HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

BUILD
BRIDGE
BELIEVE

Campus Name: Stephen F. Austin High School

Campus Number: 101 912 001

Principal: Jorge Arredondo

School Support Officer / Lead Principal: Noelia Longoria

Chief School Officer: Harrison Peters

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2014-2015

SIP Part 1: Background, Data Analysis and Needs Assessment

MISSION STATEMENT

Mission Statement

The **vision** of Stephen F. Austin High School (Austin) is to develop socially responsible and productive lifelong learners who will positively contribute to the East End community and society as a result of a quality educational experience. The **mission** of the school is to provide the opportunity for students to fully develop the skills needed to think logically, independently, and creatively as well as communicate effectively.

The **core values** of Austin are:

Step by Step: We believe greatness is the result of hard work, dedication and innovation.

Value the Purpose: We believe in one community learners stretching towards excellence.

Understand Then Be Understood: We believe everyone deserves a voice and we respect individual authenticity.

It will require an unwavering commitment to a shared course of action to make our beliefs and visions a reality. Above all, the results of all reform must have a positive impact on the important relationship between the teacher and the student.

SCHOOL PROFILE

Austin HS had a total enrollment of 1,695 students for the 2013-2014 school year.* The total membership is 1,657 students. Approximately 88% percent of our students are from families of economic disadvantage or low socio-economic status and approx. 77% are considered at-risk. There are 12 students or .7% identified as belonging to families who are migrant workers. Approximately 9% of the students are identified as Gifted and Talented. Approximately 95% are of Hispanic-American descent, approximately 4% of African- American descent, and approx. 1% are of Anglo- American, American Indian, or of other descent. Approximately 38 or approx. 2% are classified as immigrant. Approximately 92% are enrolled in classes in the Career and Technical Education pathways. The special education population is about 11% of the student body, the limited English proficiency population (LEP) is approx. 21%, of which 18% are enrolled in mainstream education and approx. 3% are Special Education students. *(data from 1/24/14)

SHARED DECISION MAKING

Organizational Structure

The Campus Intervention Team (CIT) is based on the Shared Decision-Making model (SDM) designed to establish, monitor, and evaluate goals for budgeting, staffing, curriculum, planning, school organization, staffing patterns, and staff development. This model is aligned to state legislation and HISD board policy. A Professional Service Provider (PSP), and a School Support Officer or Lead Principal is a member of the Campus Intervention Team for schools under state *Improvement Required* sanctions or federal sanctions as a *Focus* or *Priority* campus. Teacher Development Specialists and other district level personnel can serve as members of the CIT according to the campus needs. The intention of the SDMC is to pull together our community in a constructive, organized, and unified body to enhance the education of all students. The CIT is responsible for development, implementation, and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan, monitoring of student performance, and determination of student interventions and support service.

The SDMC component of the CIT is the shared decision-making body. Professional staff representatives are elected by the faculty. Principal determines number of classroom teachers; then, assigns half that number to school-based staff. This complies with 2/3 - 1/3 rule for professional staff. In addition, the committee must have one non-instructional staff, one business member, at least two parents and at least two community members. Parents are elected by the PTO, PTA or PACS membership.

The Council meets approximately monthly and as needed to discuss issues brought forth by the administration, staff, parents, or community. It is supported by standing committees that address budgeting, staffing, curriculum,

planning, school organization, staffing patterns, and staff development. Standing committees meet as needed. Parents are encouraged to serve on standing committees.

The SDMC functions under the direction of the Principal. Members of the SDMC attend SDMC meetings for the term of his/her office, monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Plan, address issues presented by the principal, present issues for discussion and recommend resolutions to the SDMC, create ad hoc committees by consensus of the SDMC, chair standing committees and ad hoc committees, submit minutes to the principal for committee meetings, and report the recommendations to the SDMC. The SDMC is responsible for approving all professional development plans for the school.

The Principal coordinates the process of shared decision making, facilitates communication for all stakeholders, considers issues and recommendations from the community, SDMC, and standing committees, and makes decisions based on those recommendations.

Shared Decision Making Process

Consensus is the ultimate goal of the SDMC. Agreement by all participants is not always possible or necessary for consensus. Consensus is a collective process that provides a forum for full dialogue on appropriate/applicable responses to issues.

Members of the committees discuss and make recommendations to the SDMC. The SDMC reviews recommendations and reaches consensus. Sufficient consensus is defined as a willingness to settle an issue in favor of the majority. All points of view will be considered and general agreement must be reached before decisions will be implemented. If general agreement is not reached, further study of the issue will occur and alternatives will be presented until agreement is reached. After all alternatives have been explored, a deadlock can be broken by a majority vote. As issues come up for discussion, the chairperson is responsible for ensuring that all present have a legitimate opportunity to state their case. The principal retains the authority to exercise a veto over decisions made by the SDMC.

Method of Communications

Members of the school community may submit non-personnel issues for consideration through the shared decision-making process. Written issues or concerns are submitted to any SDMC member or placed in the SDMC box located in the main office. A school community member may attend a meeting of any committee to discuss or present an issue. All meetings are on the monthly calendar. The SDMC delivers issues to appropriate standing committees for action. Communications from all committees is transmitted to faculty, staff, and parents.

Membership composition of the SDMC, Updated 8/26/2014

Membership Composition of the Shared Decision-Making Committee					
Number of Classroom Teachers (2/3)		18	Number of Parents		2
Number of School-based Staff (1/3)		9	Number of Community Members		2
Number of Non-Instructional Staff		1	Number of Business Members		3
	Arredondo, Jorge	Principal	Principal		Automatic
1	Hayden, S	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
2	Johnson, T	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
3	Jones, Maj. J.	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
4	McGee, L	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
5	Michel, C	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
6	Pate, K	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
7	Ramos, A	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
8	Reed, D	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
9	Williams, M A	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	13-15	Term Ends/15
10	Kerrissey, M	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
11	Saenz, J	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
12	Treviño, V	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
13	Williams, C	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16

14	Zamora, L	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
15	Cupp, J	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
16	Sampson, W	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
17	Ji, F	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
18	Flores, E	Teacher	Classroom Teacher	14-16	Term Ends/16
1	Chavana, C	General Clerk II	Non-Instructional	14-16	Term Ends/16
1	Chapel, G	Teacher	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
2	Guerra, T	Registrar	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
3	Hernandez, L	Counselor	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
4	Maryland, D	Academy Admin.	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
5	Mayes, J	Counselor	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
6	Peña, V	Counselor	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
7	Quintanilla, Officer	Police Officer	Other School Based Prof	13-15	Term Ends/15
8	Landa, L	Assistant Principal	Other School Based Prof	14-16	Term Ends/16
9	Medina,J	Asst. Principal	Other School Based Prof	14-16	Term Ends/16
1	Alvarado, Frances	Parent, PTO President	Parent	14-16	Principal Appoint
2	Angelita Henry	Parent	Parent	14-16	Principal Appoint
1	Rocha, Aida; Luby's		Business Partner	14-16	Principal Appoint
2	Gupton, Tiffany; Luby's		Business Partner	14-16	Principal Appoint
3	Chavez, Armando; Aztek Technology Group		Community Member	14-16	Principal Appoint
4	Gonzales, Mike; FAB Industries		Business Partner	14-16	Principal Appoint
5	Garcia, Baltazar; Guacamaya Marketing and Concessions		Community Member	14-16	Principal Appoint
6	Victoremanuel Marrero-Choe, The Promise Church		Community Member	14-16	Principal Appoint

Other Campus Intervention Team members (non-SDMC):

For campuses designated for *Improvement Required*, *Focus* or *Priority* for 2014-2015:

Name	Position
Noelia Longoria	School Support Officer (SSO) or Lead
Sherry Green, Consultant	Professional Service Provider (PSP)
Barker, Lois - ELA	Teacher Development Specialist (TDS)
May, LaRhonda - Science & Campus Liaison	Teacher Development Specialist (TDS)
Conner, Deidra - Math	Teacher Development Specialist (TDS)
Olmstead, Ian - Social Studies/Hist	Teacher Development Specialist (TDS)

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Narrative of Data Analysis and Root Causes (causal factors)

Student Performance Data Analysis

I. Summary STAAR Results

Table 1 Austin HS, Comparison of STAAR All Test Campus Summary, Spring, '12, Spring, '13, Spring '14 Administrations, Achieved Level II Satisfactory or Level III Advanced Results

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Eng I Read	454	43	0	43	0	48	0	17	0	40	0	15	0	15	0	93	0
Eng II Read	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Eng I Write	454	24	0	24	0	29	0	0	0	22	0	2	0	6	0	57	0
Eng II Write	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Algebra I	403	75	7	75	7	84	0	40	0	76	9	62	5	56	0	88	25
Geometry	40	95	5	95	5	*	*	*	*	95	5	*	*	*	*	95	5
Biology	447	69	0	69	0	75	0	40	0	68	1	50	0	47	0	100	0
World Geo	450	56	0	56	0	60	0	20	0	56	0	34	0	13	0	100	4
2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Eng I Read	548	40	1	40	2	43	0	--	--	39	1	12	1	12	0	93	10
Eng II Read	418	60	3	60	3	59	5	--	--	59	3	32	0	6	0	100	10
Eng III Read	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Eng I Write	590	23	0	23	0	25	0	--	--	23	0	8	0	10	0	66	0
Eng II Write	423	24	0	25	0	19	0	--	--	24	0	11	0	5	0	63	0
Eng III Write	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Algebra I	425	67	4	67	14	74	5	--	--	67	4	43	1	57	0	88	8
Geometry	391	72	3	71	3	90	0	--	--	72	3	56	0	53	0	100	12
Algebra II	93	100	72	100	71	--	--	--	--	100	75	100	75	--	--	100	62
Biology	476	67	2	67	2	70	5	--	--	66	2	44	0	52	0	98	11
Chemistry	401	63	0	62	0	81	0	--	--	64	0	51	0	35	0	97	3
World Geo	520	54	3	55	3	32	5	80	20	53	3	34	0	32	0	91	11
World Hist	399	44	1	44	1	48	0	--	--	44	0	23	0	21	0	81	6
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Eng I All	694	36	0	36	0	33	0	33	0	35	0	15	0	16	0	84	0
First Time Eng I	443	44	0	44	0	40	0	*	*	43	0	13	0	17	0	83	0
Retest Eng I	251	22	0	22	0	14	0	*	*	20	0	16	0	15	0	*	*
Eng II All	509	39	0	38	0	44	0	*	*	38	0	8	0	10	0	85	3
First Time Eng II	384	45	0	44	0	50	0	*	*	43	0	11	0	5	0	89	3
Retest Eng II	125	21	0	20	0	*	*	*	*	20	0	4	0	18	0	*	*

