# DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2016-17

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. District Improvement Planning Process
- II. Title I Schoolwide Components Codified
- III. Wildly Important Goals (WIGs)
  - a. Teaching & Learning
  - b. Student Opportunities
  - c. School Culture & Climate
  - d. Growth & Management
- IV. 2015-16 Texas Academic Performance Report
- V. Charts and graphs based on Texas Academic Performance Report
- VI. Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) Continuous Improvement Process and Plan
- VII. Denton ISD Parental Involvement Policy
- VIII. State Compensatory Education Expenditure Status Report

#### DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANNING PROCESS

The District's planning process to improve student performance includes the development of the District's educational goals, the legal requirements for the District and campus improvement plans, all pertinent federal planning requirements, and administrative procedures. The Board shall approve the process under which the educational goals are developed and shall ensure that input is gathered from the District-level committee.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND REPORTS

The Board shall ensure that administrative procedures meet legal requirements in the areas of planning, budgeting, curriculum, staffing patterns, staff development, and school organization; adequately reflect the District's planning process; and include implementation guidelines, time frames, and necessary resources. The Superintendent shall report periodically to the Board on the status of the planning process, including a review of the related administrative procedures, any revisions to improve the process, and progress on implementation of identified strategies.

#### **RESPONSIBILITIES DISTRICT PLAN**

The District-level committee shall assist the Superintendent with the annual development, evaluation, and revision of the District improvement plan. (TEC 11.252(a)) [BQ]

#### DROPOUT PREVENTION REVIEW

The District-level committee shall analyze information related to dropout prevention, including:

- 1. The results of the audit of dropout records;
- 2. Campus information related to graduation rates, dropout rates, high school equivalency certificate rates, and the percentage of students who remain in high school more than four years after entering grade 9;
- 3. The number of students who enter a high school equivalency certificate program and:
  - a. Do not complete the program,
  - b. Complete the program but do not take the high school equivalency examination, or
  - c. Complete the program and take the high school equivalency examination but do not obtain a high school equivalency certificate.
- 4. For students enrolled in grades 9 and 10, information related to academic credit hours earned, retention rates, and placements in disciplinary alternative education programs and expulsions under Chapter 37; and
- 5. The results of an evaluation of each school-based dropout prevention program in the District.

The District-level committee shall use the information in developing the District improvement plan.

#### PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PLAN

The Board shall ensure that the District and campus improvement plans, as applicable, address all elements required by federal law for receipt of Title I, Part A funds, including elements pertaining to parental involvement. The District-level and campus-level commit-tees shall involve parents in the development of such plans and in the process for campus review and improvement of student academic achievement and campus performance. [EHBD]

#### TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENTS CODIFIED

- 1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
- 2. Schoolwide Reform Strategies (RS)
- 3. Instruction by Highly Qualified Teachers (IHQ)
- 4. Ongoing Professional Development (OPD)
- 5. Attract High-Quality Highly Qualified Teachers (AHQ)
- 6. Parent Involvement (PI)
- 7. Transition (T)
- 8. Include Teachers in the Decisions Regarding the use of Academic Assessments (A)
- 9. Effective and Timely Additional Assistance (AA)
- 10. Program Coordination and Integration (C)

WIG 1: TEACHING & LEARNING –					
Lead	Persons Responsible	Resources	Evidence of Implementation	Evidence of Impact	
Cultivate a consistent, strong, districtwide balanced curriculum based on ongoing needs assessments that supports all students establish high expectations with a curriculum that fosters inquiry and critical thinking develop academic skills and interpersonal relationships necessary for student success in college, the workplace and for life	Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development; Division of Academic Programs; principals; teachers	Title I Components: CNA, RS, IHQ, OPD, AHQ, PI, T, A, AA, C	Evidence of Implementation District Improvement Plan; Campus Improvement Plans; Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessment; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development	
Establish high expectations with a curriculum that fosters inquiry and critical thinking	Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development; Division of Academic Programs; principals; teachers		District Improvement Plan; Campus Improvement Plans; Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard	Balanced Scorecard Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction,	

			and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Develop academic skills and interpersonal relationship necessary for student success in college, the workplace, and for life	Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development; Division of Academic Programs; principals; teachers	District Improvement Plan; Campus Improvement Plans; Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Expect full implementation on each campus by instructional leaders	Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development; Division of Academic Programs; principals; teachers	District Improvement Plan; Campus Improvement Plans; Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction,

				and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Stay abreast of and incorporate best practices into teaching, learning, technology, and leadership	Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development; Division of Academic Programs; principals; teachers		District Improvement Plan; Campus Improvement Plans; Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Integrate technology into instruction using a variety of hardware (including computers, Chromebooks, iPads, smartphones, etc.) and software (such as Classworks, iStation, Think Through Math, Study Island, etc.)	Instructional Technology staff, teachers	Title I Components: CNA, RS	Increased use of technology	Increase use of technology
Offer Lone Star Technology In Action (TIA) conference to increase the integration of technology	Instructional Technology staff, teachers		Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s); website	Increased use of technology
Use the Multisensory Teaching Approach (MTA) coupled with best practices from the Alphabetic Phonics	Dyslexia Supervisor; Dyslexia/Certified Academic Language Therapists (CALTs)	SCE funds (see attached SCE budget report)	MTA program; Aware data; budget reports	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory;

and Take Flight Programs are	common assessments; local
used as the intervention	benchmarks; standards-
model for students identified	based report card
as being dyslexic will be given	assessments; etc.); state
support and appropriate	assessment (including, but
modifications and/or	not limited to State of Texas
accommodations in order to	Assessments of Academic
be successful in their	Readiness (STAAR); Division
academic programs. District	of Curriculum, Instruction,
Dyslexia/Certified Academic	and Staff Development
Language Therapists (CALTs)	Balanced Scorecard
provide instruction using the	
Multisensory Teaching	
Approach (MTA), which	
provides a sequence of letter	
introduction/concept	
introduction in addition to	
linkage papers from Scottish	
Rite Take Flight; and provide	
instruction using:	
alphabet and dictionary	
skills	
IRD/ ARD/ ISD (EPS cards)	
fluency practice	
instant words practice	
linkage verbiage at	
introductions	
coding	
spelling practice	
vocabulary development	
phonemic awareness	
verbal/expressive	
language	
reading and listening	
comprehension	

Provide supplemental Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura (DLL) Teachers and Literacy Learning Facilitators and supplemental math coaches to elementary campuses that receive Title I funds; and an early childhood coach to support students in the transition from preschool to kindergarten	Descubriendo la Lectura (DLL) Teachers; Literacy Learning Facilitators (LLFs); district math coaches (DMCs); early childhood coach (ECC)	\$620,751 (DLLs) [Title I]; \$147,098 (LLFs) \$389,434 (DMCs) [Title I]; \$66,543 (ECC) [Title I] Title I Components: CNA, RS, IHQ, OPD, AA	Teacher schedules; Reading Recovery and DLL reports	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Offer staff development including in all content areas including, but not limited to Understand by Design (UbD) units of study and Look2Learning	Elementary and secondary curriculum department	Title I Components: CNA, RS, OPD	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s)	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Provide EXPO teachers with 30 hours of gifted and talented workshops within one semester of being hired to work with gifted and talented students.	Coordinator of Advanced Academics; EXPO Specialists; teachers	GT Teachers, GT Presenters, Current Research, TAGT conference, SMU Lecture Series, ESC Region XI \$3,000 [Title II]	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s); workshops certificates	Evaluations by EXPO students, EXPO parents, and DISD staff.

Provide teachers with a	Coordinator of Advanced	GT Teachers, GT Presenters,	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	Evaluations by EXPO
yearly 6 hour gifted and	Academics; EXPO Specialists;	Current Research, TAGT	workshop certificates	students, EXPO parents, and
talented update workshop.	teachers	conference, SMU Lecture		DISD staff.
		Series, ESC Region XI		
Reduce the number of	Principals, teachers	State Compensatory	Teacher lesson plans; budget	Increased student grades and
dropouts through dropout		Education (SCE) and At-Risk	reports	achievement on local
reduction and prevention		(AK) funds (see attached SCE		assessment including, but not
programs such as:		budget report)		limited to Early Literacy
Odysseyware credit		Title I Components: CNA, RS,		Inventory; Spanish Early
retrieval program;		IHQ, OPD, AHQ, PI, T, A, AA, C		Literacy Inventory; Kathy
academic support				Richardson Assessment;
courses pairing at-risk				common assessments; local
student teachers acting				benchmarks; standards-
as coaches working				based report card
ensure work is turned in				assessments; etc.); state
on time, homework is				assessment (including, but
completed, etc.;				not limited to State of Texas
• trailer courses with first				Assessments of Academic
semester courses taught				Readiness (STAAR); Division
during the second				of Curriculum, Instruction,
semester and/or second				and Staff Development
semester courses taught				Balanced Scorecard
first semester;				
<ul> <li>intervention trailer</li> </ul>				
courses with students				
failing during first six				
weeks attending after				
school intervention				
sessions;				
<ul> <li>trained upperclassmen</li> </ul>				
student mentors paired				
with lowerclassmen				
having academic				
difficulties to touch base				
one time per week to for				

-			 l
	encouragement,		
	homework help, etc.;		
	UNT organizations and		
	fraternities volunteers		
	acting as mentors with		
	at-risk students on a		
	weekly basis working		
	with at-risk students		
	having academic		
	difficulties to touch base		
	one time per week to for		
	encouragement,		
	homework help, etc.;		
	Go Center with TWU		
	students working with at-		
	risk students who will be		
	first generation college		
	attendees; Upward		
	Bound, a federal program		
	that works with first		
	generation college		
	attendees (neither		
	parent has obtained a		
	four-year degree),		
	low/average income		
	(taxable income and the		
	ability and desire to		
	succeed in college);		
	ZAP (Zeros Aren't		
	Permitted) after school		
	program to redo any		
	papers not completed or		
	submitted;		
•	TAKS Study sessions and		
	TAKS interventions for all		

			11
seniors who have not			
mastered the TAKS math			
and/or science on			
Saturdays during			
October, February and			
April;			
Writing Workshops			
provided by English			
teachers offering one to			
two days of intensive			
writing			
instruction/remediation			
in February for seniors			
who have not mastered			
the ELA TAKS;			
EOC Study Sessions-			
Saturday, before and			
after school sessions are			
offered for students who			
have not mastered EOC			
tests; Math Center with			
teachers available from			
7:45 – 8:40 AM and 4:15			
– 5:00 PM daily for			
students having difficulty			
in math;			
• summer TAKS and EOC			
study sessions offered			
during the summer prior			
to the summer retests;			
Communities in Schools			
offered at Borman ES,			
Rivera ES, Ginnings ES,	1		
Evers Park ES, Hodge ES,	1		
Lee ES, Newton Rayzor			

<ul> <li>ES, Calhoun MS, McMath MS, Strickland MS;</li> <li>night school;</li> <li>credit restoration classes;</li> <li>counseling</li> <li>at-risk liaisons;</li> <li>Saturday School;</li> <li>On-Track Credit retrieval for Math, Science, and English;</li> <li>virtual school coursework;</li> <li>home visits to families of students with attendance</li> </ul>				
Provide accelerated instruction to any student who fails to demonstrate proficiency in mathematics or reading in grades 3–8; in the applicable subject area each time a student fails to perform satisfactorily on EOC assessment instrument; and in any subject if the student failed to perform satisfactorily on an EOC assessment instrument that measures the knowledge and skills in that course and is required for graduation.	Principals, teachers	SCE and At-Risk (AK) funds (see attached SCE budget report) \$183,273 Title I Components: CNA, RS, AA	Lesson plans; Accelerated Instruction Plans; budget reports	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Complete student fitness assessments according to	Physical Education teachers and/or coaches; nurse		Fitness Gram assessment data will be gathered and reported within the	Student assessment data that would indicate that students demonstrate an increased

TEA guidelines utilizing	guidelines for all students	level of individual physical
FitnessGram	who are required to	fitness; increased student
	participate; training of all	understanding that physical
	physical education teacher	s, fitness is a lifelong goal;
	coaches and additional	increased student
	district personnel;	understanding that physical
	information on websites.	fitness and academic success
		have a direct relationship

	WIG 2: STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES –					
Lead	Persons Responsible	Resources	Evidence of Implementation	Evidence of Impact		
Provide middle school, junior high school, and high school students, those students' teachers and school counselors, and those students' parents information about higher education admissions and financial aid opportunities; the TEXAS grant program and the Teach for Texas grant program; and provide information needed by students to make informed curriculum choices to be prepared for success beyond high school; sources of information on higher education admissions and financial aid.	Secondary school counselors		Newsletters; flyers; etc.	Increased knowledge of students and parents		
Implement Naviance on all secondary campuses.	Director of Counseling, secondary school counselors	Instructional Materials Allotment, Naviance personnel, technology department	<ul> <li>Naviance Program purchased</li> <li>for all high schools and</li> <li>middle schools; mandatory</li> <li>annual training of all</li> <li>secondary school counselors,</li> <li>registrars, and additional</li> <li>district personnel; additional</li> <li>trainings as needed; full</li> <li>implementation of</li> <li>designated aspects of</li> <li>Naviance; commitment of</li> <li>district to Naviance program</li> <li>evidenced by support of the</li> </ul>	Increased student, parent, and staff usage of Naviance per campus as evidenced by weekly report; increased number of Personal Graduation Plans/4 year plans inputted into Naviance; increased student understanding of academic goals and post-secondary goals earlier in their school career; increased student access to colleges,		

