	71%	75%
Social Studies	All Students	87%	96%	92%	99%	99%
	African American	*	*	*	*	*
	Hispanic	81%	97%	93%	>99%	99%
	White	91%	96%	91%	99%	99%
	Male	89%	95%	91%	>99%	99%
	Female	83%	98%	92%	98%	99%
	Special Ed	50%	50%	78%	94%	99%
	Econ Disadv	81%	95%	88%	98%	99%
	LEP	*	*	*	*	*
	At Risk	76%	92%	83%	98%	99%

Above data are TAKS Met Standard (Sum of all grades tested, includes selected TAKS Accommodated)

## Stockdale ISD Alternative Funding Sources for 2009 – 2010

Career and Technology	SSA with Floresville ISD	
High School Allotment		\$58,135
IDEA B	SSA with GSEC	
IDEA B (Stimulus)	SSA with GSEC	\$157,374
State Compensatory Education		\$325,670
Student Success Initiative	(pending NOGA)	\$6,969
Title I, Part A Schoolwide (Improving Basic Programs)		\$199,307
Title I, Part A Schoolwide (Stimulus)		\$99,133
Title II, Part A (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting)		\$56,576
Title II, Part D (Enhancing Education Through Technology)		\$1,773
Title II, Part D (Enhancing Education Through Technology) (Stimulus)		\$3,177
Title III, Pat A (Limited English Proficient)	SSA with Region 20	
Title IV (Safe and Drug Free Schools)	SSA with Region 20	
Title XIV ARRA Stabilization (Stimulus)		\$256,911
Vision 2020, Year 2 of 2		\$61,811

**District Goal #1 Finance**

**District Objective #1:** 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.

**District Objective #2:** 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	Monthly	Budget Review
C. Central office review of all District needs.	All district funds	Business Manager Superintendent	Ongoing	Annual Audit
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

**District Goal #2 High quality instruction, curriculum, increased course options:**

**District Objective #3:** All student groups will improve TAKS performance over the previous year’s results.

**District Objective #4:** Achieve a recognized or exemplary rating for 2009 – 2010.

**District Objective #5:** 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 2009	Summary of Results
B. Implement scientific-research based programs to increase student performance	Title I, Part A SCE	Teachers	2009 – 2010	Spring 2010 TAKS Data
C. Schedule and hold department meetings.	Local	Department Heads	2009 – 2010	Sign-In Sheets with Agenda
D. Tutoring sessions will be offered for all core subject areas.	SCE	Classroom Teachers	Spring 2010	Tutoring Attendance Sheets
E. Pull-out students who need additional instruction in reading and math.	Title I, Part A SSI	Title I Staff SSI Staff	Fall 2009 Spring 2010	List of Students
F. Provide opportunities for all students to attend presentations. (Aric Bostick, Rachel’s Challenge, Code Red, Red Ribbon Rally, Bully Busters, etc.)	Title IV Title XIV ARRA	Programs Coordinator Principals	2009 – 2010	Attendance
G. Purchase vehicle for transporting special education students for academic and extracurricular including summer and jumpstart services	IDEA ARRA	Business Manager	Fall 2009	Title of Vehicle
H. Encourage teachers to receive training that will allow them to teach Pre-AP and/or AP advanced classes.	Title II, Part A	Teachers	2009 – 2010	Certification
I. Teach SAT/ACT skills and concepts to all students.	Local	Principal Counselor	2009 – 2010	SAT/ACT Student Performance/Participation
J. Encourage all students to participate in Career and Technology Education classes to increase enrollment	CATE Local	Principal Counselor	2009 – 2010	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. Bridges and/or Kuder will be in grades 6-8.)	CATE Local	Regular Teachers CATE Teachers Counselor	2009 – 2010	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	2009 – 2010	Sign-In Sheet
M. District staff will communicate with parents concerning excessive absences.	Local	Principals	December 2009 May 2010	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 2010	TAKS Data Results
O. G/T students in grades K – 12 will be served in a pull-out program on a weekly basis.	Local	GT Teacher	2009 – 2010	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.	Local ESL	ESL Teachers	Each 9 weeks	Promotion/final report card
Q. Create a dating violence policy	Local	Programs Coordinator Principals Counselor	2009 – 2010	Written Policy
R. Create a policy addressing sexual abuse of children	Local	Programs Coordinator Principals Counselor	2009 – 2010	Written Policy
S. Provide opportunities for parental involvement (open house, parent-teacher conferences, PTO meetings, etc.)	Local	Principals	2009 – 2010	Attendance Sheets
T. Provide important information to parents in a language that they understand.	Local	Translators	2009 – 2010	Written Information Translated