	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Algebra I	451	73	4	73	4	73	0	*	*	73	4	63	1	35	0	94	17
First Time Alg I	398	79	4	80	5	80	0	*	*	80	5	73	1	38	0	94	17
Retester Alg I	62	31	0	31	0	*	*	*	*	30	0	26	0	22	0	*	*
Biology All	516	73	1	74	1	68	0	*	*	74	1	51	0	45	0	90	7
First Time Bio	441	78	1	78	1	77	0	*	*	78	1	54	0	49	0	90	7
Retest Bio	75	48	0	49	0	*	*	*	*	49	0	43	0	30	0	*	*
US Hist All	344	88	5	88	5	100	9	*	*	88	5	69	0	57	0	100	19

As seen in Table 1, the first year of the STAAR EOC administration offered up mixed results. On some tests, Year Two did not show growth overall, and posted some slightly regressive scores.

In spring of 2013, the group of students taking Algebra II did remarkably well, with all achieving a Level II score and 72% achieving Level III.

In the interim between Spring of ’13 and Spring of ’14, the legislature passed HB5, which made many changes in the EOC testing program. One major change was that the Eng I and II tests were converted from four tests (Eng I and II Reading, Eng I and II Writing) to two tests (Eng I Reading/Writing and Eng II Reading/Writing.)

Furthermore, the TEA is now releasing data on the “all” group of EOC-eligible students, the “first time” test-takers, and the “re-testers” the data look quite different from the spring of ’14 and offer up some interesting food for thought. The first-time test takers did show some progress in relation to the “all” group of prior years, but generalizations may be hazardous as this represents two different “denominators” or student groups. There are two major points that are interesting and relevant and may have major implications for campus-wide decision-making, possibly indicating direction for instruction, academic and social interventions, professional development, planning, hiring, etc., for the school.

The first is the rates of passing of the SPED and LEP students in relation to the “all” group. Both groups show significantly lower rates of passing for every test and for every administration (whether first time or retesting.) There is a serious achievement gap between “all” and these two sub-groups.

Secondly, the rates of re-testing students achieving a Level II or III is low. Re-testers seem to have the best chance of passing Biology. The Algebra test is the next most successful for re-testers. The rates of passing Eng I and Eng II are quite a bit lower. US History was initiated for our students only last year, so there is no mass re-testing data yet.

II. English I and English II (Reading and Writing) STAAR Results

Table 2 Austin High School, Comparison of STAAR EOC Met 2012 Standard and 2013, English I Reading and 2014 ELA Tests and the NEW Eng I and Eng II tests **(reading and writing were merged for Spring 2014 administration)**

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Eng I Read	454	43	0	43	0	48	0	17	0	40	0	15	0	15	0	93	0
Eng II Read	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
Eng I Read	548	40	1	40	2	43	0	--	--	39	1	12	1	12	0	93	10
Eng II Read	418	60	3	60	3	59	5	--	--	59	3	32	0	6	0	100	10
Eng III Read	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
Eng I All	694	36	0	36	0	33	0	33	0	35	0	15	0	16	0	84	0
First Time Eng I	443	44	0	44	0	40	0	*	*	43	0	13	0	17	0	83	0
Retest Eng I	251	22	0	22	0	14	0	*	*	20	0	16	0	15	0	*	*

Eng II All	509	39	0	38	0	44	0	*	*	38	0	8	0	10	0	85	3
First Time Eng II	384	45	0	44	0	50	0	*	*	43	0	11	0	5	0	89	3
Retest Eng II	125	21	0	20	0	*	*	*	*	20	0	4	0	18	0	*	*

As seen in Table 2, in the spring of 2012, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the STAAR English I Reading were low, with some subgroups doing poorly. In 2013, there was no improvement and indeed there was a regression in some scores.

In the interim between Spring of '13 and Spring of '14, the legislature passed HB5, which made many changes in the EOC testing program. One major change was that the Eng I and II tests were converted from four tests (Eng I & II Reading, Eng I & II Writing) to two tests (Eng I Reading/Writing and Eng II Reading/Writing.)

Furthermore, the TEA is now releasing data on the "all" group of EOC-eligible students, the "first time" test-takers, and the "re-testers" the data look quite different from the spring of '14 and offer up some interesting food for thought. The first-time test takers did show some progress in relation to the "all" group of prior years, but generalizations may be hazardous as this represents two different "denominators" or student groups. There are two major points that are interesting and relevant and may have major implications for campus-wide decision-making, possibly indicating direction for instruction, academic and social interventions, professional development, planning, hiring, etc., for the school.

The first is the rates of passing of the SPED and LEP students in relation to the "all" group. Both groups show significantly lower rates of passing for every test and for every administration (whether first time or retesting.) There is a serious achievement gap between "all" and these two sub-groups.

Secondly, the rates of re-testing students achieving a Level II or III is low. The rates of passing Eng I and Eng II are quite a bit lower than the other subjects.

In taking a look at the Austin HS 'all' students' overall performance on the reporting categories for English I EOC, our students struggled with "short answer rating on paired selections," (the average number of points scored was 3.3 out of a possible 9, or 36%), and "short answer rating on single selection," (the average number of points scored was 3.4 out of a possible 9, or 38%). The students did much better on the multiple choice questions dealing with "Understanding/Analysis Across Genres" (the average number of points scored was 3.2 out of a possible 6, or 53%). The students struggled with the 11 items on "Understanding/Analysis of Literary Texts," (the average number of points scored was 5.2 out of a possible 11, or 48%). The 11 items that touched on "Understanding/Analysis of Informational Texts" were also tough for the students (the average number of points scored was 5.4 out of a possible 11, or 49%). The composition could have earned a possible high score of 24. Our students averaged 11 points or 46%. They did better on revision, out of the 11 possible points, the average was 6.7 or 61%. Editing presented a possible 11 points, and our students averaged 4.9 or 44%.

In taking a look at the Austin HS 'all' students' overall performance on the reporting categories for English II EOC, our students struggled with "short answer rating on single selection," (the average number of points scored was 2.7 out of a possible 9, or 30%) and on "short answer rating on paired selections," (the average number of points scored was 3.5 out of a possible 9, or 39%). The students did much better on the multiple choice questions dealing with "Understanding/Analysis Across Genres" (the average number of points scored was 3.8 out of a possible 6, or 64%). The students struggled with the 11 items on "Understanding/Analysis of Literary Texts," (the average number of points scored was 4.7 out of a possible 11, or 42%). The 11 items that touched on "Understanding/Analysis of Informational Texts" were also tough for the students (the average number of points scored was 6 out of a possible 11, or 55%). The composition could have earned a possible high score of 24. Our students averaged 10.5 points or 44%. They did better on revision, out of the 11 possible points, the average was 6.4 or 59%. Editing presented a possible 11 points, and our students averaged 6.6 or 60%.

Table 3 Statewide, Comparison of STAAR EOC Met Standard 2012 and 2013, English I Reading

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Eng I Read	334825	68	8	59	4	59	4	82	13	56	3	18	0	24	1	96	29
Eng II Read	27513	61	9	60	6	54	5	64	11	53	5	21	0	20	0	91	27

2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
Eng I Read	383558	65	11	56	6	68	9	81	18	54	4	18	0	22	1	97	41
Eng II Read	314314	78	21	71	13	71	11	88	31	69	11	31	1	36	2	98	58
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Eng I All	469915	62	6	55	3	53	2	78	12	52	2	21	0	23	0	97	33
First Time Eng I	350566	72	8	64	4	63	4	84	14	61	3	22	0	26	1	98	34
Retest Eng I	119349	35	0	33	0	33	0	43	0	33	0	20	0	20	0	56	1
Eng II All	386468	66	6	58	3	55	2	81	10	55	2	20	0	22	0	97	28
First Time Eng II	330495	73	7	65	3	62	3	85	11	62	2	23	0	26	1	97	28
Retest Eng II	55973	27	0	26	0	25	0	33	0	25	0	14	0	14	0	47	1

For the sake of comparison, the statewide results are in Table 3. As seen in the table, the overall results for the statewide students who took the STAAR English I Reading were higher than the Austin HS students. However, it is interesting to see that statewide there were significant achievement gaps in the sub-groups, as in the Austin HS data. In comparing the Austin HS results and the statewide results, there is clearly an achievement gap in the "all" group and in every subgroup.