	WIG 3: SCHOOL CUTURE & CLIMATE –				
Lead	Persons Responsible	Resources	Evidence of Implementation	Evidence of Impact	
Address safety planning, enforcement of protective orders, school-based alternatives to protective orders, training for teachers and administrators, counseling for affected students, and awareness education for students and parents.	Principals; teachers		Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s); SafeSchools training reports	Safe schools	
Address policy (FFH (LOCAL) and FFG (EXHIBIT)) regarding sexual abuse and other maltreatment of children including methods for increasing staff, student, and parent awareness of issues regarding sexual abuse and other maltreatment of children, including prevention techniques and knowledge of likely warning signs indicating that a child may be a victim of sexual abuse or other maltreatment, using resources developed by TEA; train staff members as described at Education Code 38.0041(c) [see DMA] regarding actions that a child who is a victim of sexual abuse or other maltreatment	Principals; teachers		Board Policy FFH (LOCAL) and FFG (EXHIBIT); Student Handbook and Code of Conduct; SafeSchools training reports	Safe schools	

should take to obtain assistance and intervention; and available counseling options for students affected by sexual abuse or other maltreatment. Provide training for staff, students, and parents related to the identification and intervention of students who are at risk of suicide	Director of Counseling; Elementary Counseling Coordinator; school counselors; student assistance counselors;	Establishment of reporting and follow-up system for threats of suicide; establishment of mental health liaison on each	Increased number of early identification reports; increased number of interventions; end of the year surveys indicate
	principals	campus; sign-in sheets from district and campus trainings; Be the Voice elementary counseling curriculum related to healthy choices; Be the Voice secondary counseling curriculum addressing warning signs and symptoms of depression and suicidal ideation; information regarding locations to secure help in times of crisis is made available through district brochures, resources and websites on all campuses.	increased acceptance of all students and increased empathy, hopefulness and engagement in the student population.
Provide training and responsive services for all students regarding conflict resolution, sexual harassment, and violence prevention and intervention.	Director of Counseling; Elementary Counseling Coordinator; school counselors; student assistance counselors; principals	<ul> <li>Utilization of the following counseling prevention and intervention programs on Pre-K and Elementary Campuses:</li> <li>Second Step, Safe and Civil Schools (CHAMPS &amp; Foundations);</li> <li>Steps to Respect;</li> </ul>	End of the year surveys indicate increased acceptance of all students and increased empathy, hopefulness and engagement in the student population; increased awareness of resources for assistance (i.e. campus SRO, community

	<ul> <li>Travis &amp; Presley;</li> <li>Bully Busters;</li> <li>Chose Peace,</li> <li>Bucket Fillers;</li> <li>Be Cool;</li> <li>Salvaging Sisterhood,</li> <li>Character Counts;</li> <li>IB learner profiles and activities;</li> <li>Peace Table</li> <li>Utilization of the following counseling prevention and intervention programs on Secondary Campuses:</li> <li>Finding Kind;</li> <li>Rachel's Challenge;</li> <li>Partner PE/Partner Dance;</li> <li>Students Educating about Diversity through Dance;</li> <li>The Counselor Is In;</li> <li>Do the Right Thing;</li> <li>PALS;</li> <li>Mentors;</li> <li>Student Council;</li> <li>Safe and Civil Schools (CHAMPS &amp; Foundations)</li> <li>Be the Voice counseling curriculum addressing bully prevention</li> </ul>
--	--

		 establishment of procedures	
		and forms for bully allegation	
		investigations; Friends of the	
		Family and Child Advocacy	
		Center trainings and	
		presentations at all grade	
		levels; secondary guidance	
		lessons on dating violence	
		and healthy relationships;	
		Creation of brochures	
		addressing dating violence to	
		include information about	
		the intentional use of	
		physical, sexual, verbal or	
		emotional abuse by a person	
		to harm, threaten, intimidate	
		or control another person in	
		a dating relationship.	
Address abuse and	Director of Counseling;	Brochures given to all faculty	Increased awareness of
maltreatment of children to	Elementary Counseling	and staff regarding	warning signs; increased
include increasing staff,	Coordinator; school	maltreatment of children;	awareness of resources
student, and parental	counselors; student	Safe Schools training	available to help students
awareness of prevention	assistance counselors;	required of all district	and families; increased
techniques, knowledge of	principal; social workers;	personnel; counselor	awareness of the long term
warning signs, and reporting	nurses, student resource	presentations to staff;	implications for a victim of
procedures.	officers (SROs); teachers;	trainings provided to	abuse; increased
	Friends of the Family; Child	administrators, counselors	collaboration between
	Advocacy Center;	and nurses; monthly parent	community resources and
	Department of Family	education opportunities;	district counselors and social
	Protective Services (DFPS);	establishment of an	workers; increased tailoring
	Children's Protective Services	extended list of community	of services provided to
	(CPS); Court Appointed	resources to include medical	families to meet their
	Special Advocates (CASA);	and psychological services for	individual needs.
	law enforcement agencies	students and families.	-

#### Adhere to the legal mandates District homeless liaison, \$6,164 [Title I]; SCE funds Student Residency Increase in enrollment dictated by the McKinneysocial workers, school (see attached SCE budget Questionnaire available stability: decrease in counselors, principals; dropouts; decline in student Vento Homeless Education through InfoSnap; brochures report) Title I Components: CNA, PI, Act. registrars; secretaries distributed district wide and transfers: increased С throughout the community; awareness of the McKinneyidentified homeless children Vento law and the socialare provided transportation, emotional and academic free lunch and school impact of homelessness; supplies; enrollment is not increase in positive delayed due to lack of communication between the records or immunizations; campus and the family identified families are impacted by homelessness. provided appropriate information and referrals to agencies and community organizations. Provide services to students Homebound instructors (3) Compliance with TEA; early Increase in ADA; decrease in Coordinator of Social medically eligible for General Services: homebound [SCE funds (see attached SCE identification of student need dropout rate; increase in **Education Homebound** instructors; social workers; for services; condition of completion rates; supported budget report)] Instruction and school counselors; teachers, eligibility documented by transition back to full time Title I Components: IHQ, AA, licensed physician; **Campus Attendance** instruction: individualized **Compensatory Education** С Homebound Instruction to Committee; compliance with Pregnancy homebound services students at home and/or the parents/guardians Related Services (2.41 provided based on student's hospital bedside until weighted funding); needs. released by physician to attendance logs sent weekly return to full time instruction to home campus. at the campus. Provide an integrated **Coordinator of Social** SCE funds (see attached SCE Establishment of an extended Increased awareness of the list of community resources school social worker as a program designed to Services; social workers; budget report) enhance and support the Director of Health Services; to include medical and valuable resource for academic, economic, social principal Title I Components: IHQ, AA, psychological services for campuses; increased and physical well-being of С students and families; district collaboration between Denton ISD students and awareness of the need for an counselors, administrators, expanded role for district families. social workers and CIS in

	social; social workers are	meeting the needs of
	viewed as a part of the	students and families;
	counseling team at	increased services provided
	secondary campuses creating	to homeless and
	a holistic approach to serving	unaccompanied youth at the
	students and families.	secondary level; decrease in
		dropouts and absences;
		increase in academic success.

	WIG 4: GROWTH & MANAGEMENT –				
Lead	Persons Responsible	Resources	Evidence of Implementation	Evidence of Impact	
Conduct comprehensive needs assessments (CNA).	Principals, teachers	Title I Components: CNA	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s); Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) Summary	Local assessment; state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; and Kathy Richardson Assessment; etc. results	
Distribute, complete, analyze, and disaggregate communitywide survey	Superintendent, Communications Department, Coordinator of District Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal & State Programs, Coordinator of Data and Assessment, EIC, K12 Insight	Title I Components: CNA, PI, A	Survey	Survey results	
<ul> <li>Distribute, complete, analyze, and disaggregate</li> <li>Community and Student</li> <li>Engagement Survey to evaluate the district's</li> <li>performance and the performance of each campus in the district in the following area:</li> <li>fine arts;</li> <li>wellness and physical education;</li> <li>community and parental involvement, such as: opportunities for parents to assist students in</li> </ul>	Principals, teachers	Title I Components: CNA, PI, A	Survey	Survey results	

<ul> <li>preparing for assessments under Section 39.023, tutoring programs that support students taking assessments under Section 39.023, and opportunities for students to participate in community service projects;</li> <li>the 21st Century Workforce Development program;</li> <li>the second language acquisition program;</li> <li>the digital learning environment;</li> <li>dropout prevention</li> </ul>			
<ul><li>strategies; and</li><li>educational programs for gifted and talented</li></ul>			
students			
Use the results of the student	Title I Components: CNA, PI,	CNA	Local assessment including,
academic assessments to	A		but not limited to Early
review the progress of Title I,			Literacy Inventory; Spanish
Part A, funds and conduct an			Early Literacy Inventory;
annual evaluation of			Kathy Richardson
programs assisted with Title			Assessment; common
I, Part A, funds and use the			assessments; local
findings to modify and			benchmarks; standards-
improve the programs;			based report card
periodically review the Title I			assessments; etc.); state
program plan and, as			assessment (including, but
necessary, revise the plan.			not limited to State of Texas

				Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of the parental involvement policy toward improving the academic quality of Title I, Part A schools	Principals, CLTs	Title I Components: CNA, PI	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	Parent engagement
Allocate Title I funds to eligible campuses.	Coordinator of District Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal & State Programs	Title I Components: CNA, A, C	Budget spreadsheets and reports	Local assessment; state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; and Kathy Richardson Assessment; etc. results
Seek technical assistance and support regarding Title I funds.	Coordinator of District Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal & State Programs; principals		Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s); emails; phone calls; Title Principals Meetings; Title Secretaries Meetings; website; etc.	Increased knowledge of Title I requirements
Reserve and utilize 1% of Title I funds to support campus and district parental involvement initiatives.	Coordinator of District Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal & State Programs, principals, teachers	\$24,655 [Title I] Title I Components: CNA, PI	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s)	Parent engagement
Utilize preschool set-aside funds in addition to a communitywide preschool	Pre-K Coalition, United Way, Denton ISD staff, Ready Rosie	\$35,000 [Title I] Title I Components: CNA, T, C	Usage reports	Parent engagement as measured by star ratings

coalition to provide I				
readiness activities, parental				
involvement activities, and				
transitional activities for				
children in preschool focused				
on the Ready Rosie program				
Coordinate and integrate	Coordinator of District	Title I Components: CNA, C	A good $a(c)$ , sign in choot(c).	Coordination of
Title I, Part A, services with	Improvement & Innovation	The reomponents. CNA, C	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	
other educational services at	and Coordinator of Federal &		budget reports	programming
the LEA such as Even Start,	State Programs; Curriculum,			
Head Start, Reading First,	Instruction, and Staff			
Early Reading First, and other	Development staff; principal			
preschool programs,				
including plans for the				
transition of participants in				
such programs to school				
programs and services for				
children with limited English				
proficiency; children with				
disabilities; migratory				
children; neglected or				
delinquent youth; Indian				
children served under of Title				
VII, Part A; homeless				
children; and immigrant				
children in order to increase				
program effectiveness,				
eliminate duplication, and				
reduce fragmentation of the				
instructional program.				
Develop Title I program plan	Coordinator of District	Title I Components: CNA, A, C	CNA	Local assessment; state
in consultation with teachers,	Improvement & Innovation			assessment (including, but
and other appropriate school	and Coordinator of Federal &			not limited to State of Texas
personnel, and with parents	State Programs, EIC,			Assessments of Academic
of children on the campus;	principals, teachers			Readiness (STAAR); Early

work in collaboration with	Literacy Inventory; Spanish
other campuses in the	Early Literacy Inventory; and
development and	Kathy Richardson
implementation of CIP.	Assessment; etc. results

Educate teachers, pupil services personnel,	Principals; teachers	Title I Components: CNA, PI	Newsletters; etc.	Increased knowledge of parent engagement
principals, and other staff members, with the assistance				
of parents, in the value and				
utility of the contributions of				
parents.				
Maintain appropriate time	Coordinator of District	Title I Components: IHQ	Signed Semi-Annual	Meet NCLB highly qualified
and effort records for staff	Improvement & Innovation		Certifications; Signed	requirements
who are paid in whole or in	and Coordinator of Federal &			
part with Title I, Part A, Title	State Programs; principals;			
II, Part A, and/or Title III, Part	teachers			
A; maintain Semi-Annual				
Certification for all staff paid				
in whole or in part with Title				
I, Part A, Title II, Part A,				
and/or Title III, Part A				
File Title I, Part A campus a	Principals	Title I Components: IHQ, AHQ	Signed attestations	Meet NCLB highly qualified
written attestations that are				requirements
signed by the campus				
principals stating that the				
principal understands the				
requirements of Section 1119				
and the current status of				
his/her campus with respect				
to meeting those				
requirements. Hold the campus annual Title	Principals	Title I Components: CNA, PI	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s)	Parent engagement
I meeting to notify parents of		The Components. CNA, PI		
their school's participation in				
the Title I program, to explain				
the program requirements,				
and to inform parents of				
their right to be involved.				