**District Goal #3 Retention of staff/invest in current staff**

**District Objective #6:** Retain talented and highly effective staff by continuing to recognize achievements that promote collaboration and a positive work environment.

**District Objective #7:** Strive to lower student to teacher ratio.

**District Objective #8:** 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 D Title III, Part A Title IV IDEA Vision 2020 Local	Staff	2009 – 2010	Staff Development Certificates
B. Provide training opportunities for general education teachers regarding individual students with disabilities in their classrooms.	IDEA	GSEC Staff	2009 – 2010	Staff Development Certificates
C. Encourage all teachers to receive the initial 30 hours GT training or 6 hour GT refresher.	GT Co-Op	Teachers	2009 – 2010	Staff Development Certificates
D. Conduct Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training refreshers to trained staff.	IDEA	GSEC Staff	Fall 2009 Spring 2010	Staff Development Certificates
E. Instructional classroom paraprofessionals will receive training to meet requirements of NCLB, if any are in need of training.	Title II, Part A	ESC Staff	2009 – 2010	Certificate of Completion
F. Motivational speaker presentation.	Title IV	Programs Coordinator	August 2009	Attendance
G. Hire additional special education teachers and support staff	IDEA ARRA	Principals Superintendent	Fall 2009	Increase in Staff
H. Utilize a class size reduction teacher at 5 <sup>th</sup> grade for ELA.	Title II, Part A	Principal	2009 – 2010	Staff List
I. Provide Workers' Compensation Training	Local	Programs Coordinator	November 2009	Sign-In Sheets

#### District Goal #4 Facilities

**District Objective #9:** 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. Stockdale ISD will prepare a facility study – long term planning.	Local	Superintendent Board of Trustees Architect Firm	Ongoing	Completed Facility Study/Plan
B. Stockdale ISD Board will adopt a resolution to implement an energy savings plan to reduce energy by 5% over the next six years.	Local	Superintendent Board of Trustees	2009 – 2015	Resolution Utility Bills
C. 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
D. Replace air-conditioner units at elementary.	Title XIV ARRA	Maintenance	Fall 2009	Paid Invoice
E. Repair roof at elementary	Title XIV ARRA	Maintenance	Fall 2009	Paid Invoice
F. Upgrade air-conditioner unit in district server room	Title XIV ARRA	Maintenance	Fall 2009	Paid Invoice

**District Goal #5 Technology**

**District Objective #10:** Each grade level will address the appropriate technology TEKS during the school year that will prepare students to compete in a technologically advanced society through integration of technology within the classroom setting by increasing computer to student ratio.

STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE	FORMATIVE EVALUATION
A. Teachers will be given opportunity to attend staff development for teaching the TEKS to include the SBEC Standards and integration of technology in the classroom.	Title II, Part D	Teachers Principals	2009 – 2010	Staff Development Certificates
B. Upgrade teacher computers at elementary and junior high	Title I ARRA	Technology Director	2009 – 2010	Paid Invoices
C. Distribute Macbooks to all high school students	Vision 2020	Principal	August 2009	Inventory Log
D. Provide Elmos and projectors to all teachers at elementary and junior high	Title XIV ARRA	Technology Director	2009 – 2010	Paid Invoices