III. Math, Algebra I EOC STAAR Results

Table 4 Austin HS, Comparison STAAR EOC Met Standard 2012, 2013, 2014 Algebra I EOC

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Algebra I	403	75	7	75	7	84	0	40	0	76	9	62	5	56	0	88	25
Geometry	40	95	5	95	5	*	*	*	*	95	5	*	*	*	*	95	5
2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Algebra I	425	67	4	67	14	74	5	--	--	67	4	43	1	57	0	88	8
Geometry	391	72	3	71	3	90	0	--	--	72	3	56	0	53	0	100	12
Algebra II	93	100	72	100	71	--	--	--	--	100	75	100	75	--	--	100	62
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
Alg I All	451	73	4	73	4	73	0	*	*	73	4	63	1	35	0	94	17
Alg I First Time	389	79	4	80	5	80	0	*	*	80	5	73	1	38	0	94	17
Alg I Retest	62	31	0	31	0	*	*	*	*	30	0	26	0	22	0	*	*

As seen in Table 4, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the STAAR Algebra I were moderate in '12 and '13. In '14, the Alg I results were higher, the "all group" showing an increase of 6 percentage points achieving Level II. Some subgroups showed stronger results (African American and G/T) and others doing more poorly (LEP, and SPED). For the sake of comparison, the statewide results are in Table 5.

Table 5 Statewide, Comparison of STAAR EOC Met Standard 2012, 2013 and 2014 Algebra I EOC

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent

Algebra I	333567	83	17	79	11	75	8	90	24	76	9	60	4	50	3	98	53
Geometry	84279	98	41	97	27	95	21	99	51	96	23	87	15	85	27	100	61
2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
Algebra I	364613	78	16	74	10	69	7	88	24	71	8	51	3	43	2	98	56
Geometry	297601	86	18	83	11	78	8	92	27	81	10	65	4	55	3	99	57
Algebra II	93135	97	70	95	59	95	55	99	78	95	55	83	36	78	36	99	85
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Alg I All	388672	81	18	77	12	72	8	90	28	75	10	56	3	46	2	99	61
Alg I First Time	343471	86	20	83	14	79	9	92	29	82	12	66	4	54	3	99	61
Alg I Retest	45201	39	0	38	0	36	0	47	0	38	0	29	0	27	0	59	0

For the sake of comparison, the statewide results are in Table 5. As seen in the table, the overall results for the statewide students who took the STAAR Algebra I were higher than the Austin HS students. However, it is interesting to see that statewide there were some significant achievement gaps in the sub-groups, mirrored in the Austin data. In comparing the Austin HS results and the statewide results for Algebra, there is clearly an achievement gap between the results in the "all" group and in almost every subgroup.

When taking a look at the reporting categories for Algebra I, for the "all" group of Austin HS students, the category in with which the students struggled the most was "linear equations and inequalities" (answering an average of 4.3 questions correctly out of 10, or 43%). The students did slightly better on "quadratic and other nonlinear functions (answering an average of 4.3 questions correctly out of 9, or 47%.) The students had the strongest showing on "properties and attributes of functions" (averaging 6 questions correct out of 12, or 50%) and "functional relationships," (answering an average of 3.9 questions out of 8 correctly, or 49%).

IV. US History EOC STAAR Results

Table 6 Austin HS, US History EOC STAAR Results

2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
US History All	344	88	5	88	5	100	9	*	*	88	5	69	0	57	0	100	19

As seen in Table 6, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the US History STAAR EOC World Geography were fairly strong, with some subgroups showing stronger results (African American and G/T) and others doing much more poorly (LEP and SPED). For the sake of comparison, the statewide results are in Table 7 B.

Table 7 Statewide, Comparison of STAAR EOC Met Standard 2012 and 2013, Social Studies

2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
US History All	315057	92	16	89	10	89	9	96	25	88	9	70	2	67	4	100	45
US History First Time	312674	92	16	90	10	89	9	96	25	89	9	71	2	68	5	100	45
US History Retest	2383	52	0	53	1	44	0	54	0	51	0	44	0	33	0	79	0

For the sake of comparison, the statewide results are in Table 7. As seen in the table, the overall results for the statewide students who took the STAAR Social Studies were higher than the Austin HS students. However, it is interesting to see that statewide there were significant achievement gaps in two sub-groups (LEP and SPED),

mirrored in the Austin HS data. In comparing the Austin HS results and the statewide results for Social Studies, there is clearly an achievement gap between the results in the "all" group and subgroups.

When taking a look at the reporting categories for US History, for the "all" group of Austin High School, the students had the most success with the "geography and culture" reporting category (answering an average of 7.6 questions correctly out of a possible 12, or 64%). This was followed by "economics, science, technology and society" (answering an average of 10.1 questions correctly out of a possible 16, or 63%), "government and citizenship," (answering an average of 5.9 questions correctly out of a possible 10, or 59%), and finally "history" (answering an average of 15.8 questions correctly out of a possible 30, or 53%)

V. Science (Biology) STAAR Results

Table 8 Austin HS, Comparison of STAAR EOC Met Standard 2012, 2013 and 2014 STAAR Biology EOC

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Biology	447	69	0	69	0	75	0	40	0	71	0	50	0	47	0	100	0
2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
Biology	476	67	2	67	2	70	5	--	--	66	2	44	0	52	0	98	11
Chemistry	401	63	0	62	0	81	0	--	--	64	0	51	0	35	0	97	3
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
Bio All	516	73	1	74	1	68	0	*	*	74	1	51	0	45	0	90	7
Bio First Time	441	78	1	78	1	77	0	*	*	78	1	54	0	49	0	90	7
Bio Reteste rs	75	48	0	49	0	*	*	*	*	49	0	43	0	30	0	*	*

As seen in Table 8, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the STAAR Biology exam were moderate to good, with the GT subgroup showing stronger results and others doing more poorly (LEP and SPED).

Table 9 Statewide, Comparison of STAAR EOC Met Standard 2012, 2013 and 2014 STAAR Biology EOC

2012 STAAR RESULTS																	
	N	All Level II, Percent	All Level III, Percent	Hisp Level II, Percent	Hisp Level III, Percent	AA Level II, Percent	AA Level III, Percent	W Level II, Percent	W Level III, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level II, Percent	Econ Disadvan. Level III, Percent	LEP Level II, Percent	LEP Level III, Percent	SPED Level II, Percent	SPED Level III, Percent	GT Level II, Percent	GT Level III, Percent
Biology	319044	87	9	82	4	83	4	94	15	82	5	58	1	57	2	99	36
2013 STAAR RESULTS																	
Biology	358797	85	12	80	7	80	5	93	21	79	6	55	1	54	2	99	47
Chemistry	269069	84	12	79	6	78	5	91	17	77	5	56	2	48	2	98	38
2014 STAAR RESULTS																	
Bio All	359669	91	12	88	6	86	5	96	19	87	5	69	1	66	2	100	44
Bio First Time	333769	93	13	91	7	90	5	97	20	91	6	76	1	73	2	100	44
Bio Reteste rs	25900	54	0	54	0	52	0	58	0	53	0	46	0	43	0	74	0

For the sake of comparison, the statewide results are in Table 9. As seen in the table, the overall results for the statewide students who took the STAAR Biology were higher than the Austin HS students. However, it is interesting to see that statewide there were some significant achievement gaps in the sub-groups, mirrored in the Austin data (LEP and SPED). In comparing the Austin HS results and the statewide results for Biology and Chemistry, there is clearly an achievement gap between the results in the "all" group and in almost every subgroup.

When taking a look at the reporting categories for Biology, for the "all" group of Austin HS students, the category in with which the students struggled the most was "cell structure and function" (answering an average of 3.4 questions correctly of a possible 11, or 31%), followed by "interdependence with environmental systems" (answering an average of 3.9 questions correctly of a possible 11, or 36%), "mechanics of genetics" (answering an average of 4.1 questions out of 11 correctly, or 38%) and the best result was in "biological evolution and classification" (answering an average of 4.2 questions correctly of a possible 10, or 42%).

Table 10 Austin HS, HISD, State and Nation Participation and Number/Percent of Exams Scored at 3 or higher

	2012				2013				2014			
	Number Taking Exams	Number of Exams Taken	Number Exams Scored 3+	Percent Scored 3+	Number Taking Exams	Number of Exams Taken	Number Exams Scored 3+	Percent Scored 3+	Number Taking Exams	Number of Exams Taken	Number Exams Scored 3+	Percent Scored 3+
Austin	394	516	107	21	273	402	99	24	274	351	100	29
HISD	13403	23227	7106	31	13,403	23,227	7,106	31	12,966	22,693	7,524	33
Texas	208181	375550	179622	48	208,181	375,550	179,622	48	209,543	398,130	190,042	48
Nation	2,53,941	3,609,939	2,123,139	59	2,053,941	3,609,939	2,123,139	59	2,168,995	3,864,035	2,284,890	59

Source: Memorandum from Superintendent Grier: "Advanced Placement Results, Research and Accountability," 8/2/12

As seen in Table 9.1, the percent scoring 3+ or more on AP exams grew by 3 points.