Ensure parents have been informed concerning the statute, rules, and regulations authorizing schoolwide programs; ensure that the results from the academic assessments are provided to parents and teachers as soon as is practicably possible after the test is taken, in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand	Principals, teachers	Title I Components: CNA, PI	Reports such as Confidential Student Reports, School Report Cards, and Federal Report Cards	Parent engagement
Meet with stakeholders to revise and edit the district written parent involvement policy in conjunction with parents of participating students and distribute said to policy to all parents of participating students	EIC	Title I Components: CNA, PI	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	Parent engagement
Work with stakeholders to revise and edit the campus written parent involvement policies in conjunction with parents of participating students and distribute said to policies to all parents of participating students.	Principals, CLTs	Title I Components: CNA, PI	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	Parent engagement
Sign School-Parent compacts at each Title I, Part A campus that outline how the parents,	Teachers	\$1,448 [Title I] Title I Components: CNA, PI	Signed compacts	Parent engagement

the entire school staff, and the students share the responsibility for improved student achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards Provide communications	Coordinator of District	Title I Componente: CNA DI	Web counter	Derent engagement
about the Title I, Part A program in a format and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand; and develop the DISD Federal Programs website to provide said information.	Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal & State Programs	Title I Components: CNA, PI	web counter	Parent engagement
Allocate Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds to serve campus and district needs.	Coordinator of District Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal & State Programs	\$227,694 [Title I, Part D, Subpart 2]	Budget reports	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction,

				and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Update written agreement between the LEA and applicable correctional facilities and alternative school programs serving children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system, which details the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 program Allocate Title II, Part A funds to improve the quality of the teacher workforce by	District attorney Coordinator of District Improvement & Innovation and Coordinator of Federal &	\$282,337 [Title II]	Written agreement         Budget reports	Written agreement Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish
providing initiatives such as instructional support teachers and providing professional development including training for Reading Recovery teachers and in the core content subject areas through training provided by curriculum and instruction staff.	State Programs; Directors of Elementary and Secondary Curriculum; Instruction Support Teachers			Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local benchmarks; standards- based report card assessments; etc.); state assessment (including, but not limited to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR); Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Staff Development Balanced Scorecard
Coordinate professional development activities funded under Title II, Part A with professional development activities funded under other Federal, State, and local programs.	Directors of Elementary and Secondary Curriculum, Instruction Support Teachers; principals; teachers	\$329,339 [Title II]	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s)	Local assessment including, but not limited to Early Literacy Inventory; Spanish Early Literacy Inventory; Kathy Richardson Assessment; common assessments; local

				benchmarks; standards-
				based report card
				assessments; etc.); state
				assessment (including, but
				not limited to State of Texas
				Assessments of Academic
				Readiness (STAAR); Division
				of Curriculum, Instruction,
				and Staff Development
				Balanced Scorecard
Collaborate with teachers,	Directors of Elementary and	Title I Components: CNA, A	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s)	Local assessment including,
paraprofessionals, principals,	Secondary Curriculum,			but not limited to Early
other relevant school	Instruction Support Teachers;			Literacy Inventory; Spanish
personnel, and parents in	Educational Improvement			Early Literacy Inventory;
planning Title II, Part A	Council; principals; teachers			Kathy Richardson
program activities and				Assessment; common
preparing the LEA application				assessments; local
for funding; and coordinate				benchmarks; standards-
professional development				based report card
activities funded under Title				assessments; etc.); state
II, Part A with professional				assessment (including, but
development activities				not limited to State of Texas
funded under other Federal,				Assessments of Academic
State, and local programs.				Readiness (STAAR); Division
				of Curriculum, Instruction,
				and Staff Development
				Balanced Scorecard
Allocate Title III, Part A funds	Coordinator of District	\$519,363 [Title III]	Budget reports	
to serve campus and district	Improvement & Innovation			
Bilingual/ESL needs identified	and Coordinator of Federal &			
	State Programs; Director of			
	Bilingual/ESL			
Consult with participating	Coordinator of District	Title I Components: AA	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	
private nonprofit school	Improvement & Innovation		Affirmation of Consultation	
officials regarding the	and Coordinator of Federal &		with PNP Officials	

development and	State Programs; private			
implementation of the Title I,	nonprofit (PNP) staff			
Part A, Title II, Part A, and				
Title III, Part A program in a				
timely and meaningful way				
prior to making any decision				
that affects the opportunities				
of eligible private school				
children, teachers, and other				
educational personnel to				
participate in the program,				
and continue throughout the				
implementation and				
assessment of program				
activities.				
Provide services to eligible	Coordinator of District	\$16,801 + \$17,155 = \$33,622	Agenda(s); sign-in sheet(s);	Increased student
students attending private	Improvement & Innovation	total [Title I];	emails; budget reports; PNP	achievement on measures
schools and provide timely,	and Coordinator of Federal &	\$3,721 + \$3,376 + \$1,125 =	Equitable Services Worksheet	such as the Iowa Test of Basic
ongoing, and meaningful	State Programs; private	\$8,222 total [Title II]		Skills (ITBS)
consultation with private	nonprofit (PNP) staff			
school officials regarding		Title I Components: AA		
such services.				
Academically assess the Title	Coordinator of District	Title I Components: AA	Local assessment results	Increased student
I, Part A, Title II, Part A, and	Improvement & Innovation			achievement on measures
Title III, Part A services	and Coordinator of Federal &			such as the ITBS
provided to participating	State Programs; private			
private schools as agreed	nonprofit (PNP) staff			
upon during consultation,				
and use the results to				
improve services to private				
schools.				
Ensure that the data entered	Coordinator of District		NCLB Compliance Report	NCLB Compliance
on the Compliance Report	Improvement & Innovation			
matches the application and	and Coordinator of Federal &			
that the appropriate boxes	State Programs			

are completed on the		
Compliance Report.		

#### Denton ISD Highly Qualified Plan

The Denton ISD Human Resources (HR) Department plans to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified prior to hire. This plan begins with the early detection of "highly qualified" concerns either at the time of hire or prior to approval of intra-district transfers.

#### For the Teacher:

- Monitor and communicate with both the teacher and the principal the requirement for specific exams or necessary professional development to meet HOUSE requirements
- Monitor teacher progress scheduling exams and provide follow-up communications regarding the appropriate timeline of exams
- Communicate the importance of continued professional development in the area of assignment

#### For the campus:

- Annually educate campus administration in the importance of the role of the principal in NCLB compliance
- For any campus not meeting 100 % HQ requirements, the HQ Implementation Team consisting of the Executive Director of HR, a HR Certification Specialist, the HR Director of Classified/Auxiliary/Operations and Paraprofessional Personnel, an Executive Director of Academic Programs, the Executive Director of Special Education, and the Director of Counseling, will meet with campus administration and collaboratively devise a plan of action identifying concerns and as well as a step-by-step process ensuring compliance.
  - This process includes:
    - Communication with campus administration, teacher(s), and all stakeholders regarding compliance concerns by the twentieth day of instruction
    - Identification of specific campus teaching areas of non-compliance
    - Development of an individual plan for each teacher in areas of non-compliance with recommendations for future considerations to maintain compliance
    - Annual monitoring and training regarding NCLB/HQ requirements

# 2015-16 Texas Academic Performance Report

District Name: **DENTON ISD** 

District Number: 061901

2016 Accountability Rating: Met Standard

2016 Special Education Determination Status:

Meets Requirements
		State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL^
STAAR Percent at Level II S	Satisfactory Stand	lard or Abo												
Grade 3														
Reading	2016	73%	75%	76%	63%	67%	84%	87%	84%	*	85%	48%	63%	64%
Mathematics	2016	75%	76%	7 <b>9</b> %	63%	75%	86%	80%	95%	*	82%	56%	69%	72%
STAAR Percent at Level II S Grade 4	Satisfactory Stand	lard or Abo	ove											
Reading	2016	75%	76%	77%	68%	64%	87%	67%	92%	100%	86%	46%	62%	52%
Mathematics	2016	73%	74%	76%	63%	69%	84%	89%	94%	100%	78%	47%	65%	66%
Writing	2016	69%	71%	71%	59%	63%	80%	67%	86%	100%	69%	39%	59%	57%
STAAR Percent at Level II S Grade 5 **	Satisfactory Stand	lard or Abo	ove											
Reading	2016	81%	82%	87%	83%	78%	93%	71%	96%	*	90%	52%	79%	72%
Mathematics	2016	86%	86%	87%	77%	82%	92%	82%	98%	*	85%	56%	80%	80%
Science	2016	74%	75%	77%	67%	64%	86%	65%	96%	*	78%	46%	64%	55%
STAAR Percent at Level II S Grade 6	Satisfactory Stand	lard or Abo	ove											
Reading	2016	69%	73%	75%	63%	63%	84%	80%	91%	83%	84%	33%	58%	43%
Mathematics	2016	72%	74%	78%	66%	70%	85%	100%	95%	83%	84%	43%	63%	54%
STAAR Percent at Level II S Grade 7	Satisfactory Stand	lard or Abo	ove											
Reading	2016	71%	74%	7 <b>8</b> %	67%	69%	85%	57%	91%	*	94%	35%	65%	50%
Mathematics	2016	69%	70%	79%	69%	69%	87%	64%	93%	*	87%	36%	66%	50%
Writing	2016	69%	73%	76%	68%	64%	83%	43%	89%	*	90%	29%	62%	43%
STAAR Percent at Level II S Grade 8 **	Satisfactory Stand	lard or Abo	ove											
Reading	2016	87%	89%	92%	89%	86%	96%	75%	97%	*	100%	61%	85%	67%

		State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL^
STAAR Percent at Level II Sa	tisfactory Stand		ove											
Grade 8 ** Mathematics	2016	82%	82%	90%	84%	87%	94%	100%	96%	*	90%	56%	84%	77%
materiales	2010	0270	0270	0070	01/0	0, /0	5170	10070	5070		5070	5070	01/0	,,,,,
Science	2016	75%	76%	80%	65%	72%	88%	89%	99%	*	83%	44%	68%	48%
Social Studies	2016	63%	67%	71%	57%	59%	80%	67%	97%	*	93%	32%	54%	32%
STAAR Percent at Level II Sa End of Course	tisfactory Stand	ard or Abo	ove											
English I	2016	65%	69%	71%	61%	61%	81%	73%	80%	*	-	28%	58%	37%
English II	2016	67%	72%	71%	57%	60%	83%	69%	82%	*	*	25%	55%	36%
Algebra I	2016	78%	80%	80%	68%	74%	87%	76%	90%	*	*	43%	72%	54%
Biology	2016	87%	90%	89%	81%	83%	95%	85%	93%	*	*	50%	82%	62%
U.S. History	2016	91%	92%	91%	86%	85%	97%	89%	96%	*	*	56%	84%	68%
STAAR Percent at Level II Sa All Grades	tisfactory Stand	ard or Abo	ove											
All Subjects	2016	75%	77%	<b>79%</b>	69%	71%	87%	76%	92%	78%	85%	43%	68%	57%
Reading	2016	73%	76%	78%	68%	68%	86%	72%	89%	74%	89%	40%	65%	53%
Mathematics	2016	76%	78%	81%	70%	75%	88%	83%	94%	83%	83%	48%	71%	66%
Writing	2016	69%	72%	73%	63%	64%	82%	56%	88%	100%	76%	34%	61%	52%
Science	2016	79%	81%	<b>82</b> %	71%	73%	90%	78%	96%	*	81%	47%	71%	55%
Social Studies	2016	77%	80%	80%	71%	71%	88%	81%	97%	*	93%	42%	67%	49%
STAAR Percent at Postsecor All Grades	ndary Readiness	Standard												
Two or More Subjects	2016	45%	48%	50%	34%	36%	60%	44%	77%	48%	47%	11%	31%	17%
Reading	2016	46%	50%	52%	38%	39%	63%	43%	77%	61%	56%	14%	34%	19%

