

Borger ISD

District Improvement Plan

2010-11

**Our students will become educated, successful, and responsible citizens
of our society.**

DISTRICT: Borger Independent School District

SUPERINTENDENT: Chance Welch

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT FOR CURRICULUM AND PERSONNEL: Linda Rotramel

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION: De' Lila Holder

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION: Patti Brown

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

Johnny Rusten, President

Robert Bradley, Vice-President

David Brandon, Secretary

Elaine Feese

Gary Schneck

Todd Harris

Dr. Kent Gray

Borger ISD Belief Statements

- 1 We believe that education is both a right and a privilege and that the schools of Borger, Texas should create a climate of mutual cooperation and respect among school personnel, students, parents, and the community.
- 2 We believe that in a dynamic and changing world, the curriculum must be designed to provide wholesome learning experiences which will allow each student to use the basic tools and skills of learning, to explore and to know his individual interests and aptitudes, to make wise choices of vocation and to continue his quest for knowledge.
- 3 We believe that the public school in cooperation with parents and the community has the responsibility to reflect our democratic society, to give guidance and to provide opportunities for all students to develop good character and responsible citizenship.
- 4 We believe that the school should provide an environment conducive to the development of each student so that he may foster understanding and wisdom, good work and study habits, desirable attitudes toward self and others, maturity and self-confidence, self-direction, self-determination, and the ability to solve problems creatively and critically.
- 5 We believe that in a dynamic and changing world, the curriculum must be designed to provide wholesome learning experiences which will allow each student to use the basic tools and skills of learning, to explore and to know his individual interests and aptitudes, to make wise choices of vocation and to continue his quest for knowledge.
- 6 We believe that the public school in cooperation with parents and the community has the responsibility to reflect our democratic society, to give guidance and to provide opportunities for all students to develop good character and responsible citizenship.
- 7 We believe that education is both a right and a privilege and that the schools of Borger, Texas should create a climate of mutual cooperation and respect among school personnel, students, parents, and the community.
- 8 We believe that in a dynamic and changing world, the curriculum must be designed to provide wholesome learning experiences which will allow each student to use the basic tools and skills of learning, to explore and to know his individual interests and aptitudes, to make wise choices of vocation and to continue his quest for knowledge.
- 9 We believe that the public school in cooperation with parents and the community has the responsibility to reflect our democratic society, to give guidance and to provide opportunities for all students to develop good character and responsible citizenship.
- 10 We believe that the school should provide an environment conducive to the development of each student so that he may foster understanding and wisdom, good work and study habits, desirable attitudes toward self and others, maturity and self-confidence, self-direction, self-determination, and the ability to solve problems creatively and critically.
- 11 We believe that in a dynamic and changing world, the curriculum must be designed to provide wholesome learning experiences which will allow each student to use the basic tools and skills of learning, to explore and to know his individual interests and aptitudes, to make wise choices of vocation and to continue his quest for knowledge.
- 12 We believe that the public school in cooperation with parents and the community has the responsibility to reflect our democratic society, to give guidance and to provide opportunities for all students to develop good character and responsible citizenship.

Goal 1: BISD student performance will demonstrate gains as necessary to attain or maintain Recognized or Exemplary status as measured by scores on TAKS, ACT, and other state and national tests, while performance gaps between minority and non-minority students will narrow.

Correlates with:

State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum		
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
1) Students will Reach High Standards	2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	
Effective School Correlates			
2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission	5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task
6) Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress			
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
2) Ensure Planning is Incorporated	3) Use Effective Methods	5) Highly Qualified Teachers	6) Opportunities for Professional Development
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	4) Professional Development	6) Parental Involvement	7) Student Transition to Elementary Programs
8) Include Teachers in Decisions	10) Federal, State, and Local Programs		

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 1 - Strategy 1				Improve drop-out rate and completion rate			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Principals BMS/BHS		Brief Description: Borger ISD shall lower the drop-out rate and increase the graduation rate with the final goal of having all BISD students graduating with his/her own age group.		Evaluation Benchmark: Completion rates will reach 100% on the PEIMS Data Review report.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: May 2011 May 2012							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
Volunteer Support		Number of FTE's: 1.00		Compensatory Ed. Budget		\$45,000.00	
Title Teachers		Fully Comp. Ed Funded				<hr/>	
Staff		Cost: \$45,000.00				\$45,000.00	
Parent Support							
District Staff							
District Coordinator							
Campus Admin. Staff							