Table 11 Austin HS, AP Examinations by Year, Subject and Frequency of Scores

	2014						
	Scores						
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**Total**	**Change from '13 of 3 or higher**
Art History	**0**	**0**	**1**	**2**	**7**	**10**	**+1 (3)**
Studio Art:Drawing Portfolio	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**6**	**+2 (3)**
Eng Lang	**0**	**1**	**0**	**22**	**61**	**84**	**-1(4), -4(3)**
Eng Lit	**0**	**1**	**5**	**12**	**10**	**28**	**+1 (4) and +4 (3)**
US History	**0**	**1**	**0**	**2**	**17**	**20**	**-1(4), -2(3)**
World History	**0**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**36**	**43**	**+1(4), +2 (3)**
Calculus A/B	**0**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**8**	**13**	**-2(5), -2(4),+2(3)**
Stats	**0**	**0**	**1**	**6**	**15**	**22**	**No change**
Biology	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**1**	**7**	**-1(3)**
Chemistry	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**4**	**No change**
Physics B	**0**	**0**	**3**	**2**	**10**	**15**	**+2(3)**
Spanish Language and Culture	**11**	**27**	**38**	**13**	**3**	**92**	**+3(4), +21 (3)**
Spanish Literature and Culture	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**5**	**-1(5),-4(4), -10(3)**
	11	**31**	**57**	**76**	**174**	**349**	
	2013						
	Scores						
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**Total**	**Change from '12 of 3 or higher**
Biology	**0**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**6**	**+1 "3" score 100%**
Calculus AB	**2**	**2**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**9**	**+2 "5", +2 "4", 500%**
Chemistry	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**23**	**23**	**This was not offered in '12**
Eng Lang	**0**	**2**	**4**	**15**	**10**	**31**	**+2 "4," -7 "3"**
Eng Lit	**0**	**0**	**1**	**9**	**1**	**11**	**-2 "3"**
Environ Sci	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**6**	**No change in passing scores**
Euro Hist	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**-1 "5", +1 "3"**
Microeconomics	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**This was not offered in '12**
Macroeco	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**34**	**34**	**No change in passing scores**
Physics B	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**14**	**16**	**No change in passing scores**
Span Lang	**21**	**24**	**17**	**25**	**24**	**111**	**+2 "5", +2 "4", - 14 "3"**
Span Lit	**1**	**4**	**12**	**3**	**1**	**21**	**+1 "5", +9 "3"**
Stats	**0**	**0**	**1**	**4**	**7**	**12**	**No change in passing scores**
Studio Art: Drawing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**8**	**-1 "3"**

US Govt & Politics	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**31**	**32**	**No change in passing scores**
US History	**0**	**2**	**2**	**8**	**13**	**25**	**No change in passing scores**
World History	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**44**	**46**	**-1 "3"**
Art History	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**6**	**No change in passing scores**
TOTALS	**24**	**34**	**41**	**79**	**224**	**402**	

2012

	Scores						
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**Total**	
Biology	0	0	0	0	5	5	
Calculus AB	0	0	1	0	24	25	
Eng Lang	0	0	11	16	9	36	
Eng Lit	0	0	3	20	6	29	
Environ Sci	0	0	0	2	4	6	
Euro Hist	1	0	0	1	6	8	
Macroeco	0	0	0	0	27	27	
Physics B	0	0	0	1	17	18	
Span Lang	19	22	31	30	35	137	
Span Lit	0	4	3	1	2	10	
Stats	0	0	1	1	5	7	
Studio Art: 2-D	0	0	4	3	0	7	
Studio Art: Drawing	0	0	1	8	14	23	
US Govt & Politics	0	0	0	0	29	29	
US History	0	2	2	7	15	26	
World History	0	1	0	20	99	120	
Art History	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Human Geography	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTALS	**20**	**29**	**57**	**110**	**297**	**513**	

2011

	Scores						
	5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**Total**	
Biology	0	0	1	0	16	17	
Calculus AB	0	0	1	2	18	21	
Eng Lang	0	0	5	13	18	36	
Eng Lit	0	0	1	10	21	32	
Environ Sci	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Euro Hist	0	0	0	2	10	12	
Macroeco	0	0	0	0	6	6	
Physics B	0	0	1	1	11	13	
Span Lang	10	14	30	42	46	142	
Span Lit	0	0	4	4	4	12	
Stats	0	0	0	3	9	12	
Studio Art: 2-D	0	0	1	2	0	3	
Studio Art: Drawing	0	0	0	2	11	13	
US Govt & Politics	0	0	0	0	0	0	
US History	0	0	1	10	32	43	
World History	0	0	0	1	70	71	
Art History	0	0	0	0	2	2	

Human Geography	0	0	0	0	19	19	
TOTALS	**10**	**14**	**45**	**92**	**293**	**454**	

Table 12 Austin HS students enrolled in Pre-AP and/or AP classes in 2012-2013, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015

Classes	Number of students 2012-2013	Number of students 2013-2014	Number of students 2014-2015
Pre-AP Classes throughout the year	772		671
AP Classes	247		509
Students enrolled in either Pre AP or AP or both	843		1180

Table 13 2014 State Accountability System Safeguards

	All St.	Af Am	Hisp	White	Am Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More races	Econ Disad	SpEd	ELL	TTL Met	TTL Eligible	% of Eligible Measures Met
Performance Status State														
Targets	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%				
Reading	N	N	N						N	N	N	0	6	0
Math	Y		Y						Y	N	Y	4	5	80
Writing												0	0	
Science	Y	Y	Y						Y	N	Y	5	6	83
Social Studies	Y		Y						Y	Y	Y	5	5	100
Totals												14	22	64
Performance Status Federal														
Federal Target	79%	79%	79%	79%					79%	79%	79%			
Reading	N		N		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	N	N	N	n/a		
Math	N		N		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	N	N	N	n/a		
Participation Status														
Targets	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%			
Reading	N	N	N						N	Y	N	1	6	17
Math	N	N	N						N	Y	N	1	6	17
Totals												12	12	17
Federal Graduation Status														
Graduation Target Met	Y		Y						Y	Y	Y	5	5	100
Reason Code	B		B						B	C	C			
												5	5	100
District: Met Federal Limits on Alternative Assessments														
Reading														
Overall	3%													
Modified	2%													
Alternate	1%													
Mathematics														
Overall	3%													
Modified	2%													
Alternate	1%													
Overall Total												21	39	54

As can be seen in Table 2, AHS met most of the eligible measures. AHS did not achieve targets in reading for the students, in math for the Special Education students, and for science for the Special Education students. Austin HS met all the graduation targets. For All, Hispanic and Econ Disadvantaged students, the school met the "b" target, which is a four year graduation rate of 80%, the "c" target was met for Special Education and ELL,

which is the safe harbor target of a 10% decrease in difference from the prior year rate. Interventions for all of these missed targets; graduation and academic achievement, are addressed in the narrative, and in the SMART goals.

Table 14 State, District and Austin HS Attendance in percentages for state, district and school

	State Average	District Average	School (All Students)	
2013-2014			94.3%	Source: Attendance Office,
2012-2013			93.6%	Source: Attendance Office, TX Campus Summary Report
2011-2012	95.9%	95.7%	92.8%	Source: Attendance Office
2009-2010	95.5 %	95.1%	94.1%	Source: School Report Card
2008-2009	95.6 %	95.1%	94.1%	Source: School Report Card

As seen in Table 11, the school's attendance rate has steadily climbed and is the best it has been since at least the 2008-2009 school year.

Table 15 Austin HS Attendance in 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 by Grade level

Grade	Attendance Percentage 2011-2012	Attendance Percentage 2012-2013	Attendance Percentage 2013-2014
9	93	92.9	93.6
10	93.3	94.5	94.5
11	92.8	94.0	95.1
12	92.2	93.0	94.3

Source: Attendance Office, Chancery

As seen in Table 12, the school's attendance rate seems to be best in grade 10, and seems to progressively diminish in grades 11 and 12.

Table 16 Austin HS Student Behavior Summary Report, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

	2011-2012					2012-2013					2013-2014				
PEIMS Category	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	TTL	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	TTL	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	TTL
02 Felony	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
04-Drugs	20	5	3	3	31	32	10	10	5	57	9	9	7	6	31
05-Alcohol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	2
07-Publlc Lewdness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
09-Off Campus Felony T5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
09-Off Campus Felony Not T5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
14-Weapon	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
16-Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
18-Indecency w a Child	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21-Code of Conduct	1063	575	546	213	2397	1478	543	393	316	2730	1224	375	246	297	2142
22-Criminal Mischief	3	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26-Terroristic Threat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
27-Assault School Emp	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28-Assault, Non-School Emp	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	1	2
33-Tobacco	1	1	2	2	6	2	0	4	0	6	1	2	0	0	3
28-Assault against non employee volunteer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41- Fighting	26	10	5	0	41	56	11	12	8	87	6	0	1	1	8
42-Truancy Prt Contributing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
43-Truancy 3 or > Unex Absencs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	33	20	10	164
50-Non-illegal Knife Code	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	3

Source: 2011-2012 data is a report from Chancery, run by Registrar. The 2010-2011 data is a report from Research and Accountability.

As seen from Table 13, the incidences of offenses coded '21" went up from 2011-2012 school year to 2012-2013. This trend was reversed, when the number of total "21" offenses went down 22% from the 2012-2013 school year to the 2013-2014. Drugs, code of conduct offenses, tobacco, and fighting all went down. Fighting went down a precipitous 91%.

Four Year Graduation and Completion Summary, Class of 2012 – As seen in Table 10, the graduation rate for Austin High School is not as strong as the HISD graduation rate overall. This is data which is provided without the TEA 2011 exclusions. A discussion of exclusions follows the table.