		State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL^
STAAR Percent at Postseco	ndary Readiness	s Standard	:		:	•	:			1		1		
All Grades		100/	.=		2001			1001		=		100/	<b>D</b> 4 4 4	<b>-</b> /
Mathematics	2016	43%	45%	47%	30%	37%	57%	42%	78%	50%	48%	13%	31%	24%
Writing	2016	41%	44%	46%	33%	35%	55%	29%	73%	*	43%	11%	32%	28%
Science	2016	47%	49%	50%	35%	37%	62%	42%	73%	*	46%	11%	34%	14%
Social Studies	2016	47%	51%	51%	36%	38%	62%	58%	69%	*	48%	14%	33%	13%
STAAR Percent at Advanced All Grades	l Standard													
All Subjects	2016	18%	19%	19%	10%	12%	26%	20%	39%	22%	23%	6%	10%	7%
Reading	2016	17%	19%	20%	10%	12%	27%	19%	35%	29%	31%	6%	10%	6%
Mathematics	2016	19%	19%	20%	9%	13%	25%	18%	48%	*	21%	6%	11%	10%
Writing	2016	15%	16%	15%	9%	10%	19%	16%	30%	*	16%	5%	9%	6%
Science	2016	16%	17%	17%	7%	9%	23%	24%	38%	*	15%	4%	8%	4%
Social Studies	2016	22%	25%	25%	14%	16%	33%	33%	38%	*	27%	6%	14%	3%
STAAR Percent Met or Exce All Grades	eded Progress													
All Subjects	2016	62%	62%	64%	61%	62%	65%	63%	71%	64%	67%	55%	61%	61%
Reading	2016	60%	61%	62%	60%	60%	64%	64%	66%	*	71%	54%	61%	60%
Mathematics	2016	63%	64%	65%	62%	63%	66%	63%	78%	*	63%	56%	61%	62%
STAAR Percent Exceeded Pr All Grades	rogress													
All Subjects	2016	17%	16%	17%	15%	16%	17%	20%	25%	18%	22%	14%	16%	17%
Reading	2016	16%	16%	17%	16%	16%	17%	19%	19%	*	25%	16%	17%	16%
Mathematics	2016	17%	17%	17%	13%	16%	18%	21%	32%	*	18%	13%	15%	18%

			Region		African			American		Pacific	Two or More	Special	Econ	
		State	11	District	American	Hispanic	White	Indian	Asian	Islander	Races	Ed	Disadv	ELL <sup>*</sup>
Progress of Prior-Year Non-P Sum of Grades 4-8	roficient Stude	nts												
Reading	2016	35%	35%	40%	42%	35%	45%	25%	*	*	65%	21%	36%	33%

		Region		African			American		Pacific	Two or More	Special	Econ	
	State	11	District	American	Hispanic	White	Indian	Asian	Islander	Races	Ed	Disadv	ELL
Student Success Initiative		·		· · ·	•		:	·	i	·	i	÷	
Grade 5 Reading													
Students Meeting Level II Standard on F	irst STAAR	Administrat	ion										
2016	73%	75%	7 <b>9</b> %	72%	67%	87%	71%	95%	*	78%	39%	66%	56%
Students Requiring Accelerated Instruct	ion												
2016	27%	25%	21%	28%	33%	13%	29%	*	*	22%	61%	34%	44%
STAAR Cumulative Met Standard													
2016	80%	82%	86%	82%	78%	92%	71%	97%	*	90%	49%	78%	71%
STAAR Non-Proficient Students Promot	ed by Grad	e Placement	Committee	9									
2015	95%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	*	-	-	100%	100%	100%
STAAR Met Standard (Non-Proficient in	Previous Y	ear)											
Promoted to Grade 6													
2016	11%	10%	5%	*	6%	*	-	*	-	-	*	*	*
Grade 5 Mathematics													
Students Meeting Level II Standard on F	irst STAAR	Administrat	ion										
2016	77%	77%	7 <b>9</b> %	63%	73%	86%	71%	97%	*	76%	41%	69%	68%
Students Requiring Accelerated Instruct	ion												
2016	23%	23%	21%	37%	27%	14%	29%	*	*	24%	59%	31%	32%
STAAR Cumulative Met Standard													
2016	85%	86%	87%	76%	82%	92%	82%	98%	*	85%	53%	80%	80%

										Two or	- · ·	_	
	State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Student Success Initiative		:			•		· · ·	:		:			
Grade 8 Reading													
Students Meeting Level II Standard on F	irst STAAR	Administrat	tion										
2016	80%	83%	87%	81%	79%	93%	75%	94%	*	100%	45%	77%	51%
Students Requiring Accelerated Instruct	tion												
2016	20%	17%	13%	19%	21%	7%	25%	*	*	*	55%	23%	49%
STAAR Cumulative Met Standard													
2016	86%	89%	<b>92%</b>	89%	86%	96%	75%	94%	*	100%	58%	85%	65%
STAAR Non-Proficient Students Promot	ed by Grad	e Placement	Committee	3									
2015	97%	<b>98%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	*	*	*	100%	100%	100%
STAAR Met Standard (Non-Proficient in	Previous Y	ear)											
Promoted to Grade 9													
2016	12%	15%	13%	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	14%	*
Grade 8 Mathematics													
Students Meeting Level II Standard on F	irst STAAR	Administrat	tion										
2016	71%	72%	81%	70%	75%	88%	86%	96%	*	86%	38%	71%	55%
Students Requiring Accelerated Instruct	tion												
2016	29%	28%	19%	30%	25%	12%	14%	*	*	*	62%	29%	45%
STAAR Cumulative Met Standard													
2016	81%	82%	90%	83%	86%	94%	100%	96%	*	90%	51%	83%	75%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Performance

County Name: DENTON District Number: 061901

#### Bilingual Education/English as a Second Language

(Current Year ELL Students)

		State	Region 11	District	Bilingual Education	BE-Trans Early Exit		BE-Dual Two-Way	BE-Dual One-Way	ESL	ESL Content	ESL Pull-Out	LEP No Services	LEP With Services	Total ELL
STAAR Percent at Level II Sat	isfactory Stan	dard or A	bove		······································			<b>č</b> .	<b>*</b>						
All Grades								<b>6</b> 00/	<b>6-0</b> /						
All Subjects	2016	75%	77%	7 <b>9</b> %	66%	*	*	69%	65%	52%	46%	55%	55%	57%	57%
Reading	2016	73%	76%	7 <b>8</b> %	62%	*	*	68%	61%	48%	48%	49%	50%	53%	53%
Mathematics	2016	76%	78%	81%	74%	*	*	71%	74%	60%	53%	63%	70%	66%	66%
Writing	2016	69%	72%	73%	61%	-	-	61%	61%	43%	29%	53%	*	52%	52%
Science	2016	79%	81%	<b>82</b> %	56%	*	-	78%	55%	55%	45%	58%	*	56%	55%
Social Studies	2016	77%	80%	80%	-	-	-	-	-	49%	19%	52%	*	49%	49%
STAAR Percent at Postsecon All Grades	dary Readines	ss Standar	d												
Two or More Subjects	2016	45%	48%	50%	24%	*	*	27%	23%	13%	11%	14%	*	17%	17%
Reading	2016	46%	50%	52%	27%	*	*	29%	26%	14%	13%	14%	*	19%	19%
Mathematics	2016	43%	45%	47%	34%	-	*	43%	33%	19%	20%	19%	*	24%	24%
Writing	2016	41%	44%	46%	35%	-	-	37%	35%	19%	17%	20%	*	27%	28%
Science	2016	47%	49%	50%	14%	-	-	*	13%	14%	6%	17%	*	14%	14%
Social Studies	2016	47%	51%	51%	-	-	-	-	-	13%	*	14%	*	13%	13%
STAAR Percent at Advanced S All Grades	Standard														
All Subjects	2016	18%	19%	19%	12%	*	*	10%	13%	4%	7%	3%	*	7%	7%
Reading	2016	17%	19%	20%	11%	*	*	14%	11%	4%	8%	2%	*	6%	6%
Mathematics	2016	19%	19%	20%	17%	*	*	9%	18%	6%	8%	5%	*	10%	10%
Writing	2016	15%	16%	15%	9%	-	-	*	10%	2%	*	*	*	6%	6%
Science	2016	16%	17%	17%	4%	*	-	*	5%	3%	*	3%	*	4%	4%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
Texas Academic Performance Report

#### 2015-16 District Performance

County Name: DENTON District Number: 061901

Bilingual Education/English as a Second Language

(Current Year ELL Students)

		State	Region 11	District		BE-Trans Early Exit		BE-Dual Two-Way	BE-Dual One-Way	ESL	ESL Content	ESL Pull-Out	LEP No Services	LEP With Services	Total ELL
STAAR Percent at Advanced St	tandard						·			1	·	·		·	
All Grades Social Studies	2016	22%	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	3%	*	3%	*	3%	3%
STAAR Percent Met or Exceede All Grades	ed Progress														
All Subjects	2016	62%	62%	64%	69%	*	*	61%	70%	55%	54%	55%	*	60%	60%
Reading	2016	60%	61%	62%	66%	*	*	61%	66%	55%	54%	55%	*	58%	59%
Mathematics	2016	63%	64%	65%	72%	*	*	61%	73%	55%	55%	55%	*	62%	62%
STAAR Percent Exceeded Prog All Grades	jress														
All Subjects	2016	17%	16%	17%	25%	*	*	18%	25%	14%	17%	12%	*	18%	18%
Reading	2016	16%	16%	17%	19%	*	*	20%	19%	15%	19%	14%	*	16%	16%
Mathematics	2016	17%	17%	17%	29%	*	*	17%	31%	12%	16%	10%	*	19%	19%
Progress of Prior-Year Non-Pro Sum of Grades 4-8	oficient Stud	ents													
Reading	2016	35%	35%	40%	23%	-	-	*	24%	37%	33%	40%	*	33%	33%

		Desien		A fui a a u			A		Desifie	Two or	Crassial	Feen	
	State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
2016 STAAR Participation (All Grades)													
All Tests													
Test Participant	99%	99%	<b>99%</b>	99%	99%	99%	100%	99%	96%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Included in Accountability	94%	94%	94%	93%	94%	95%	93%	89%	86%	93%	93%	92%	91%
Not Included in Accountability													
Mobile	4%	4%	4%	6%	3%	4%	6%	7%	10%	7%	4%	5%	4%
Other Exclusions	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	2%	1%	5%
Not Tested	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Absent	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	1%	0%	0%

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Attendance and Postsecondary Readiness

County Name: DENTON District Number: 061901

	State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander M	Two or lore Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Attendance Rate													
2014-15	95.7%	95.8%	95.9%	96.1%	96.0%	95.8%	95.5%	97.2%	94.8%	95.3%	95.4%	95.6%	96.5%
2013-14	95.9%	95.9%	96.0%	96.4%	96.0%	95.9%	95.8%	97.5%	95.4%	95.0%	95.3%	95.6%	96.6%
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 7-8)													
2014-15	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%
2013-14	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.7%
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 9-12)													
2014-15	2.1%	1.6%	0.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%
2013-14	2.2%	1.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.8%	0.7%
4-Year Longitudinal Rate (Gr 9-1 Class of 2015	12)												
Graduated	89.0%	89.3%	95.5%	95.4%	94.4%	96.2%	77.8%	100.0%	*	96.3%	87.2%	93.7%	94.6%
Received GED	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Continued HS	4.1%	4.6%	1.8%	0.9%	2.4%	1.8%	11.1%	0.0%	*	0.0%	9.9%	2.6%	1.8%
Dropped Out	6.3%	5.5%	2.3%	3.2%	3.2%	1.6%	11.1%	0.0%	*	3.7%	2.8%	3.5%	3.6%
Graduates and GED	89.6%	89.9%	95.8%	95.9%	94.4%	96.6%	77.8%	100.0%	*	96.3%	87.2%	93.9%	94.6%
Grads, GED, & Cont	93.7%	94.5%	<b>9</b> 7.7%	96.8%	96.8%	98.4%	88.9%	100.0%	*	96.3%	97.2%	96.5%	96.4%
Class of 2014													
Graduated	88.3%	88.7%	94.9%	94.4%	92.7%	95.9%	94.4%	95.6%	-	100.0%	78.8%	92.8%	91.8%
Received GED	0.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%
Continued HS	4.3%	4.2%	2.3%	2.1%	3.5%	1.9%	0.0%	2.2%	-	0.0%	12.5%	3.5%	2.7%
Dropped Out	6.6%	6.4%	2.4%	3.6%	3.3%	1.7%	5.6%	2.2%	-	0.0%	8.7%	3.2%	5.5%
Graduates and GED	89.1%	89.4%	95.3%	94.4%	93.2%	96.4%	94.4%	95.6%	-	100.0%	78.8%	93.3%	91.8%
Grads, GED, & Cont	93.4%	93.6%	97.6%	96.4%	96.7%	98.3%	94.4%	97.8%	-	100.0%	91.3%	96.8%	94.5%
5-Year Extended Longitudinal R	ate (Gr 9-12	2)											
Class of 2014													
Graduated	90.4%	90.8%	96.4%	95.9%	94.8%	97.2%	94.4%	95.6%	-	100.0%	84.5%	94.6%	93.3%
Received GED	1.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Continued HS	1.3%	1.4%	0.7%	1.0%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	2.2%	-	0.0%	8.7%	1.3%	0.0%
Dropped Out	7.2%	6.8%	2.4%	3.1%	3.5%	1.7%	5.6%	2.2%	-	0.0%	6.8%	3.4%	6.7%
Graduates and GED	91.5%	91.8%	96.9%	95.9%	95.3%	97.9%	94.4%	95.6%	-	100.0%	84.5%	95.3%	93.3%
Grads, GED, & Cont	92.8%	93.2%	97.6%	96.9%	96.5%	98.3%	94.4%	97.8%	-	100.0%	93.2%	96.6%	93.3%
Class of 2013	<b></b>	<b>aa a a</b> <i>i</i>		a a = 4 i	07.00/		<b>AA AA</b> <i>i</i>			00 =0. <sup>-</sup>			
Graduated	90.4%	90.7%	97.0%	96.7%	97.8%	96.7%	93.8%	100.0%	*	89.5%	89.8%	95.8%	96.2%
Received GED	1.1%	1.1%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%
Continued HS	1.3%	1.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	6.3%	0.0%	*	0.0%	4.7%	0.8%	0.0%
Dropped Out	7.2%	7.0%	1.9%	2.7%	1.9%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	*	10.5%	4.7%	3.2%	3.8%
Graduates and GED	91.5%	91.8%	97.6%	97.3%	98.1%	97.5%	93.8%	100.0%	*	89.5%	90.6%	96.0%	96.2%
Grads, GED, & Cont	92.8%	93.0%	<b>98.</b> 1%	97.3%	98.1%	98.4%	100.0%	100.0%	*	89.5%	95.3%	96.8%	96.2%