Goal 1 - Strategy 1		Improve drop-out rate and completion rate												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A u g	S e p	O c t	N o v	D e c	J a n	F e b	M a r	A p r	M a y	J u n	J u l	Evaluation
Identify students at-risk of dropping out so that services can be started as early as possible	Exec. Director of Elem. Instruction	X		X		X		X				X		Identify students who are at risk and begin services within 3 weeks of identification.

Goal 1 - Strategy 2 Maintain Promotion Strategies			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals	Brief Description: Borger ISD will improve promotion percentages.	Evaluation Benchmark: Improve promotions to 91% district wide.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: May 2011 December 2011 May 2012			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: None	General Budget	\$5,000.00
Outside Consultant	Partially Title Funded	Title Budget	\$5,000.00
District Staff	Cost: \$10,000.00		<hr/> \$10,000.00
District Admin. Staff			

Goal 1 - Strategy 2		Maintain Promotion Strategies												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Implement higher order thinking skills by using teaching strategies from the 5E model.	Asst Supt. Curriculum					X					X			91% of all BISD students will successfully move to the next grade level.

Goal 1 - Strategy 3 Attain Recognized status			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Superintendent	Brief Description: Borger ISD will become a recognized district with at least one campus reaching Exemplary status as defined by the Texas Education Agency.	Evaluation Benchmark: BISD will increase the number of students reaching commended levels on TAKS by 10%.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: Feb. 2011 May 2011 May 2012			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: None	Title Budget	\$7,000.00
Staff	Fully Title Funded		\$7,000.00
Computers	Cost: \$7,000.00		
Campus Admin. Staff			

Goal 1 - Strategy 3		Attain Recognized status												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Teachers will use the Inova program information to identify the students whose projected score could be in the commended range with a slight increase.	Principal							X		X	X			10% more of our students will score in the commended range on the TAKS test.

Goal 1 - Strategy 4 Attain Recognized status			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Superintendent	Brief Description: Administer benchmark tests at least 2 times before TAKS test is given.	Evaluation Benchmark: Chart benchmark scores to ascertain weak areas and to identify areas to reteach.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: January, 2011 October, 2011 January, 2012 March, 2012			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: 1.00	District Budget	\$5,500.00
Supplies	None		<hr/> \$5,500.00
District Staff	Cost: \$26,000.00		
District Admin. Staff			
Campus Admin. Staff			

Goal 1 - Strategy 4 Attain Recognized status														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Administer benchmark tests based on balanced curriculum.	Principals			X			X		X					Increase in benchmark scores by 10% from one test to the next.

Goal 1 - Strategy 5 Increase Average Scale Scores			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Superintendent Leader Progress Report Dates: February, 2011 April, 2011 May, 2011	Brief Description: Use Inova individual student profiles to identify strike zone objectives in order to increase student's understanding of the content area.	Evaluation Benchmark: TAKS scale scores will increase by 10% for the 10-11 school year. TAKS scores will increase by 5% for the 2011-12 school year.	
Resources Required: Teachers Supplies District Admin. Staff Campus Admin. Staff	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: 15.00 Partially Title Funded Cost: \$30,000.00	Source of Funds: Title Budget	Amount \$7,000.00 <hr/> \$7,000.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 5 Increase Average Scale Scores														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Develop extended day activities for students based on the strategies outlined by Inova.	Principals			X			X				X			Students will attain at least one year of value in 1 school year.

Goal 1 - Strategy 6 Increase % taking AP exams			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Counselors	Brief Description: BISD will maximize the number of students taking AP exams, number of tests taken and the number of exams scored 3 or higher.	Evaluation Benchmark: Increase number of students scoring 3 or higher on AP exams by 5%.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: May, 2011 May, 2012			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: None	None	\$0.00
Campus Admin. Staff	None Cost: None		<hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 6															Increase % taking AP exams
Timeline															
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation	
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u		
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l		
Encourage students to enroll in AP courses and to take the exam.	Counselors										X			At least 90% of students taking AP exams will score a 3 or higher.	