Table 17 - HISD and Austin HS Graduation with <u>No Exclusions</u>, Continuer, GED, Dropout and Completion Rates, 2011 and 2012

Houston Independent School District, No Exclusions Standard Education Program, Class of 2012							
	TTL	Graduation Rate (used for AYP)	Continuer Rate	GED Rate	Dropout Rate		
All Students	11,461	78.8	8.0	0.7	12..5		
Af American	3,542	76.7	6.8	0.7	15.8		
Amer Indian	38	71.1	13.2	0	15.8		
Asian	416	91.6	3.6	0	4.8		
Hispanic	6,420	77.4	9.7	0.5	12.4		
Pac. Isl.	28	92.9	3.6	0	3.6		
Two or More	73	91.8	6.8	0	1.4		
White	1,030	89.0	3.5	1.9	5.5		
Other	4	*	*	*	*		
Economic Disad	7,846	80.5	7.1	0.4	12.0		
LEP Ever	1,385	54.6	24.0	0	21.4		
SPED	1,184	61.1	14.5	0.3	24.1		
Stephen F. Austin High School, No Exclusions Standard Education Program, Class of 2012							
	TTL	Graduation Rate (used for AYP)	Continuer Rate	GED Rate	Dropout Rate		
All Students	418	74.6	11.5	0.5	13.4		
Af American	16	81.3	0				
Amer Indian	2	*	*	*	*		
Asian	*	*	*	*	*		
Hispanic	397	74.3	12.1				
Pac. Isl.	*	*	*	*	*		
Two or More	*	*	*	*	*		
White	3	*	*	*	*		
Other	*	*	*	*	*		
Economic Disad	320	80.0	5.6	0.6	13.8		
LEP Ever	97	58.8	21.6	0	19.6		
SPED	39	41.0	17.9	0	41.0		
Houston Independent School District, No Exclusions Standard Education Program, Class of 2011							
	TTL	Graduation Rate (used for AYP)	Continuer Rate	GED Rate	Dropout Rate	Completion Rate	
All Students	11561	78.5	9.1	.6	11.8	87.6	
Af American	3746	77.1	7.5	.6	14.7	84.7	
Amer Indian	21	71.4	14.3		14.3	85.7	
Asian	448	91.7	5.1	.2	2.9	96.9	
Hispanic	6212	76.2	11.3	.6	12	87.5	
White	1076	90.1	4.1	1.4	4.5	94.1	
Economic Disad	7688	80.5	8.6	.5	10.4	89.1	

LEP Ever	1473	54.4	25.2	.2	20.2	79.6	
SPED	1137	64.6	1	.6	19.8	79.6	
Stephen F. Austin High School, No Exclusions Standard Education Program, Class of 2011							
	TTL	Graduation Rate	Continuer Rate	GED Rate	Dropout Rate	Completion Rate	
All Students	468	79.1	12	.2	8.8	91	
Af American	16	87.5	6.2		6.2	93.8	
Amer Indian	1	*	*	*	*	*	
Asian	1	*	*	*	*	*	
Hispanic	446	78.5	12.3	.2	9	90.8	
White	4	*	*	*	*	*	
Economic Disad	399	84.5	7.3	.3	8	91.7	
LEP Ever	104	61.5	21.2		17.3	82.7	
SPED	40	75	20		5	95	

In 2011, the TEA introduced six criteria that exclude a student from the longitudinal rate calculations for campus and district reporting. A student who meets one or more of the following criteria is excluded from campus and district completion rate calculations used for accountability purposes:

- A student who is ordered by court to attend a high school equivalency certificate program but has not earned a high school equivalency certificate,
- A student previously reported to the state as a dropout,
- A student in attendance but who is not in membership for purposes of average daily attendance,
- A student whose initial enrollment in a school in the United States in Grades 7-12 was as an unschooled refugee or asylee as defined by TEC §39.027 (a-1),
- A student who is in a district exclusively as a function of having been detained at a county facility but is otherwise not a student of the district in which the facility is located (TEC §39.054(f) and §39.055), and
- A student who is incarcerated in a state jail or federal penitentiary as an adult or as a person certified to stand trial as an adult

A completion rate is the percentage of students from a class of beginning (not repeating) ninth graders who complete their high school education by their anticipated graduation date. The cohort includes students who transfer in during the second, third, or fourth years. Depending on the accountability system used, a completer may be defined as a student who graduates, continues high school in the fall after expected graduation, or receives a GED.

An initiative that was inaugurated in the 2011-2012 school year that may have had a mitigating impact on graduation is the creation of two inter-session semesters. The Winter Holiday Accelerated Credit Program (WHACP) allowed students to work off attendance asterisks, use APEX software to regain credits for failed classes and gain original credit for Economics. During the Spring Break holiday, we had a Spring Holiday Accelerated Credit Program (SHACP) in which students worked off asterisks and regained credits for failed classes. We will continue with these programs, and possibly will add other Saturday or PM programs.

Narrative of Identified Needs

Identified Needs for English I and II

As seen in Table 2, in the spring of 2012, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the STAAR English I Reading were low, with some subgroups doing poorly. In 2013, there was no improvement and indeed there was a regression in some scores.

In the interim between Spring of ’13 and Spring of ’14, the legislature passed HB5, which made many changes in the EOC testing program. One major change was that the Eng I and II tests were converted from four tests (Eng I & II Reading, Eng I & II Writing) to two tests (Eng I Reading/Writing and Eng II Reading/Writing.)

Furthermore, the TEA is now releasing data on the “all” group of EOC-eligible students, the “first time” test-takers, and the “re-testers” the data look quite different from the spring of ’14 and offer up some interesting food for thought. The first-time test takers did show some progress in relation to the “all” group of prior years, but

generalizations may be hazardous as this represents two different "denominators" or student groups. There are two major points that are interesting and relevant and may have major implications for campus-wide decision-making, possibly indicating direction for instruction, academic and social interventions, professional development, planning, hiring, etc., for the school.

The first is the rates of passing of the **SPED and LEP** students in relation to the "all" group. Both groups show significantly lower rates of passing for every test and for every administration (whether first time or retesting.) There is a serious achievement gap between "all" and these two sub-groups.

Secondly, the rates of **re-testing students** achieving a Level II or III is low. The rates of passing Eng I and Eng II are quite a bit lower than the other subjects.

In taking a look at the Austin HS 'all' students' overall performance on the reporting categories for English I EOC, our students struggled with "short answer rating on paired selections," (the average number of points scored was 3.3 out of a possible 9, or 36%), and "short answer rating on single selection," (the average number of points scored was 3.4 out of a possible 9, or 38%). The students did much better on the multiple choice questions dealing with "Understanding/Analysis Across Genres" (the average number of points scored was 3.2 out of a possible 6, or 53%). The students struggled with the 11 items on "Understanding/Analysis of Literary Texts," (the average number of points scored was 5.2 out of a possible 11, or 48%). The 11 items that touched on "Understanding/Analysis of Informational Texts" were also tough for the students (the average number of points scored was 5.4 out of a possible 11, or 49%). The composition could have earned a possible high score of 24. Our students averaged 11 points or 46%. They did better on revision, out of the 11 possible points, the average was 6.7 or 61%. Editing presented a possible 11 points, and our students averaged 4.9 or 44%.

In taking a look at the Austin HS 'all' students' overall performance on the reporting categories for English II EOC, our students struggled with "short answer rating on single selection," (the average number of points scored was 2.7 out of a possible 9, or 30%) and on "short answer rating on paired selections," (the average number of points scored was 3.5 out of a possible 9, or 39%). The students did much better on the multiple choice questions dealing with "Understanding/Analysis Across Genres" (the average number of points scored was 3.8 out of a possible 6, or 64%). The students struggled with the 11 items on "Understanding/Analysis of Literary Texts," (the average number of points scored was 4.7 out of a possible 11, or 42%). The 11 items that touched on "Understanding/Analysis of Informational Texts" were also tough for the students (the average number of points scored was 6 out of a possible 11, or 55%). The composition could have earned a possible high score of 24. Our students averaged 10.5 points or 44%. They did better on revision, out of the 11 possible points, the average was 6.4 or 59%. Editing presented a possible 11 points, and our students averaged 6.6 or 60%.

As seen in Table 4, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the STAAR Algebra I were moderate in '12 and '13. In '14, the Alg I results were higher, the "all group" showing an increase of 6 percentage points achieving Level II. Some subgroups showed stronger results (African American and G/T) and others doing more poorly **(LEP, and SPED).**

Identified Needs for Biology

As seen in Table 8, the overall results for the Austin HS students who took the STAAR Biology exam were moderate to good, with the GT subgroup showing stronger results and others doing more poorly **(LEP and SPED.)**

Identified Needs for US History

When taking a look at the reporting categories for US History, for the "all" group of Austin High School, the students had the most success with the "geography and culture" reporting category (answering an average of 7.6 questions correctly out of a possible 12, or 64%). This was followed by "economics, science, technology and society" (answering an average of 10.1 questions correctly out of a possible 16, or 63%), "government and citizenship," (answering an average of 5.9 questions correctly out of a possible 10, or 59%), and finally "history" (answering an average of 15.8 questions correctly out of a possible 30, or 53%)

What will the school do to improve student achievement on STAAR EOC Assessments and instruction overall?