#### County Name: DENTON District Number: 061901

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Attendance and Postsecondary Readiness

				African			American		Pacific	Two or	Special	Econ	
	State	Region 11	District	American	Hispanic	White	Indian	Asian	Islander	More Races	Ed	Disadv	ELL
6-Year Extended Longitudinal	Rate (Gr 9-12	2)											
Class of 2013		-/											
Graduated	90.9%	91.3%	97.3%	96.2%	97.8%	97.4%	100.0%	100.0%	*	89.5%	93.0%	96.4%	96.2%
Received GED	1.4%	1.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.0%
Continued HS	0.6%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	1.6%	0.2%	0.0%
Dropped Out	7.2%	6.8%	1.9%	2.7%	1.9%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	*	10.5%	4.7%	3.0%	3.8%
Graduates and GED	92.3%	92.7%	98.0%	96.7%	98.1%	98.3%	100.0%	100.0%	*	89.5%	93.8%	96.8%	96.2%
Grads, GED, & Cont	92.8%	93.2%	98.1%	97.3%	98.1%	98.5%	100.0%	100.0%	*	89.5%	95.3%	97.0%	96.2%
Class of 2012													
Graduated	90.9%	91.2%	96.5%	96.9%	94.4%	97.2%	100.0%	100.0%	*	100.0%	94.8%	95.4%	89.2%
Received GED	1.5%	1.6%	1.0%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	2.6%	0.7%	0.0%
Continued HS	0.6%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%
Dropped Out	7.0%	6.6%	2.5%	1.9%	4.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	*	0.0%	1.7%	3.7%	10.8%
Graduates and GED	92.4%	92.7%	97.5%	98.1%	95.5%	98.2%	100.0%	100.0%	*	100.0%	97.4%	96.1%	89.2%
Grads, GED, & Cont	93.0%	93.4%	97.5%	98.1%	95.7%	98.2%	100.0%	100.0%	*	100.0%	98.3%	96.3%	89.2%
4-Year Federal Graduation Ra	te Without Ex	clusions (Gr 9	-12)										
Class of 2015	89.0%	89.3%	94.6%	94.1%	92.4%	95.8%	77.8%	100.0%	*	96.3%	84.8%	92.6%	89.7%
Class of 2014	88.3%	88.7%	93.8%	91.5%	91.3%	95.3%	94.4%	95.6%	*	100.0%	76.9%	91.8%	84.8%
5-Year Extended Federal Grac	luation Rate \	Nithout Exclus	sions (Gr 9-1	2)									
Class of 2014	90.4%	90.8%	95.6%	93.9%	94.0%	96.7%	94.4%	95.6%	*	100.0%	82.2%	93.9%	88.8%
Class of 2013	90.4%	90.7%	96.2%	95.7%	96.3%	96.6%	88.2%	100.0%	*	89.5%	90.0%	95.3%	92.7%
RHSP/DAP Graduates (Longit	udinal Rate)												
Class of 2015	86.1%	85.8%	91.3%	84.1%	90.8%	93.3%	71.4%	97.1%	*	92.3%	44.7%	86.3%	83.8%
Class of 2014	85.5%	85.0%	92.0%	89.1%	91.4%	92.7%	100.0%	97.7%	-	89.4%	39.0%	89.0%	91.0%
FHSP-E Graduates (Longitudi													
Class of 2015	3.5%	8.0%	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
FHSP-DLA Graduates (Longit	udinal Rate)												
Class of 2015	38.7%	25.1%	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DL													
Class of 2015	84.1%	84.2%	91.2%	83.7%	90.8%	93.3%	71.4%	97.1%	*	92.3%	44.7%	86.1%	83.8%
RHSP/DAP Graduates (Annua		<b>•</b> • • • • •		0= 00/	<b>22</b> 22/	<b>aa a a a</b>	==	07.00/	*	00 D0/	4= 00/		
2014-15	84.3%	84.4%	91.1%	85.2%	90.8%	92.6%	75.0%	97.2%	*	89.3%	45.2%	86.8%	84.3%
2013-14	83.8%	83.3%	90.3%	85.5%	88.8%	91.7%	100.0%	95.3%	-	89.1%	35.4%	85.5%	89.7%
FHSP-E Graduates (Annual R													
2014-15	3.5%	7.4%	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-
FHSP-DLA Graduates (Annua													
2014-15	37.3%	24.9%	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Attendance and Postsecondary Readiness

County Name: DENTON District Number: 061901

	State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander M	Two or lore Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
RHSP/DAP/FHSP-E/FHSP-DL	A Graduates	(Annual Rate)											
2014-15	82.2%	82.6%	91.0%	84.8%	90.8%	92.6%	75.0%	97.2%	*	89.3%	45.2%	86.6%	84.3%
Advanced Course/Dual Credit	t Course Com	pletion (Grades	s 11-12)										
Any Subject		•	-										
2014-15	54.5%	55.7%	55.1%	40.6%	46.6%	62.5%	65.0%	72.8%	20.0%	57.6%	7.4%	41.4%	31.3%
2013-14	53.2%	53.7%	52.7%	40.5%	41.6%	59.9%	65.4%	83.8%	*	58.3%	7.0%	38.4%	28.6%
English Language Arts													
2014-15	29.0%	30.7%	27.4%	17.4%	15.9%	35.3%	26.3%	48.1%	*	29.0%	2.1%	12.8%	2.6%
2013-14	28.9%	30.0%	24.1%	15.9%	14.0%	30.1%	25.0%	53.2%	*	20.6%	0.5%	11.0%	2.7%
Mathematics													
2014-15	43.8%	45.4%	36.7%	26.2%	29.4%	42.3%	36.8%	57.7%	*	36.2%	1.2%	26.6%	15.3%
2013-14	42.4%	43.3%	34.2%	23.0%	26.0%	38.5%	45.8%	69.7%	*	52.2%	4.7%	25.0%	12.5%
Science	72.770	13.370	U T.L /J	20.070	20.070	20.070	10.070	00.770		52.270	/0	20.070	12.570
2014-15	12.7%	13.6%	14.5%	10.5%	7.5%	18.8%	0.0%	30.4%	*	8.3%	0.0%	6.3%	1.5%
2013-14	13.4%	14.7%	15.6%	9.8%	10.4%	17.7%	43.8%	47.1%	*	17.9%	0.7%	8.4%	4.2%
Social Studies	13.470	14.7 /0	13.070	5.070	10.470	17.770	45.070	47.170		17.570	0.7 /0	0.470	4.270
2014-15	28.4%	30.0%	34.3%	22.5%	23.4%	41.8%	40.0%	62.0%	20.0%	46.9%	1.6%	21.4%	6.9%
2014-13	27.8%	28.7%	34.5 % 34.6%	24.3%	23.4%	41.8%	34.8%	74.3%	20.078	28.6%	0.5%	21.7%	8.1%
Any Subject 2014-15 2013-14 English Language Arts 2014-15 2013-14 Mathematics 2014-15 2013-14 Science 2014-15 2013-14 Social Studies 2014-15	34.6% 33.1% 15.7% 15.4% 19.4% 18.8% 5.2% 5.6% 19.5%	35.2% 33.2% 15.3% 14.9% 20.3% 19.3% 5.9% 6.2% 21.5%	33.3% 34.1% 12.7% 11.8% 16.6% 15.9% 6.2% 7.5% 23.2%	23.6% 23.7% 8.1% 7.5% 10.6% 10.4% 3.8% 4.7% 15.0%	26.6% 24.7% 7.6% 6.8% 13.3% 11.7% 3.2% 4.6% 15.3%	38.8% 40.5% 16.2% 14.8% 19.2% 18.1% 8.1% 8.8% 28.7%	34.0% 37.5% 11.1% 13.5% 15.2% 21.2% 2.3% 15.9% 22.2%	46.6% 55.8% 20.5% 25.9% 30.6% 34.9% 16.1% 26.4% 40.1%	18.2% 11.1% 11.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 22.2%	38.5% 43.8% 17.0% 12.4% 20.8% 27.6% 4.4% 9.6% 33.3%	4.5% 3.7% 1.6% 0.2% 0.4% 1.8% 0.0% 0.2% 0.7%	22.2% 21.9% 5.7% 5.2% 10.9% 10.8% 2.4% 3.5% 13.1%	15.0% 12.6% 1.2% 1.0% 6.1% 4.5% 0.5% 1.4% 4.2%
2014-13 2013-14 College-Ready Graduates	18.3%	20.1%	25.4%	16.5%	16.1%	31.6%	23.5%	49.7%	11.1%	27.5%	0.6%	14.5%	4.2 <i>%</i> 5.0%
English Language Arts 2014-15	42.0%	51.0%	57.0%	31.0%	51.0%	66.0%	20.0%	68.0%	-	61.0%	10.0%	44.0%	20.0%
Mathematics 2014-15 Both Subjects	38.0%	45.0%	48.0%	22.0%	40.0%	55.0%	20.0%	71.0%	-	57.0%	5.0%	35.0%	17.0%
2014-15 Either Subject	35.0%	42.0%	46.0%	18.0%	38.0%	54.0%	20.0%	65.0%	-	57.0%	5.0%	32.0%	15.0%
2014-15	45.0%	53.0%	59.0%	35.0%	53.0%	67.0%	20.0%	74.0%	-	61.0%	10.0%	47.0%	22.0%

District Name: DENTON ISD County Name: DENTON

District Number: 061901

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Attendance and Postsecondary Readiness