## APPENDIX

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

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

Student Group	6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2007		6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2008		6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2009		7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2007		7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2008		7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2009	
	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	88	19	86	41	91	39
Male	92	69	96	54	100	54	82	18	88	41	86	29
Female	94	61	100	59	97	65	100	21	84	40	96	50
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	97	75	97	62	100	65	88	16	93	50	88	41
Hispanic	86	57	100	44	96	56	90	24	73	23	100	38
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	63	0	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	82	45	97	43	100	60	84	16	81	30	85	23
At-Risk	75	50	88	50	100	27	76	4	65	18	67	0
GT	*	*	100	100	100	100	*	*	100	80	100	50
Title I	71	29	91	9	88	0	77	12	67	11	56	0

Student Group	8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2007		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading # 2008		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading # 2009	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	91	46	94	49	88	51
Male	89	41	91	31	88	46
Female	93	52	100	88	88	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	94	55	96	54	88	41
Hispanic	87	35	95	48	86	41
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	38	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	*	*
Economically Disadvantaged	92	19	92	46	78	41
At-Risk	82	18	77	23	63	11
GT	100	73	100	80	*	*
Title I	80	16	73	18	47	0

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

Student Group	9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2007		9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2008		9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading 2009		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 2007		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 2008		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 2009	
	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	94	2	95	19	93	23
Male	100	33	88	44	91	11	90	0	91	17	90	21
Female	95	18	90	38	100	21	100	5	100	20	96	25
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	100	26	83	44	93	7	92	0	95	19	94	19
Hispanic	96	26	96	37	95	25	96	4	95	18	92	28
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	71	0	*	*	---	---	*	*	50	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	100	21	85	26	91	23	90	5	95	10	96	13
At-Risk	95	9	72	8	75	0	91	0	100	6	81	5
GT	100	40	100	73	100	43	*	*	100	20	100	75
Title I												

Student Group	11 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 2007		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 2008		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA 2009	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	96	25	98	13	91	22
Male	93	27	96	18	85	19
Female	100	23	100	6	100	26
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	100	25	100	21	90	20
Hispanic	91	22	95	5	92	24
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	---	---	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	86	0	95	5	90	20
At-Risk	91	4	96	12	88	6
GT	100	75	*	*	100	40
Title I						

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

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

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

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

Student Group	9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2007		9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2008		9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2009		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2007		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2008		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2009	
	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	76	4	63	12	61	9
Male	83	25	76	30	74	24	71	3	68	5	67	11
Female	76	24	59	17	75	44	83	6	57	19	56	7
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	86	27	75	28	81	30	80	0	70	20	71	13
Hispanic	74	22	58	19	71	33	71	8	57	4	48	4
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	17	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	72	11	59	15	61	22	74	5	57	5	57	5
At-Risk	59	0	29	0	25	0	55	0	41	0	16	0
GT	100	80	100	73	100	100	*	*	100	40	100	25
Title I												

Student Group	11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2007		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2008		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math 2009	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	82	18	79	17	75	25
Male	93	24	73	20	69	27
Female	70	11	89	11	83	22
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	94	27	81	22	84	26
Hispanic	65	4	76	10	68	24
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	69	8	74	9	68	21
At-Risk	57	0	65	8	60	0
GT	100	50	*	*	100	60
Title I						

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

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

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

Student Group	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2007		5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2008		5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2009		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2007		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2008		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2009	
	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	71	17	74	22	71	23
Male	100	76	100	57	96	67	77	23	71	29	74	36
Female	94	48	94	50	92	46	65	12	80	7	65	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	*	*	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	100	62	94	64	97	60	90	23	78	22	76	29
Hispanic	88	59	100	38	90	52	45	9	71	24	59	14
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	83	0	100	20	---	---	*	*	38	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	*	*	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	97	42	97	47	94	48	56	4	72	12	64	7
At-Risk	89	11	96	20	92	36	50	0	50	0	33	6
GT	100	100	---	---	100	100	100	45	100	80	*	*
Title I	89	22	87	7	82	18	43	0	45	0	29	0