To improve student achievement on STAAR End-of-Course (EOC) assessments and instruction overall, we will continue to implement the HISD Seven Elements for High Quality Literacy Instruction:

1. Authentic and Purposeful Reading
2. Authentic and Purposeful Writing
3. Authentic and Purposeful Vocabulary Study
4. Accountable Student Academic Discourse
5. Digital Literacy and Research Skills
6. Tiered, Structured and Personalized Intervention
7. Progress Monitoring (Checking for Understanding)

In addition, we plan to implement:
* Instructional Rounds will help to develop a common language of excellent instruction in our school. It will furthermore enhance Professional Learning Community conversations regarding instruction,
* Design new practices in looking at student data by teachers, as well as by leaders, including scheduling regular data team meetings. The faculty must improve practices to manage data to improve instruction and target interventions,
* Continue to enhance instruction and student engagement through the revolutionary PowerUp laptop computer program,
* Change the grade-level order of mathematics courses to Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry and Pre-Cal (for most students) in order that the students will receive algebra concepts in tenth grade as well as ninth.
* Offer electives which will support EOC success, such as Creative Writing and Environmental Systems,
* Continue to improve administrative monitoring of existing Professional Learning Community (SOSA) activities,
* Offer support for reading through I-station as part of the larger Secondary Reading Initiative,
* Utilize the HISD Curriculum's EOC Intervention Framework for Algebra I, Biology, English I to assist in providing instruction to re-testers;
* Participate in HISD PD training of department chairs and lead teachers in strategies for improving literacy instruction, in all content areas, for all students and for ELL and SPED students in particular,
* Seek training for our content-area teachers to address the academic and linguistic needs of our ELL students,
* Create an intervention program for EOC test takers (who failed) which is cost efficient and fully accepted (meaning full participation) by students and parents,
* Purchase the STELLAR reading/writing materials from Region IV for every ELA teacher and provide training in October to help teachers utilize this source.
* Continue to utilize of the teacher-created School-wide Academic Intervention Plan (SWIPE) to actively monitor and respond to student failures,
* Continuation of activities for appraisers to improve calibration of Teacher Appraisal and Development System,
* Regular meetings with the Teacher Development Specialists assigned to Austin to debrief on observed trends,
* Improved monitoring of appropriate accommodations and modifications.
* Improve climate through the implementation of a pilot TEACH program with a limited number of faculty and classrooms,
* Implementation of a tutoring program with Senior Academic tutors.

Following the in-depth data analysis, needs assessment and development of the campus SIP, the campus must indicate on this table that any unmet or barely met accountability standards have been addressed:

Performance Index	Met? Y/N	Unmet or barely met Subject(s) / Measure(s)?	Student Group(s) Below Standard?	Needs addressed in the following SIP Goal(s):
Texas Accountability System				
I. Student Achievement	Yes	Reading, 46%	All, African American, Hispanic, SPED, Econ Disadv, ELL	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
II. Student Progress	n/a	This campus is not rated on Index 2.	This campus is not rated on Index 2.	This campus is not rated on Index 2.
III. Closing Gaps	Yes	Reading	Hispanic, Econ Disadv	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
IV. Postsecondary Readiness	Yes	STAAR Postsecondary Readiness and Post Secondary Indicator	All, Hispanic	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
Federal System Safeguards				
Reading Performance	No	Reading	All, African American, Hispanic, Econ Disadv, SPED, ELL	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.

Performance Index	Met? Y/N	Unmet or barely met Subject(s) / Measure(s)?	Student Group(s) Below Standard?	Needs addressed in the following SIP Goal(s):
Reading Participation	No	Reading.	All, African American, Hispanic, Econ Disadv, ELL. For SPED the standard was met.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
Reading Alt/Mod	Yes	Reading	For SPED the standard was met.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
Math Performance	No	Math	All, African American, Hispanic, Econ Disadv, ELL, SPED.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
Math Participation	No	Math	All, African American, Hispanic, Econ Disadv, ELL. For SPED the standard was met.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
Math Alt/Mod	Yes	Math	For SPED the standard was met.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
4 Year Graduation	Yes	4 Year Graduation	All, Hispanic, Econ Disadv, SPED, ELL.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.
5 Year Graduation	No	5 Year Graduation	No groups met the five year graduation target of 85%.	Needs assessment and discussion of instructional interventions in the SIP.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Ongoing throughout the Year	TEACH: To Educate All Children. This is training to improve classroom and school climate.	Personnel from TEACH.	
Ongoing throughout the Year	Partnership with Alley Theatre. These are classroom activities led by theatre professionals including theatre professionals and Equity actors designed to spark engagement and improve reading/writing, as well as pedagogy.	Personnel with the Alley Theatre.	
Ongoing throughout the Year	Writers in the Schools (WITS): This is training and lesson planning by published authors to improve ELA instruction.	Personnel from WITS	
Ongoing throughout the Year	Houston A+ Challenge, Leadership Support by Mr. Paul Castro: Mr. Castro provides consultation to the administrative team on a variety of leadership topics.	Mr. Castro of Houston A+ Challenge.	
8/11/2014	The '14-'15 School Improvement Plan	Principal Arredondo	01:00:00
8/11/2014	Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support	Administrator D. Maryland	02:30:00

8/11/2014	Teambuilding Activities followed by Career and Technical Education Tour	CTE Teachers	02:00:00
8/12/2014	Instructional Rounds	Dean of Instruction E. Cocina, Asst. Principal Landa	07:00:00
8/12/2014	Campus Emergency Preparedness	Asst. Principal Medina	01:00:00
8/12/2014	Blood Borne Pathogens	Asst. Principal Landa	01:00:00
8/12/2014	Faculty Handbook Updates	Principal Arredondo	01:30:00
8/12/2014	Department and PLC Meeting Time	Content Managers and Administrators	02:30:00
8/12/2014	ELA Instructional Roundtable	Asst. Principal I. Rodriguez	02:00:00
8/13/2014	Department and PLC Meeting Time	Content Managers and Administrators	02:30:00
8/13/2014	ELA Instructional Roundtable	Asst. Principal I. Rodriguez	02:00:00
8/14/2014	Department and PLC Meeting Time	Content Managers and Administrators	02:30:00
8/14/2014	ELA Instructional Roundtable	Asst. Principal I. Rodriguez	02:00:00
8/15/2014	Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Child Abuse Reporting EEOC Training	Dean of Instruction E. Cocina	01:00:00
8/15/2015	HISD TADS Update	Asst. Principal Medina	01:30:00
8/15/2014	Bullying Awareness Training	Administrator D. Maryland	01:00:00
8/15/2014	Grade Level Planning/Team Meetings	Various Administrators	02:30:00
8/18/2014	HUB Training (PowerUp Computer Dashboard Training)	HISD Personnel	07:00:00
8/19/2014	STAAR 3Di: Instruct, Implement, Impact (Looking at Instructional Data)	LeadForward Trainer Dr. Wade Labay	07:45:00
8/18/2014	Boating Safety Certification for Maritime and Ag Sci Teachers	State Parks Personnel	03:00:00
8/19/2014	Athletic Coaches Planning Meeting, Working Lunch	Administrator D. Maryland	01:00:00
8/20/2014	TEACH: To Educate All Children, Training for All Staff (Classroom/School Affective Climate/Management Training)	Personnel from TEACH, Shannon Caleffe	01:30:00
8/21/2014	Baylor College of Medicine TB Study Overview	Dr. L. Hatzenbuehler, MD	00:30:00
8/21/2014	Digital Citizenship for Teachers	Computer Education Tech Cervantes	02:00:00
8/21/2014	SPED Accommodated Test and Classroom/Lesson Modifications	SPED Content Manager Raul Asoy	01:00:00
8/21/2014	First day of school procedures	Attendance Clerk Ms. Chavana	02:00:00
9/27/2014	Understanding Student Progress and HISD TADS	Coach Emile Fair of HISD	01:00:00
Sept. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Eng I and II EOC Literacy Routine: Pencil to Paper	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Sept. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: United Streaming	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00

Oct. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Note taking Strategies to Enhance Academic Writing Literacy Routine: Get to Know Me	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Oct. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: Discovery Education	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
10/29/2014	Region IV Training on STELLAR Materials for ELA Classrooms: "Putting the Puzzle Together: Reading, Writing, and Rigor--Making It Fit Together"	Ms. S. Starr of Region IV	07:45:00
Nov. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Two Column Notes to Enhance Academic Writing Literacy Routine: Turn the Light On	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Nov. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: United Streaming	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
Dec. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Three Column Notes to Enhance Academic Writing Literacy Routine: Do I Really Get It?	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Dec. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: Accessing Digital Textbooks	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
Jan. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Reading Strategy (Annotation or Other) Literacy Routine: Huddle	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Jan. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: Google Books for Specific Lexile Levels	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
Feb. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Reading Strategy (Annotation or Other) Literacy Routine: Be The Lead Reader	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Feb. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: Collaboration Tools for Literacy	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
Mar. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Reading Strategy (Annotation or Other) Literacy Routine: Let's Talk	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00
Mar. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: OneNote	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
Apr. Faculty Meeting	Discussion of Reading Strategy (Annotation or Other) Literacy Routine: Pump Up the Vocab	Dean of Instruction Cocina	00:45:00

Apr. Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: HUB	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00
May Conference Period Training	Training on Digital Literacy: Other Digital Literacy Web App	Campus Education Tech Noe Cervantes	00:45:00

Based on the Data Analysis and Needs Assessment, the following Goals and Objectives have been developed to address the identified needs:

SIP Part 2: Goals & Objectives – Planning, Implementing, Monitoring

GOAL AREA I: Reading

See: Campus Literacy Plan (a copy of the Campus Literacy Plan is kept with this template)

The 2014-2015 *Campus Literacy Plan* will serve as the Reading Goal for all schools. This plan must be developed in collaboration with the SDMC and submitted for review and approval along with the rest of the SIP document.

Summary of the Campus Literacy Plan – Austin High School will focus on "Authentic and Purposeful Reading, Writing and Vocabulary study for the whole school, across all content areas. We will implement this through these action steps:

- Purchase Region IV STELLAR teacher materials for all ELA teachers, then provide campus-based training by Region IV staff in late October,
- Purchase of high-interest materials for reading in elective classrooms that are on a variety of Lexile levels,
- Institute regular, systematic Instructional Rounds,
- Institute regular, systematic Data Team meetings,
- Institute regular, systematic meetings on Teacher and Student Work Products (e.g. lesson plans), (e.g. essays),
- Faculty Meetings regularly and systematically include instructional prof dev presentation on a Literacy Routine (e.g. Sept. – Pencil to Paper, Oct. – Get to Know Me, Nov. – Turn the Light On, etc.),
- Faculty Meetings regularly and systematically include a mini lesson on a literacy topic that can be utilized easily and immediately by ELA and on ELA teachers (e.g. Summary Exit Tickets, Annotation strategy, Inference from Text, Use of Sentence Stems, Thesis statements in every content, etc.)