				African			American		Pacific	Two or	Special	Econ	
	State	Region 11	District	American	Hispanic	White	Indian	Asian		lore Races	Ed	Disadv	ELL
College and Career Ready Gra	duates												
2014-15	74.5%	72.2%	76.5%	63.2%	74.8%	79.7%	75.0%	94.4%	*	89.3%	56.5%	70.7%	65.7%
Texas Success Initiative Asses	sment (TSIA	)											
English Language Arts													
2014-15	10.6%	12.6%	14.4%	13.7%	14.0%	15.3%	0.0%	5.6%	*	14.3%	0.9%	11.6%	4.6%
Mathematics													
2014-15	7.1%	8.4%	8.1%	7.8%	8.6%	7.9%	0.0%	8.3%	*	10.7%	0.0%	7.5%	3.7%
Completion of Two or More Ac	lvanced/Dual	Credit Course	s in Current	and/or Prior	Year (Annual (	Graduates)							
2014-15	48.1%	50.6%	49.8%	33.3%	40.5%	56.4%	50.0%	88.9%	*	71.4%	3.5%	33.1%	20.4%
Completion of Twelve or More	Hours of Po	stsecondary C	redit (Annua	al Graduates)									
Any Subject 2014-15	10.6%	7.5%	2.2%	2.0%	1.8%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	*	7.1%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
AP/IB Course Completion (Ani													
2014-15	43.4%	46.5%	53.7%	37.3%	45.5%	60.3%	50.0%	83.3%	*	71.4%	3.5%	39.4%	28.7%
CTE Coherent Sequence (Ann	ual Graduate	s)											
2014-15	46.6%	36.3%	44.2%	42.6%	50.0%	42.3%	37.5%	33.3%	*	39.3%	53.9%	52.2%	51.9%
2013-14	46.4%	36.3%	42.6%	4.0%	12.9%	22.2%	0.7%	1.4%	-	1.4%	2.2%	15.4%	1.9%
AP/IB Results (Participation)													
All Subjects													
2015	24.9%	28.0%	26.4%	14.7%	20.6%	30.9%	36.4%	59.0%	20.0%	25.0%	n/a	15.4%	n/a
2014	23.5%	26.0%	23.8%	11.7%	16.6%	29.4%	20.0%	58.8%	*	18.3%	n/a	12.7%	n/a
English Language Arts													
2015	15.1%	16.9%	13.2%	7.1%	8.1%	16.7%	9.1%	33.3%	0.0%	14.1%	n/a	5.5%	n/a
2014	15.0%	16.7%	13.3%	8.8%	6.8%	16.9%	12.0%	40.0%	*	8.5%	n/a	5.5%	n/a
Mathematics													
2015	6.8%	8.0%	6.1%	2.7%	3.6%	7.3%	4.5%	26.9%	0.0%	10.9%	n/a	3.5%	n/a
2014	6.5%	7.3%	7.4%	2.7%	3.6%	9.9%	12.0%	21.3%	*	7.0%	n/a	3.1%	n/a
Science													
2015	10.2%	12.9%	9.7%	3.4%	6.3%	12.6%	0.0%	29.5%	0.0%	4.7%	n/a	4.8%	n/a
2014	6.9%	7.7%	7.0%	3.9%	4.6%	8.4%	4.0%	25.0%	*	5.6%	n/a	3.7%	n/a
Social Studies													
2015	14.4%	16.7%	15.8%	8.6%	9.9%	19.5%	18.2%	43.6%	20.0%	15.6%	n/a	8.0%	n/a
2014	13.8%	15.9%	16.1%	7.8%	9.8%	20.6%	16.0%	46.3%	*	8.5%	n/a	8.2%	n/a
AP/IB Results (Examinees >= ( All Subjects	Criterion)												
2015	49.1%	53.1%	53.6%	38.3%	56.1%	54.6%	37.5%	56.5%	*	50.0%	n/a	54.3%	n/a
2013	49.1% 51.3%	55.1% 56.8%	53.6% 57.3%	30.3% 41.7%	60.9%	54.6% 56.4%	37.5% 60.0%	56.5% 74.5%	-	30.0% 38.5%	n/a	54.3% 56.8%	n/a
	51.5%	50.0%	57.5%	41.770	00.970	50.470	00.070	74.370	-	50.5%	II/d	50.0%	n/d
English Language Arts	13 70/	E2 60/	54.6%	21 00/	46.2%	E0 20/	*	6E 40/		EE 60/	-1-	41 00/	-1-
2015 2014	43.7% 44.7%	53.6% 53.8%	54.6% 56.7%	31.0% 41.7%	46.2% 54.7%	58.3% 57.8%	*	65.4% 71.9%	-	55.6% 33.3%	n/a n/a	41.9% 53.1%	n/a n/a
2014	44.7%	55.0%	50.7%	41.7%	34.770	57.070	r.	/ 1.970	-	33.370	11/d	55.1%	ıl/d

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Attendance and Postsecondary Readiness

County Name: DENTON District Number: 061901

	State	Region 11	District	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander M	Two or ore Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
AP/IB Results (Examinees >	= Criterion)												
Mathematics													
2015	51.7%	52.7%	49.0%	18.2%	48.6%	57.7%	*	19.0%	-	28.6%	n/a	43.6%	n/a
2014	53.6%	58.3%	45.1%	27.3%	44.1%	46.1%	*	47.1%	-	40.0%	n/a	47.2%	n/a
Science													
2015	35.4%	33.9%	30.5%	14.3%	18.0%	36.0%	-	21.7%	-	*	n/a	29.6%	n/a
2014	45.7%	49.6%	46.4%	43.8%	46.5%	47.1%	*	50.0%	-	*	n/a	44.2%	n/a
Social Studies													
2015	40.1%	45.2%	35.9%	25.7%	20.0%	41.1%	*	47.1%	*	30.0%	n/a	17.8%	n/a
2014	41.6%	46.9%	42.8%	40.6%	31.5%	46.4%	*	40.5%	-	33.3%	n/a	35.4%	n/a
SAT/ACT Results													
Tested													
Class of 2015	68.3%	69.4%	63.5%	64.2%	48.4%	69.7%	50.0%	97.2%	*	78.6%	n/a	49.1%	n/a
Class of 2014	66.3%	68.4%	66.5%	73.1%	50.4%	70.5%	72.2%	95.3%	-	84.8%	n/a	50.0%	n/a
At/Above Criterion													
Class of 2015	24.3%	30.8%	33.6%	5.3%	26.0%	41.8%	*	54.3%	-	36.4%	n/a	19.5%	n/a
Class of 2014	25.1%	31.2%	29.4%	7.1%	17.9%	37.7%	30.8%	48.8%	-	30.8%	n/a	16.2%	n/a
Average SAT Score													
All Subjects													
Class of 2015	1394	1444	1474	1261	1413	1537	*	1606	-	1495	n/a	1376	n/a
Class of 2014	1417	1453	1477	1297	1409	1537	1478	1608	-	1456	n/a	1374	n/a
English Language Arts and	d Writing												
Class of 2015	912	948	972	829	926	1018	*	1038	-	978	n/a	903	n/a
Class of 2014	925	951	975	856	926	1018	963	1044	-	957	n/a	903	n/a
Mathematics													
Class of 2015	482	496	502	432	486	519	*	568	-	518	n/a	474	n/a
Class of 2014	491	501	502	441	483	519	515	564	-	498	n/a	470	n/a
Average ACT Score													
All Subjects													
Class of 2015	20.6	21.9	21.5	17.8	19.5	22.7	*	24.3	-	23.2	n/a	18.8	n/a
Class of 2014	20.6	21.9	21.1	17.8	19.2	22.3	23.7	25.4	-	21.7	n/a	18.5	n/a
English Language Arts													
Class of 2015	20.1	21.6	21.3	17.2	18.7	22.8	*	23.8	-	23.0	n/a	18.0	n/a
Class of 2014	20.0	21.5	20.8	17.0	18.5	22.3	24.0	25.0	-	21.5	n/a	17.7	n/a
Mathematics													
Class of 2015	20.9	22.0	21.3	18.2	19.7	22.2	*	25.3	-	23.4	n/a	19.5	n/a
Class of 2014	21.2	22.3	21.0	18.1	19.9	21.8	22.8	26.4	-	21.8	n/a	19.3	n/a
Science													
Class of 2015	20.7	21.9	21.5	18.3	20.2	22.5	*	23.7	-	22.5	n/a	19.2	n/a
Class of 2014	20.7	21.9	21.2	18.4	19.6	22.2	23.0	24.5	-	21.9	n/a	18.9	n/a
Graduates Enrolled in TX Ins	•												
2013-14	57.5%	57.6%	59.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012-13	56.9%	57.0%	54.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Attendance and Postsecondary Readiness

				African			American		Pacific	Two or	Special	Econ	
	State	Region 11	District	American	Hispanic	White	Indian	Asian	Islander Mo	re Races	Ed	Disadv	ELL
Graduates in TX IHE Comp	leting One Year	Without Reme	diation										
2013-14	70.5%	73.2%	72.2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012-13	70.8%	74.9%	7 <b>6.3</b> %	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Dis	trict	State			
Student Information	Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
Total Students:	27,296	100.0%	5,284,252	100.0%		
Students by Grade:						
Early Childhood Education	66	0.2%	13,009	0.2%		
Pre-Kindergarten	838	3.1%	220,390	4.2%		
Kindergarten	1,952	7.2%	376,505	7.1%		
Grade 1	2,141	7.8%	409,767	7.8%		
Grade 2	2,088	7.6%	411,080	7.8%		
Grade 3	2,187	8.0%	409,157	7.7%		
Grade 4	2,151	7.9%	396,895	7.5%		
Grade 5	2,110	7.7%	393,941	7.5%		
Grade 6	2,152	7.9%	390,379	7.4%		
Grade 7	2,125	7.8%	389,411	7.4%		
Grade 8	2,094	7.7%	386,455	7.3%		
Grade 9	2,091	7.7%	428,470	8.1%		
Grade 10	1,985	7.3%	386,290	7.3%		
Grade 11	1,756	6.4%	351,888	6.7%		
Grade 12	1,560	5.7%	320,615	6.1%		
Ethnic Distribution:						
African American	3,683	13.5%	666,933	12.6%		
Hispanic	8,219	30.1%	2,760,302	52.2%		
White	13,841	50.7%	1,507,225	28.5%		
American Indian	197	0.7%	20,855	0.4%		
Asian	772	2.8%	212,973	4.0%		
Pacific Islander	41	0.2%	7,392	0.1%		
Two or More Races	543	2.0%	108,572	2.1%		
Economically Disadvantaged	11,468	42.0%	3,118,758	59.0%		
Non-Educationally Disadvantaged	15,828	58.0%	2,165,494	41.0%		
English Language Learners (ELL)	4,104	15.0%	979,868	18.5%		
Students w/ Disciplinary Placements (2014-2015)	369	1.3%	76,611	1.4%		
At-Risk	9,307	34.1%	2,645,402	50.1%		
Graduates (Class of 2015):			242 227			
Total Graduates	1,547	100.0%	313,397	100.0%		
By Ethnicity (incl. Special Ed.):						
African American	204	13.2%	39,692	12.7%		
Hispanic	444	28.7%	148,966	47.5%		
White	826	53.4%	104,377	33.3%		
American Indian	8	0.5%	1,335	0.4%		
Asian	36	2.3%	13,090	4.2%		
Pacific Islander	1	0.1%	486	0.2%		
Two or More Races	28	1.8%	5,451	1.7%		

	Dis	trict	Sta	te
Student Information	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
By Graduation Type (incl. Special Ed.):				
Minimum H.S. Program	138	8.9%	46,723	14.9%
Recommended H.S. Program/DAP	1,408	91.0%	251,524	80.3%
Foundation High School Plan (No Endorsement)	1	0.1%	8,982	2.9%
Foundation High School Plan (Endorsement)	0	0.0%	523	0.2%
Foundation High School Plan (DLA)	0	0.0%	5,645	1.8%
Special Education Graduates	115	7.4%	23,541	7.5%

	- Non-Special Edu		- Special Education Rates		
Student Information	District	State	District	Stat	
Retention Rates by Grade:					
Kindergarten	1.5%	1.9%	10.1%	8.2%	
Grade 1	1.4%	4.1%	2.5%	7.4%	
Grade 2	0.7%	2.7%	0.0%	3.4%	
Grade 3	0.5%	2.0%	0.0%	1.69	
Grade 4	0.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.89	
Grade 5	0.0%	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%	
Grade 6	0.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.89	
Grade 7	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.99	
Grade 8	0.3%	0.8%	0.9%	1.39	
	District Count	Percent	State Count	Percer	
Data Quality:					
PID Errors (students) ""	-	-	-		
PID Errors (students) ## Underreported Students	70	0.6%	- 7,834	0.39	
Underreported Students			7,834		
	70	District	7,834		
Underreported Students <u>Class Size Information</u> Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De	70	District	7,834		
Underreported Students <u>Class Size Information</u> Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary:	70	District	7,834	Stat	
Underreported Students <u>Class Size Information</u> Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary: Kindergarten	70	District ords): 17.8	7,834	<u>Stat</u> 18.	
Underreported Students <u>Class Size Information</u> Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary:	70	District	7,834	<b>Stat</b> 18. 19.	
Underreported Students Class Size Information Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0	7,834	<b>Stat</b> 18. 19. 19.	
Underreported Students Class Size Information Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6	- 7,834	<b>Stat</b> 18. 19. 19. 19.	
Underreported Students Class Size Information Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1 19.7	7,834	<b>Stat</b> 18 19 19 19 19	
Underreported Students Class Size Information Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1	7,834	Stat 18. 19. 19. 19. 19. 20.	
Underreported Students  Class Size Information  Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De  Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 6  Secondary:	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1 19.7 22.9 22.5	7,834	Stat 18. 19. 19. 19. 19. 20. 20.	
Underreported Students  Class Size Information  Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De  Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 5 Grade 6  Secondary: English/Language Arts	70	District fords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1 19.7 22.9 22.5 20.1	7,834	Stat 18. 19. 19. 19. 20. 20. 20.	
Underreported Students  Class Size Information  Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De  Elementary:     Kindergarten     Grade 1     Grade 2     Grade 3     Grade 3     Grade 4     Grade 5     Grade 5     Grade 6  Secondary:     English/Language Arts     Foreign Languages	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1 19.7 22.9 22.5 20.1 20.1 20.0	7,834	Stat 18. 19. 19. 19. 20. 20. 20. 17. 19.	
Underreported Students  Class Size Information  Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De  Elementary: Kindergarten Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 5 Grade 6  Secondary: English/Language Arts Foreign Languages Mathematics	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1 19.7 22.9 22.5 20.1 20.0 21.0	7,834	Stat 18. 19. 19. 19. 20. 20. 17. 19. 18.	
Underreported Students  Class Size Information  Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (De  Elementary:     Kindergarten     Grade 1     Grade 2     Grade 3     Grade 3     Grade 4     Grade 5     Grade 5     Grade 6  Secondary:     English/Language Arts     Foreign Languages	70	District ords): 17.8 18.0 18.6 19.1 19.7 22.9 22.5 20.1 20.1 20.0	7,834	0.3% Stat 18. 19. 19. 19. 20. 20. 20. 17. 19. 18. 19. 19. 19.	