Student Group	10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2007		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2008		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2009		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2007		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2008		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Science 2009	
	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	90	9	85	4	87	11
Male	65	13	73	14	79	7	100	10	82	7	85	12
Female	61	6	52	5	44	0	78	7	89	0	89	11
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	---	---	---	---	*	*	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	72	12	60	10	74	6	97	15	96	8	90	10
Hispanic	54	8	65	9	46	0	78	0	70	0	84	12
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	17	0	*	*	---	---	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	58	11	62	5	71	5	71	0	81	0	75	10
At-Risk	32	0	35	0	40	0	80	0	71	0	81	6
GT	*	*	100	60	100	17	100	38	*	*	100	60
Title I												

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

Student Group	8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2007		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2008		8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2009		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2007		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2008		10 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2009	
	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	82	18	92	28	86	18	98	25	95	23	93	42
Male	84	20	89	31	86	24	97	30	95	27	93	57
Female	81	15	100	20	87	9	100	17	95	19	93	26
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	---	---	*	*	*	*	---	---	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	93	24	96	30	86	24	100	40	90	15	94	45
Hispanic	68	9	86	24	86	9	96	9	100	30	92	38
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	---	---	*	*	75	0	---	---	*	*	67	0
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	75	13	88	24	75	4	94	17	95	19	95	38
At-Risk	63	0	67	8	67	0	95	0	94	6	85	15
GT	100	45	100	80	*	*	*	*	100	80	100	83
Title I	59	0	64	9	64	0						

Student Group	11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2007		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2008		11 <sup>th</sup> Grade Social Studies 2009	
	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended	Percent Met Standard	Percent Commended
All Students	97	47	100	23	100	25
Male	100	61	100	27	100	32
Female	93	30	100	17	100	16
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	*	*	---	---	---	---
White, non-Hispanic	100	53	100	30	100	26
Hispanic	91	35	100	14	100	24
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	*	*	*	*	*	*
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	---	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	93	36	100	17	100	16
At-Risk	92	24	100	8	100	6
GT	100	75	*	*	100	60
Title I						

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

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

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

Above data are taken from 2008 & 2009 District AYP Report and 2007-2008 & 2008-2009 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) District Report.

Student Group	Student Attendance Rates			Student Graduation Rates		
	2005 – 2006	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	Class of 2006	Class of 2007	Class of 2008
All Students	97.0%	96.5%	96.5%	95.3%	95.8%	93.1%
Male	97.2%	96.6%	96.5%	96.7%	91.7%	100%
Female	96.9%	96.4%	96.4%	94.1%	100%	84.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	*	---	*	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	95.9%	94.6%	96.7%	---	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	97.1%	96.7%	96.4%	95.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Hispanic	97.0%	96.3%	96.5%	95.2%	90.0%	82.6%
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	96.4%	95.7%	96.1%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	97.1%	97.4%	97.7%	*	---	---
Economically Disadvantaged	96.6%	96.0%	95.8%	100.0%	91.7%	85.7%
At-Risk	96.5%	96.2%	95.6%	93.5%	90.5%	80%

Student Group	Student Dropout Rates (7-8)			Student Dropout Rates (9-12)		
	2005 – 2006	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008	2005 – 2006	2006 – 2007	2007 – 2008
All Students	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	1.6%
Male	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Female	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	3.7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black, non-Hispanic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
White, non-Hispanic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.0%	3.8%
Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	---	---	---	*	---	*
Economically Disadvantaged	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
At-Risk	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%

*Above data are taken from 2008 & 2009 District AYP Report and 2007-2008 & 2008-2009 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	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
District Aggregate	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Campuses	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

HQT Highly Qualified Teacher Report	Percentage of Classes Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers (Low-Poverty Schools)			Percentage of Classes Taught By Highly Qualified Teachers (High-Poverty Schools)		
	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
District Aggregate	100%	100%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Campuses	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009
District Aggregate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campuses	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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

Stockdale	Adequate Yearly Progress			Title I School Improvement		
	2006 - 2007	2007 - 2008	2008 – 2009	2006 - 2007	2007 - 2008	2008 – 2009
District	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None
High School	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None
Junior High	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None
Elementary	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Meets AYP	None	None	None

*Above data are taken from 2007, 2008 & 2009 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.