These implementation and efficacy of these steps will be monitored through:

- Regular, systematic Instructional Rounds,
- Regular, systematic Data Team meetings,
- Regular, systematic meetings on Teacher and Student Work Products (e.g. lesson plans), (e.g. essays)
- SOSA Team Meetings
- Ed Plan Metrics, including CBA's, end of cycle and spring DLA's,
- Lesson Plans
- Walk-Through's
- EOC, TELPAS, AP and other results at the end of the year.

GOAL AREA I: Mathematics

Priority Need:	Improve percentage of students achieving a Level II or III on the STAAR Alg I EOC examination.
Critical Success Factor(s):	Improve Academic Performance, which is the foundational CSF.
Goal:	By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of Algebra I students taking the EOC STAAR test achieving a Level II results will reach 80% (up from 73% in 2014). The percentage achieving Level III will reach 10 % (up from 4% in 2014.)

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
Teacher production of more than 50 videos on instruction in order to 'flip' the classroom.	Differentiation of Instruction, Effective use of Technology, Efficient Use of Resources incl. Teacher Time	Maria Rios, Content Manager	Extra duty pay	June, 2014 – June 2015	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
PowerUp Laptop Initiative	Efficient use of learning time, improved student climate	Noe Cervantes, Campus Education Tech	Salary and extra duty pay, Various logistical resources including storage space	Jan., 2014 – Jun. 2015	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Instructional Rounds	Improve academic performance	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Data Team Meetings	Increase the use of quality data to drive instruction	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	

Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

GOAL AREA I: Other Academic

Priority Need:	Improve percentage of students achieving a Level II or III on the STAAR Bio EOC examination.
Critical Success Factor(s):	Improve Academic Performance, which is the foundational CSF.
Goal:	By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of Biology students taking the EOC STAAR test achieving a Level II results will reach 80% (up from 73% in 2014). The percentage achieving Level III will reach 10 % (up from 1% in 2014.)

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
PowerUp Laptop Initiative	Efficient use of learning time, improved student climate	Noe Cervantes, Campus Education Tech	Salary and extra duty pay, Various logistical resources including storage space	Jan., 2014 – Jun. 2015	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Instructional Rounds	Improve academic performance	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Data Team Meetings	Increase the use of quality data to drive instruction	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	

Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

GOAL AREA I: Other Academic

Priority Need:	Improve percentage of students achieving a Level II or III on the STAAR U S History EOC examination.
Critical Success Factor(s):	Improve Academic Performance, which is the foundational CSF.
Goal:	By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of US Hist students taking the EOC STAAR test achieving a Level II results will reach 95% (up from 88% in 2014). The percentage achieving Level III will reach 10 % (up from 5% in 2014.)

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
PowerUp Laptop Initiative	Efficient use of learning time, improved student climate	Noe Cervantes, Campus Education Tech	Salary and extra duty pay, Various logistical resources including storage space	Jan., 2014 – Jun. 2015	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Instructional Rounds	Improve academic performance	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Data Team Meetings	Increase the use of quality data to drive instruction	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	

Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

GOAL AREA I: Attendance

Priority Need:	Raise the attendance rates.
Critical Success Factor(s):	Improve School Climate
Goal:	By the end of the '14-'15 school year, attendance percentage will be 96% or better.

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
Weekly Graduation Success Squad or DRIP Team Meeting	Monitor attendance data to the last child on a weekly basis.	Ms. Chavana, Attendance Leadership Team	Time Leadership Focus	August 11, 2014 – June, 2015	This practice is monitored weekly. Systematic use of new data on a weekly basis.
PBIS Program (Positive Behavior Interventions and Support)	Improve School Climate	Administrator Dytonya Maryland	Time Incentives for desired behavior and acts of good citizenship including attendance	August 11, 2014 – June, 2015	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
TEACH Program	Improve School Climate	Principal Jorge Arredondo	Time Leadership Focus	August 11, 2014 – June, 2015	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	

Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

GOAL AREA I: Index 4

Priority Need:	Improve STAAR Postsecondary Readiness
Critical Success Factor(s):	Improve Academic Performance, which is the foundational CSF.
Goal:	By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of students meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard will rise from 25% in 2014 to 45%.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.

Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
Dropout Prevention	Reduce the number of drop-outs	The Graduation Success Squad or DRIP Team.	Time and Leadership Focus	Year-Round	10/31, there will be a review. In the fall, spring the SDMC will review and evaluate.
Ninth Grade Promotion	Reduce the number of ninth-grade repeaters	Assistant Principal Ivonne Rodriguez	Mentorship program Time Leadership Focus Teacher and other Caring Adult Participation	Year-Round	In the fall, spring the SDMC will review and evaluate by looking at grades and credit recovery efforts.
AP/IB, Dual Credit Enrollment	Increase the number of students enrolled in AP classes	Magnet Coordinator C. Trejo	Time Leadership Focus Materials and presentation for parents	Year-Round	In the fall, spring the SDMC will review and evaluate by looking at grades and participation in special AP and DC initiatives such as weekend practice testing.
AP/IB Exams Participation/Prep	Increase the number of students who sit for AP examinations and increase the number of examinations they take	Magnet Coordinator C. Trejo	Special tutorial opportunities for intensive instruction and practice	Year-Round	In the fall, spring the SDMC will review and evaluate by looking at grades and participation in special AP initiatives such as weekend practice testing.
PSAT/SAT/ACT Participation/Prep	Increase the number of students who sit for SAT examinations	Counselor J. Mayes	Time in School Day for school day SAT	Fall, 2014	In the fall, spring the SDMC will review and evaluate by looking at participation rates.
College Readiness	Increase the number of students who are fully	Principal Arredondo	Time and Leadership Focus	Year-Round	In the fall, spring the SDMC will review and

	"college ready" upon graduation. This postsecondary component is defined as the percent of graduates meeting the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) college readiness standards in both reading/ELA and mathematics; specifically, high school graduates who met the college-ready criteria on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) exit-level test, or the SAT test, or the ACT test, in both English language arts and mathematics.				evaluate by looking at grades and participation in special tutorial, AP and DC initiatives such as weekend practice testing.
Other:					

GOAL AREA I: Highly Qualified and Effective Teachers, Administrators and Paraprofessionals

Priority Need:	Increase Teacher Quality
Critical Success Factor(s):	Increase Teacher Quality, Increase Leadership Effectiveness
Goal:	By the end of 2014, sophisticated systems for embedded professional development such as Instructional Rounds and Data Team meetings will be implemented on a systematic and regular basis.

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
Instructional Rounds	Improve academic performance	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.
Data Team Meetings	Increase the use of quality data to drive instruction	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	Professional development, purchase of study books, time	Dr. Cocina, Dean of Instruction	SDMC and Leadership Team evaluates the program in the fall, mid-year and end of year.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	

	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

GOAL AREA II: Safety, Public Support, Public Confidence

Priority Need:	Decrease the numbers of "21" offenses on the school campus
Critical Success Factor(s):	Improve School Climate
Goal:	By the end of 2014, the number of "21" offenses reported on the campus will decrease by 10% from 2142 in 2013-2014 school year to 1928 in the 2014-2015 school year.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Fall
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	Spring
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.

Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
Bullying Prevention	Reduce the incidence of bullying on campus.	Administrator Dytonya Maryland	Positive Behavioral Intervention Program	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Child Abuse Prevention	Reduce the incidence of reports of child abuse.	Counselors and CIS	Student Handbook Materials and programs to educate the students	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Sexual Abuse Prevention	Reduce the incidence of reports of sexual abuse.	Counselors and CIS	Student Handbook Materials and programs to educate the students	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Dating Violence Awareness	Reduce the incidence of reports of dating violence.	Counselors and CIS	Student Handbook Materials and programs to educate the students	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Discipline Management	Reduce the number of discipline referrals for any code	Administrator Dytonya Maryland	Positive Behavioral Intervention Program	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Drug, Tobacco, Alcohol Prevention	Reduce the incidence of students using controlled substances.	Counselors and CIS	Student Handbook Materials and programs to educate the students	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Suicide Prevention	Reduce the number of students who present with suicidal ideation	Counselors and CIS	Student Handbook Materials and programs to educate the students	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Decrease DAEP Referrals	Reduce the incidence of DAEP referrals from campus.	Administrator Dytonya Maryland	Positive Behavioral Intervention Program	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Decrease Special Education In-School Suspension	Reduce the incidence of ISS referrals from campus.	Administrator Dytonya Maryland	Positive Behavioral Intervention Program	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.

Decrease Special Education Out-of-School Suspension	Reduce the incidence of SPED Out of School Suspension on campus.	Administrator Dytonya Maryland	Positive Behavioral Intervention Program	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Coordinated Health Program	Reduce the incidence of absences due to health concerns.	Nurse A. Johnson	Materials for health education	July, 2014 – July, 2015	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Other:					

GOAL AREA III: Special Populations

GOAL AREA IV: Parent & Community Involvement

Priority Need:	Parents must be involved in their children's education
Critical Success Factor(s):	Increase Family and Community Engagement
Goal:	By the end of 2014, parental engagement will increase by 10% as documented by parent involvement in parent events and meetings.