	Dis	trict	Sta	ate
Staff Information	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Total Staff	3,490.0	100.0%	688,142.2	100.0%
Professional Staff:	2,549.5	73.1%	442,538.0	64.3%
Teachers	1,978.9	56.7%	347,272.1	50.5%
Professional Support	460.8	13.2%	67,755.2	9.8%
Campus Administration (School Leadership)	96.8	2.8%	20,170.5	2.9%
Central Administration	13.0	0.4%	7,340.2	1.1%
Educational Aides:	302.5	8.7%	65,803.2	9.6%
Auxiliary Staff:	638.0	18.3%	179,800.9	26.1%
Total Minority Staff:	901.3	25.8%	331,599.3	48.2%
Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex:				
African American	135.2	6.8%	34,949.8	10.1%
Hispanic	242.8	12.3%	90,214.9	26.0%
White	1,544.8	78.1%	211,190.4	60.8%
American Indian	8.0	0.4%	1,242.9	0.4%
Asian	7.5	0.4%	5,134.3	1.5%
Pacific Islander	0.0	0.0%	819.3	0.2%
Two or More Races	40.6	2.1%	3,720.6	1.1%
Males	493.5	24.9%	81,756.8	23.5%
Females	1,485.4	75.1%	265,515.3	76.5%
Teachers by Highest Degree Held:				
No Degree	12.0	0.6%	3,524.0	1.0%
Bachelors	1,406.5	71.1%	259,559.7	74.7%
Masters	549.1	27.7%	82,029.5	23.6%
Doctorate	11.4	0.6%	2,158.9	0.6%
Teachers by Years of Experience:				
Beginning Teachers	103.3	5.2%	27,995.4	8.1%
1-5 Years Experience	448.5	22.7%	94,786.9	27.3%
6-10 Years Experience	532.2	26.9%	75,285.1	21.7%
11-20 Years Experience	630.9	31.9%	94,649.7	27.3%
Over 20 Years Experience	264.0	13.3%	54,555.0	15.7%
Number of Students per Teacher	13.8	n/a	15.2	n/a

Staff Information	District	State
Average Years Experience of Teachers:	11.2	10.9
Average Years Experience of Teachers with District:	7.4	7.3
Average Teacher Salary by Years of Experience (regular duties only):		
Beginning Teachers	\$49,993	\$45,507
1-5 Years Experience	\$51,107	\$47,996
6-10 Years Experience	\$52,701	\$50,459
11-20 Years Experience	\$54,292	\$53,794
Over 20 Years Experience	\$63,254	\$60,613
Average Actual Salaries (regular duties only):		
Teachers	\$54,113	\$51,891
Professional Support	\$61,812	\$61,145
Campus Administration (School Leadership)	\$80,702	\$75,654
Central Administration	\$125,126	\$99,111
Instructional Staff Percent:	73.3	64.5
Turnover Rate for Teachers:	11.0	16.5
Staff Exclusions:		
Shared Services Arrangement Staff:		
Professional Staff	0.0	1,116.6
Educational Aides	0.0	230.6
Auxiliary Staff	1.1	493.6
Contracted Instructional Staff:	0.0	1,914.4

#### TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY Texas Academic Performance Report 2015-16 District Profile

Program Information         Count         Percent         Count           Student Enrollment by Program:	
Bilingual/ESL Education       4,111       15.1%       968,569         Career & Technical Education       7,254       26.6%       1,284,748         Gifted & Talented Education       2,714       9.9%       404,540         Special Education       2,861       10.5%       453,955         Teachers by Program (population served):         Bilingual/ESL Education       39.5       2.0%       20,650.0         Career & Technical Education       83.7       4.2%       15,311.2         Compensatory Education       0.0       0.0%       10,066.4         Gifted & Talented Education       30.1       1.5%       6,656.1	Percent
Career & Technical Education         7,254         26.6%         1,284,748           Gifted & Talented Education         2,714         9.9%         404,540           Special Education         2,861         10.5%         453,955           Teachers by Program (population served):         39.5         2.0%         20,650.0           Bilingual/ESL Education         39.5         2.0%         15,311.2           Compensatory Education         0.0         0.0%         10,066.4           Gifted & Talented Education         30.1         1.5%         6,656.1	
Gifted & Talented Education         2,714         9.9%         404,540           Special Education         2,861         10.5%         453,955           Teachers by Program (population served):         5         2.0%         20,650.0           Bilingual/ESL Education         39.5         2.0%         20,650.0           Career & Technical Education         83.7         4.2%         15,311.2           Compensatory Education         0.0         0.0%         10,066.4           Gifted & Talented Education         30.1         1.5%         6,656.1	18.3%
Special Education         2,861         10.5%         453,955           Teachers by Program (population served):	24.3%
Teachers by Program (population served):Bilingual/ESL Education39.52.0%20,650.0Career & Technical Education83.74.2%15,311.2Compensatory Education0.00.0%10,066.4Gifted & Talented Education30.11.5%6,656.1	7.7%
Bilingual/ESL Education         39.5         2.0%         20,650.0           Career & Technical Education         83.7         4.2%         15,311.2           Compensatory Education         0.0         0.0%         10,066.4           Gifted & Talented Education         30.1         1.5%         6,656.1	8.6%
Career & Technical Education         83.7         4.2%         15,311.2           Compensatory Education         0.0         0.0%         10,066.4           Gifted & Talented Education         30.1         1.5%         6,656.1	
Compensatory Education         0.0         0.0%         10,066.4           Gifted & Talented Education         30.1         1.5%         6,656.1	5.9%
Gifted & Talented Education 30.1 1.5% 6,656.1	4.4%
	2.9%
Degular Education 1 E60 2 78 90/ 2E2 100 4	1.9%
Regular Education 1,560.3 78.8% 252,100.4	72.6%
Special Education 201.4 10.2% 30,567.0	8.8%
Other 64.0 3.2% 11,921.0	3.4%

#### Link to: PEIMS Financial Standard Reports/ 2014-2015 Financial Actual Report

<sup>1</sup>/<sup>4</sup> Indicates that ELL rates at met or exceeded standard and exceeded standard include current and monitored students.

\* Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.

'-' Indicates zero observations reported for this group.

'n/a' Indicates data reporting is not applicable for this group.

\*\*\*' Indicates that rates for Reading and Mathematics are based on the cumulative results from the first and second administrations of STAAR.

'?' Indicates that the data for this item were statistically improbable, or were reported outside a reasonable range.

<sup>##\*</sup> Indicates that PID Error rate information cannot be reported in 2015-16 due to the transition from PEIMS Edit+ to TSDS.

This page intentionally left blank.

# Early Literacy Inventory – Spanish Early Literacy Inventory 2015-16

**Board Report** 

December 13, 2016

Marcia Kellum & Carmen Lipscomb

PreK 2015-16



Kindergarten ELI, 2015-16



At Risk Progressing On Level 1st Grade ELI, 2015-16



### 2nd Grade ELI, 2015-16



Kindergarten SELI, 2015-16



1st Grade SELI, 2015-16



2nd Grade SELI, 2015-16



# Texas Academic Performance Report

**Denton ISD Board Meeting** 

December 13, 2016

Lyneille Meza



### 2015-16 District Profile - Student Demographics



## Student Enrollment by Program








## Teachers by Gender

## Teachers by Highest Degree Held





## STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above, All Grades, All Subjects



## STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above, All Grades, Reading



## STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above, All Grades, Mathematics



## STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above, All Grades, Writing



## STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above, All Grades, Science



## STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above, All Grades, Social Studies





#### Attendance Rate

**2**013-14 **2**014-15







RHSP/DAP Graduates (Annual Rate)

**2**013-14 **2**014-15



## Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion, Grades 9-12

**2**013-14 **2**014-15

## AP/IB Results - Participation



AP/IB Results- At/Above Criterion



## SAT/ACT Results - Tested



## SAT/ACT Results - At/Above Criterion



Average SAT Score



Average ACT Score





## Denton ISD Parent and Family Engagement Policy



Denton ISD PDC Federal & State Programs 1212 Bolivar Street Denton, TX 76201 (940) 369-0650

#### **Purpose of the Policy**

Because school age children spend 70% of their waking hours (including weekends and holidays) outside of school, parental involvement and engagement is essential to the success of children in school. While volunteering at school is beneficial, and attending parent-teacher conferences, school events, and parent involvement activities are important, "the most significant type of involvement is what parents do at home. By monitoring, supporting and advocating, parents can be engaged in ways that ensure that their children have every opportunity for success." Involvement encompasses: setting goals with children and fostering achievement of those goals, accessing and using children's academic scores to ensure they're on track, frequently viewing the parent portal, developing a relationship with children's teachers and keeping in touch with them often, and advocating for improvements in the school building and with local, state, and federal officials to ensure schools have the resources they need to provide a world class education to every student."



#### Parental Involvement Research

Extensive research demonstrates "a positive and convincing relationship between family involvement and benefits for students, including improved academic achievement. This relationship holds across families of all economic, racial/ethnic, and educational backgrounds and for students at all ages. The benefits for students include:

- higher grade point averages and scores on standardized tests or rating scales,
- enrollment in more challenging academic programs,
- more classes passed and credits earned,
- better attendance,
- improved behavior at home and at school, and
- better social skills and adaptation to school."





#### Ways to Be Involved and Engaged in Our Schools

- Ready Rosie and Bringing Up are online resources for parents that offers instant, interactive, and consistent parent-child engagement activities aligned to our reading and math curriculum. These programs are provided by Denton ISD at no charge to parents whose child(ren) attend campuses that receive Title I funds. Ready Rosie is designed to serve children from birth to age six; and Bringing Up is designed for parents of students from kindergarten to third grade. If you've ever asked, "How can I help my child at home?" these are THE resources for you!
- Attend parent-teacher conferences.
- Attend school activities with your child(ren).
- Volunteer at your child(ren)'s school(s). Visit your child(ren)'s school for more details.
- Serve on the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) at your child(ren)'s school.
- Talk, read, and play with your child(ren). Talking about anything leads learning about everything Readers get their start on the lap of a parent. Playing ignites learning, creativity, and curiosity.

#### Development of the Parent and Family Engagement Policy

According to the Every Student Succeeds Act, "Each local education agency (LEA) shall develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy." Additionally, each school served under Title I shall "jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parent and family engagement policy, agreed on by such parents." Further, each school shall "involve parents, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way, in the planning, review, and improvement of programs under Title I, including the planning, review, and improvement of the school parent and family engagement policy." This brochure is our way of informing parents of our family engagement policies.

#### **Title I Annual Meetings**

Each school served under Title I shall "convene an annual meeting, at a convenient time, to which all parents of participating children shall be invited and encouraged to attend, to inform parents of their school's participation under Title I and to explain the requirements of Title I, and the right of the parents to be involved."

#### **School-Parent Compacts**

Each school served under Title I shall "jointly develop with parents for all children served under this part a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership to help children achieve the State's high standards."

#### **Districtwide Program Plan**

Each LEA shall involve parents and family members in jointly developing the LEA plan (i.e. district improvement plan). Further, each school served under Title I shall "involve parents, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way, in the joint development of the schoolwide program plan." Parent representatives serve on our Educational Improvement Council (EIC) and assist in the development of the district improvement plan.

Denton ISD: Empowering lifelong learners to be engaged citizens who positively impact their local and global community.



# DISTRICT OF INNOVATION PLAN ENTROPINDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Under the **Texas Education Code Chapter 12A: Districts of Innovation**, Denton ISD has identified the following requirements imposed by the Texas Education Code that inhibit the goals of the Denton ISD Innovation Plan:

#### FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION

Texas Education Code: Sec. 25.0811. FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.25.htm#25.0811

"A school district may not begin instruction for students for a school year before the fourth Monday in August."

**Board Policy:** EB: SCHOOL YEAR EB (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=EB(LEGAL).pdf</u> EB (LOCAL) http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=EB(LOCAL).pdf

#### **Rationale:**

Denton ISD believes the local community should decide what is best for its students in setting the first day of instruction. By claiming exemption from Sec. 25.0811, the district shall determine the first day of instruction for its students on an annual basis with input from stakeholders. Regardless of whether any adjustments or changes are made to the current start date law, Denton ISD believes this issue to be a local decision as opposed to a state mandate.

#### CERTIFICATION

Texas Education Code: Sec. 21.003. CERTIFICATION REQUIRED http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.003

"A person may not be employed as a teacher, teacher intern or teacher trainee, librarian, educational aide, administrator, educational diagnostician, or school counselor by a school district unless the person holds an appropriate certificate or permit issued."

#### Sec. 21.044. EDUCATOR PREPARATION

http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.044 Sec. 21.053. PRESENTATION AND RECORDING OF CERTIFICATES http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.053 Sec. 21.055. SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHING PERMIT http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.055 Sec. 21.057. PARENTAL NOTIFICATION http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.057

#### **Board Policy:**

DBA: EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS CREDENTIALS AND RECORDS DBA (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DBA(LEGAL).pdf</u> DBA (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DBA(LOCAL).pdf</u>

#### DK: ASSIGNMENT AND SCHEDULES

DK (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DK(LEGAL).pdf</u> DK (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DK(LOCAL).pdf</u> DK (EXHIBIT) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DK(XHIBIT).pdf</u>

#### **Rationale:**

Denton ISD believes school district leadership should decide what is best for its students in determining the candidate best suited to teach career and technical education (CTE) courses; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) courses; dual credit coursework; etc. By claiming exemption from Sec. 21.044 the district shall have the right to recruit individuals from certain trades, industries, and vocations with industry knowledge and real world experience and consider qualifications based on experience, industry certification, etc. District leadership including principals, CTE administrators, human resource department members, etc. shall determine whether it is in the best interest of its students to certify individuals based on these factors rather than appeal to the Commissioner of Education as stated in Sec. 21.055. Further, the district shall establish local criteria for training and locally certifying individuals rather than adhere strictly to mandates outlined in Sec. 21.053. In doing so, parental notification of "inappropriately certified or uncertified teachers" under Sec. 21.057 would no longer be necessary. Regardless of whether any adjustments or changes are made to the certification laws, Denton ISD believes this issue to be a local decision as opposed to a state mandate.

### SITE-BASED DECISION-MAKING

#### **Texas Education Code:**

Sec. 11.251. PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.11.htm#11.251 Sec. 11.252. DISTRICT-LEVEL PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.11.htm#11.252 Sec. 11.253. CAMPUS PLANNING AND SITE-BASED DECISION-MAKING http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.11.htm#11.253 Sec. 11.255. DROPOUT PREVENTION REVIEW http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.11.htm#11.255

"To implement the process at the district level, administration should consider the following critical success factors [which include but are not limited to]: Extensive and continuous training prior to and during implementation within the school district. Training should include, but not be limited to, developing skills on

consensus building, brainstorming, problem solving, managing change and interpersonal communication skills such as conflict resolution, value clarification and negotiation. An extensive amount of time will be spent changing role definitions, training school district staff, educating the community, establishing objectives, developing and implementing programs and monitoring program success."

#### **Board Policy:**

BQ: PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS BQ (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=BQ(LEGAL).pdf</u> BQ (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=BQ(LOCAL).pdf</u>

BQA: PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS DISTRICT-LEVEL BQA (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=BQA(LEGAL).pdf</u> BQA (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=BQA(LOCAL).pdf</u>

BQA: PLANNING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS CAMPUS-LEVEL BQB (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=BQB(LEGAL).pdf</u> BQB (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=BQB(LOCAL).pdf</u>

#### **Rationale:**

According to the <u>Site-based Decision Making Update 14: A Module of the Texas Education Agency (TEA)</u> <u>Financial Accountability System Resource Guide (FASRG)</u>,

"Site-based decision making is a process for decentralizing decisions to improve the educational outcomes at every school campus through a collaborative effort by which principals, teachers, campus staff, district staff, parents, and community representatives assess educational outcomes of all students, determine goals and strategies, and ensure that strategies are implemented and adjusted to improve student achievement.

The basic premise of site-based decision making is that the most effective decisions are made by those who will actually implement the decisions."

The implementation process for site-based decision making occurs at two levels – district and campus. From a district standpoint, perhaps the guide says it best,

"The belief is that people involved at the campus level have a greater opportunity to identify problems, develop problem resolution and change strategy than people located off-campus. Site-based decision making concepts also recognize that people at the campus level are more likely to internalize change and to support its implementation if they are involved in the decision making than if they are not."

And research would show this to be the case, but most notably and noticeably at the "campus level" and particularly with the principal and teacher leadership working collaboratively. Because of the breadth and depth of the inner workings of a large school district, it is much more difficult to ascertain its effectiveness in a large, fast-growth district. According to the *FASRG*,

"To implement the process at the district level, administration should consider the following critical success factors [which include, but are not limited to]:

- Extensive and continuous training prior to and during implementation within the school district. Training should include, but not be limited to, developing skills on consensus building, brainstorming, problem solving, managing change and interpersonal communication skills such as conflict resolution, value clarification, and negotiation.
- An extensive amount of time will be spent changing role definitions, training school district staff, educating the community, establishing objectives, developing and implementing programs and monitoring program success."

"Extensive and continuous training" and "an extensive amount of time" would indeed be necessary for all stakeholders, but is it practical? According to Sec. 11.252, (e), "The district-level committee established under Section 11.251 shall hold *at least one public meeting per year*." Denton ISD board policy BQA (LOCAL) further states, "The chairperson of the council shall set its agenda and shall schedule *at least two meetings per year*;

additional meetings may be held at the call of the chairperson." Currently, Denton ISD holds *six* meetings yearly. However, considering the education code and board policy require members to address, at a minimum, the areas of planning, budgeting, curriculum, staffing patterns, staff development, school organization as well as a host of other responsibilities identified in additional sections of the education code; one (or even six) meetings is insufficient to *discuss* the required topics much less have sufficient (or "extensive") training to equip members to have meaningful dialogue and input. With district site-based management committee topping 60 members including a teacher rep from each of the 40 campuses, it is quite a daunting task. Consider the amount of "extensive training" it would require a classroom teacher representative to endure to have the knowledge to offer constructive feedback on the district budget currently in excess of \$200 million. Frankly, not only is it unfathomable, it isn't reasonable to expect such a far-reaching viewpoint. *If trained to address all the areas listed in law, "extensive training" would become "excessive training.*" If a district went so far as to provide this level of training, it could be rendered pointless. Board policy BQA (LOCAL), states, "The council shall serve *exclusively* in an advisory role except that the council shall approve staff development of a Districtwide nature." Therefore, any recommendation made by a well-informed committee could be deemed unusable and the investment of time for naught.

While all stakeholders are represented, it is often a difficult task for parent, community, and business reps to offer a voice in a broad sense. Although each offers perspective, feedback is typically more representative of individual perspective than as an advocate for those in similar roles (i.e. a business rep should ideally speak on behalf of local businesses based on feedback from other business members). Outside representatives have proven valuable in the manner in which the EIC has operated over the past several years, which has served as a discussion-based group on a variety of topics. Over time, both district- and campus-level parents of students enrolled in the district, community members, and business and industry representatives have expressed concerns feeling they had little to contribute to the overall conversation in the traditional format of these committees. Because so much is to be considered as a part of the district and campus improvement plan (including federal and state law), leaders (both principals and teacher leaders) must have deep conversation prior to the site-based management committee meetings. As a result, the committee is merely a rubber-stamp committee with considerable de jure power but little de facto power.

In addition a comprehensive needs assessment, measurable performance objectives, strategies, resources (including staff), and evaluative measures, the number of strategies mandated in Sec. 11.252 are excessive and bring to mind the exhaustive list of the ever increasing burden on America's public schools (<u>http://www.jamievollmer.com/pdf/the-list.pdf</u>) crafted by author Jamie Vollmer. Mandates include, but are not limited to, instructional methods for addressing the needs of student groups not achieving their full potential;

- methods for addressing the needs of students for special programs, such as
  - suicide prevention,
  - conflict resolution,
  - violence prevention, or
  - o dyslexia treatment programs;
  - dropout reduction;
  - o integration of technology in instructional and administrative programs;
  - discipline management;
  - staff development for professional staff of the district;
  - career education to assist students in developing the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary for a broad range of career opportunities; and
  - accelerated education;
- strategies for providing to middle school, junior high school, and high school students, those students' teachers and counselors, and those students' parents information about:
  - higher education admissions and financial aid opportunities;
  - the TEXAS grant program and the Teach for Texas grant program established under Chapter 56;

- the need for students to make informed curriculum choices to be prepared for success beyond high school;
- and sources of information on higher education admissions and financial aid;
- goals and objectives for the coordinated health program at the campus based on:
  - student fitness assessment data, including any data from research-based assessments such as the school health index assessment and planning tool created by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;
  - student academic performance data;
  - student attendance rates;
  - $\circ$  the percentage of students who are educationally disadvantaged;
  - the use and success of any method to ensure that students participate in moderate to vigorous physical activity as required by Section 28.002(1); and
  - any other indicator recommended by the local school advisory council.

#### While the components to be addressed are critical, the district has other means to address these matters.

Finally, Denton ISD uses the *FranklinCovey Leadership: Great Leaders, Great Teams, Great Results* model for improvement planning. Based upon the four disciplines of execution, Denton ISD improvement plans focus on "Wildly Important Goals (WIGs)." A Wildly Important Goal is described by FranklinCovey as "a goal that makes all the difference. Failure to achieve this goal renders any other achievements inconsequential." Research demonstrates "great leaders realize they can execute only two or three goals with excellence at one time. There will always be more good ideas than the capacity to execute." Jim Collins, author of Good to Great said, "The enemy of the great is the good. Organizations have to say no to good ideas. The law of diminishing return shows when an organization has two to three goals, it is likely to achieve the goals. With four to ten goals, the organization is likely to only achieve one to two; and it is unlikely to achieve any of the goals when there are more than ten goals." Therefore, these mandates are antithetical.

As a result, Denton ISD is claiming exemption from the specific provisions of Sec. 11.251 - 11.255 and shall determine the processes and memberships of its site-based management committees. While Denton ISD will continue to develop district and campus improvement plans based upon a comprehensive needs assessment, the district is claiming exemption from the specific mandates of these sections and shall determine the contents of its plans while honoring federal mandates that cannot be excluded. Regardless of whether any adjustments or changes are made to site-based decision-making rules and laws, Denton ISD believes this issue to be a local decision as opposed to a state mandate.

#### MINIMUM ATTENDANCE FOR CLASS CREDIT OR FINAL GRADE

#### **Texas Education Code:**

Sec. 25.092. MINIMUM ATTENDANCE FOR CLASS CREDIT OR FINAL GRADE <u>http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.25.htm#25.092</u>

"A student in any grade level from kindergarten through grade 12 may not be given credit or a final grade for a class unless the student is in attendance for at least 90 percent of the days the class is offered."

#### **Board Policy:**

FEC: ATTENDANCE FOR CREDIT FEC (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=FEC(LEGAL).pdf</u> FEC (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=FEC(LOCAL).pdf</u>

#### **Rationale:**

Denton ISD believes 90% is an arbitrary percentage emphasizing "seat time" over content mastery. By claiming exemption from Sec. 25.092, the district can abstain from penalizing students who miss class time due to extraand co-curricular activities, academic activities, and/or other extenuating circumstances enabling the district to accommodate students with legitimate scheduling conflicts while reducing dropouts and increasing the number of qualifying graduates. Note that relief from Sec. 25.092 does not in any way impact or alter existing compulsory attendance requirements or University Interscholastic League (UIL) rules. Furthermore, in no way does this exemption limit a teacher's right to determine the finality of a grade in accordance with Texas Education Code Sec. 28.214 nor does it restrict or alter a teacher's right to assign grades in accordance with Texas Education Code Sec. 28.216. Regardless of whether any adjustments or changes are made to the minimum attendance for class credit or final grade laws, Denton ISD believes this issue to be a local decision as opposed to a state mandate.

#### **RECOMMENDED APPRAISAL PROCESS AND PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**

#### **Texas Education Code:**

Sec. 21.351. RECOMMENDED APPRAISAL PROCESS AND PERFORMANCE CRITERIA<u>http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.351</u>

"The commissioner shall adopt a recommended appraisal process and criteria on which to appraise the performance of teachers."

Sec. 21.354. APPRAISAL OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATORS http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.354

"The commissioner shall adopt a recommended appraisal process and criteria on which to appraise the performance of various classifications of school administrators."

Sec. 21.3541. APPRAISAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM FOR PRINCIPALS <u>http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/Docs/ED/htm/ED.21.htm#21.3541</u>

"The commissioner by rule shall establish and shall administer a comprehensive appraisal and professional development system for principals."

#### **Board Policy:**

DNA: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL EVALUATION OF TEACHERS DNA (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DNA(LEGAL).pdf</u> DNA (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DNA(LOCAL).pdf</u>

DNB: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL EVALUATION OF OTHER PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES DNB (LEGAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DNB(LEGAL).pdf</u>

DNB (LOCAL): PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL EVALUATION OF CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS DNB (LOCAL) <u>http://pol.tasb.org/Policy/Download/383?filename=DNB(LOCAL).pdf</u>

#### **Rationale:**

Denton ISD believes it is essential to maintain flexibility in using a variety of measurements, including goal setting, observations, student growth progress toward learning objectives, and other formative assessments in determining the performance of its educators. By claiming exemption from Sec. 21.351, 23.354, and 23.3541, the

district can determine locally the most appropriate appraisal instrument to evaluate its educators. Regardless of whether any adjustments or changes are made to the state-mandated appraisal system and laws, Denton ISD believes this issue to be a local decision as opposed to a state mandate.