Strategy	Objective	Responsible	Resources	Timeline	Milestones/ Evaluation
Design and implement events and meetings that are engaging to parents and will provide an opportunity for school personnel to share information about their children's academic life.	The objective is that more parents participate in programs and understand the challenges their children are facing in school (and hopefully assist in overcoming them).	Dr. Cocina Dean of Instruction, Title I Coordinator	Time Funding for parent door prize supplies and breakfast snacks	Ongoing, throughout the year	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.
Provide materials and communications to the home that are in intelligible languages and appropriate culturally	The objective is that more parents participate in programs and understand the challenges their children are facing in school (and hopefully assist in overcoming them).	Dr. Cocina Dean of Instruction, Title I Coordinator	Time School Messenger Publication resources	Ongoing, throughout the year	The SDMC can look at data in the fall and spring as benchmarks.

Milestone Monitoring to be completed by Campus Intervention Team/SDMC/Leadership

	Mid-Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
On track?	
Modifications?	
	End of Year
Date of Review	Click here to enter a date.
Major intervention(s)	
Data reviewed	
Achievements?	
Challenges?	
Goal met?	

Special Funding Goals

Goal Area: Title I Ten Components

1. **Comprehensive needs assessment** – All data were reviewed for all students and student groups. The results and conclusions of this review are reflected in the SMART goals and the Executive Summary for the next school year. The components of the campus needs assessment include the: establishment of a school wide planning team, clarification of the campus vision with a focus on reform, creation of the school profile, identification of data sources and analysis of the data.
2. **School-wide reform strategies** – The continued use of the student information system to identify and monitor student growth; the continued use of district Unit Planning Guides and the staff development which accompanies it; the use of Exemplar Lessons and the meeting by content and grade level to monitor; and develop instructional plans are part of our school-wide reform strategies.
3. **Instruction by highly qualified teachers** –100% of our teachers are certified for the position they hold. They have varying levels of experience, and support is given to less experienced teachers by their colleagues. Parents are notified if a teacher is not certified and the teacher must either be working toward certification or efforts continue to hire someone who is certified.
4. **High-quality and on-going professional development** – Lead Teachers who receive training during the summer and during the school year, provide on-site training and monitoring to assist in professional development. The Shared Decision-Making Committee identifies areas in which staff development is needed. Staff members participate in staff development offered by the District. Staff development may also be done on site by in-house instructional leaders and also by administrative district instructional support staff.
5. **Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers** – Recruitment and retention of teachers who are certified for positions for which they are appropriately certified is ongoing. We closely work with our district's HISD Personnel officer and network with other principals to help in this effort; our own teachers also serve as recruiters. The result has been that 100% of our classroom teachers are appropriately certified for the position they hold.
6. **Strategies to increase parental involvement** –Open Houses, frequent telephone contact and website updates are methods of recognizing parents as partners.
7. **Transition from early childhood programs** –Not applicable to secondary schools.
8. **Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the uses of academic assessments** – Ongoing staff development is available on site to analyze assessment data, whether national, state or teacher produced, to use in making instructional decisions. Grade level or departmental meetings and the SDMC provide forums to discuss assessment issues.
9. **Effective, timely additional assistance** – The use of formative and summative assessments allow for individual student progress to be monitored at the teacher level, building and administrative district levels so that interventions and assistance will be timely.

Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs – At the building level, federal, state and local services and programs are coordinated to best address student needs; this coordination of services and programs is reflected in the activities listed in the campus goals and activities.

Goal Area: State Compensatory Education

Total amount of State Compensatory Education funds: $842,033

Personnel funded with State Compensatory Education funds:

List names here: Derry, Jeffrey; Josue, Editha; Chang, Shiao-Ben; Harding, Robert E.; Hamilton, Terrance; Saenz, Jr., Jose.; Camp, Morgan; Hubbard, Richard; Johnson, Timothy; Lewis, Kimberly; Flores, Elia; Rivera, Martha; Taylor, Tamyra; Casupang, Judith; Khan, Bushra; Maliakkal, Julie.

Total number of FTE's funded with State Compensatory Education funds: 15.44

Brief description of how these funds are utilized on your campus: These supplemental State Compensatory Education funds are used to enhance the Title I School Program at our campus.

State Compensatory Education funds are coded in the Resources column of the SIP Part 2 as SCE. $842,033.

For Title I schools: These supplemental State Compensatory Education funds are used to enhance the Title I School Program at our campus.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2014-2015

Campus Name: Stephen F. Austin High School

Stephen F. Austin High School (AHS), led by Principal Jorge Arredondo, provides a student-centered environment for learning in order to assure high rigor and college preparedness and career readiness. In addition to the focus on excellence in education, AHS is a comprehensive high school, offering multiple opportunities for rich extracurricular activities including JROTC, athletics, Houston Urban Debate League, and student clubs. AHS maintains multiple partnerships including the University of Houston College of Education, the University of Houston Mexican American Studies Academic Achievers Program, Rice University DREAM, Writers in the Schools, TEACH Houston, and the Alley Theatre.

AHS serves 1,695 students (data from 1/24/14). The total membership is 1,657 students. Approximately 88% percent of our students are from families of economic disadvantage, approx. 77% are considered at-risk. Approximately 95% are of Hispanic-American descent, approximately 4% of African- American descent, and approx. 1% are of Anglo- American, American Indian, or of other descent. Approximately 38 or approx. 2% are classified as immigrant. Approximately 92% are enrolled in classes in the Career and Technical Education pathways. The special education population is about 11% of the student body, the limited English proficiency population (LEP) is approx. 21%, of which 18% are enrolled in mainstream education and approx. 3% are Special Education students.

The two flagship programs of AHS are the AHS Magnet Program for Teaching Professions (MPTP) and the Port of Houston Maritime Academy (POHMA). As of 9/10/2014, 317 students are enrolled in the MPTP and 283 students are enrolled in the POHMA. In addition to the two flagship programs, the Agriculture Science program maintains very high interest and student participation, offering an annual Livestock Show and Auction.

AHS offers sixteen Advanced Placement courses with 509 students enrolled. The school offers twelve Pre-Advanced Placement courses, with 671 students enrolled. Through a partnership with Houston Community College the school offers six dual credit opportunities with 163 students enrolled in one or more.

Areas in need of improvement must begin with the rates of students achieving a Level II or Level III score on the STAAR English I EOC and the STAAR English II. By the end o

Other end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of students taking the English I or English II STAAR EOC who achieve at least a Level II result will reach 70%. The percentage achieving Level III will reach 5%.

Other measurable objectives include:

- By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of Algebra I students taking the EOC STAAR test achieving a Level II results will reach 80% (up from 73% in 2014). The percentage achieving Level III will reach 10 % (up from 4% in 2014.)
- By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of Biology students taking the EOC STAAR test achieving a Level II results will reach 80% (up from 73% in 2014). The percentage achieving Level III will reach 10 % (up from 1% in 2014.)
- By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of US Hist students taking the EOC STAAR test achieving a Level II results will reach 95% (up from 88% in 2014). The percentage achieving Level III will reach 10 % (up from 5% in 2014.)
- By the end of the '14-'15 school year, attendance percentage will be 96% or better.
- By the end of the '14-'15 school year, the percentage of students meeting Postsecondary Readiness Standard will rise from 25% in 2014 to 45%.
- By the end of 2014, sophisticated systems for embedded professional development such as Instructional Rounds and Data Team meetings will be implemented on a systematic and regular basis.

- By the end of 2014, parental engagement will increase by 10% as documented by parent involvement in parent events and meetings.
- By the end of 2014, the number of "21" offenses reported on the campus will decrease by 10% from 2142 in 2013-2014 school year to 1928 in the 2014-2015 school year.

The major initiatives or strategies that will be implemented in order for the school to achieve its goals include:

- Purchase of high-interest reading material for the elective classrooms,
- Continuing as a Year 2, PowerUp campus, providing a laptop to every student,
- Implementation of more intensive, systematic professional development, including Instructional Rounds and Data Team Meetings,
- Utilization of professional development made available through the district, such as Literacy Routines,
- Change the grade-level order of mathematics courses to Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry and Pre-Cal (for most students) in order that the students will receive algebra concepts in tenth grade as well as ninth.
- Offer electives which will support EOC success, such as Creative Writing and Environmental Systems,
- Offer support for reading through I-station as part of the larger Secondary Reading Initiative,

In 2014, theTexas Education Agency Accountability Rating was "Met Standard."

SIP APPROVAL 2014-2015

Campus: Stephen F. Austin High School

Principal: Jorge Arredondo

This School Improvement Plan for Stephen F. Austin High School was developed according to the procedures described in this document. The final draft of the plan was submitted to the Shared Decision Making Committee on 9/272014 as evidenced by the SDMC agenda. Through the SDMC the SIP was reviewed with parents, community members, and the professional staff. The plan was presented to the professional staff for a vote of approval by secret ballot on 8/29/2014 . The plan received at least two-thirds approval. I attest that if this school is under a designation as Required Improvement, Focus, or Priority, an on-site needs assessment has been conducted in compliance with TEC §39.106(b) and recommendations were made by the intervention team when considered appropriate. In addition, these findings have been recorded and are available upon request.

_____ _____

Principal Date

Signatures below indicate review and approval of this document.

_____ _____

PTO/PTA or other Parent Representative Date

_____ _____

SDMC Teacher Representative Date

_____ _____

School Support Officer / Lead Principal (DCSI) Date

_____ _____

Chief School Officer Date

_____ _____

Professional Service Provider (for IR, Focus, Priority) Date