Goal 1 - Strategy 7 Increase College Readiness			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): District Staff/Principal Leader Progress Report Dates: May 2011 May 2012	Brief Description: The percent of students who meet or exceed the college readiness standard in the areas of ELA and math on the TAKS test will increase annually.	Evaluation Benchmark: Students meeting college readiness standards will increase by 10% annually.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 7 Increase College Readiness														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Students will be encouraged to graduate on the Recommended program or higher.	Counselors	X									X			August, 2010 May, 2011

Goal 1 - Strategy 8 Increase Sp.Ed. TAKS test takers			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Principals</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: Principals March, 2011 May, 2011 May, 2012</p>	<p>Brief Description: Through the ARD process, Special Education student will take the appropriate TAKS test. All Sp. Ed. students will progress toward taking the regular TAKS test.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: Increase number of Sp. Ed. students taking TAKS test by 10%.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: Staff Outside Consultant</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: Special Grant</p>	<p>Amount</p> <p>\$6,000.00</p> <hr/> <p>\$6,000.00</p>

Goal 1 - Strategy 8		Increase Sp.Ed. TAKS test takers												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Perform item analysis on students in Special Education to determine gaps in learning to develop instructional goals.	Teachers													10% increase of Special Ed. students passing TAKS

Goal 1 - Strategy 9 Meet District AYP			
<i>Supports TAKS Reading - Grade: All Grades, TAKS Math - Grade: All Grades, TAKS Science - Grade: All Grades</i>			
Leader(s): Superintendent	Brief Description: Review ARD Committee decision procedures regarding state assessments. Ensure that appropriate assessments are selected for each student.	Evaluation Benchmark: Use Inova to query scores of 100% of all Special Ed. students in order to determine the appropriate test.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: Special Ed. Director, April 2011 Principals, April 2011 Staff, April 2012			
<i>NEW INITIATIVE</i>			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: None	Title Budget	\$7,000.00
Supplies	None Cost: None		<hr/> \$7,000.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 9		Meet District AYP												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Disaggregate scores using Inova or comparable program in order to plan appropriate instructional strategies for struggling students.	Principals									X	X			TAKS scores for all students will increase by 15%.

Goal 1 - Strategy 10 Improve scores of special populations			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principal	Brief Description: Borger ISD will improve the TAKS scores of special populations enrolled in the Career and Technology Education Program. CTE teachers will plan collaboratively with regular education teachers in order to improve performance using real-world applications.	Evaluation Benchmark: Math and Science benchmark scores will improve by 10%.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: January 2011 May 2011			
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 10 Improve scores of special populations

Timeline

Goal 1 - Strategy 11 Teacher in-service			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principal Leader Progress Report Dates: December 2010 May 2011	Brief Description: CTE teachers will receive in-service training on strategies to use with special populations regarding the collaboration of regular education and Career and Technology Education.	Evaluation Benchmark: 6-8 hours of training regarding a collaborative teaching approach.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 11 Teacher in-service

Timeline

Goal 1 - Strategy 12 Class Reduction			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Superintendent Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2010 October, 2010 May, 2011 August, 2011	Brief Description: Add an additional Kindergarten teacher and a 1st grade teacher to accommodate an increased number of students in the district at these grade levels.	Evaluation Benchmark: Maintain the class size ratio of < 22 to 1.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 12 Class Reduction

Timeline

Goal 1 - Strategy 13 Student tour of receiving campus			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: May, 2011	Brief Description: Principals will arrange for incoming students to tour the campus that students will attend in the coming school year. This will give the students an opportunity to become familiar with the campus each of them will be attending the next school year.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of the students who are transitioning to a new building will have an opportunity to tour the new campus.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 13 Student tour of receiving campus

Timeline

Goal 1 - Strategy 14 Rtl folder exchange			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: May, 2011 August, 2011	Brief Description: Principals will meet to exchange Rtl folders of the students who will be attending that campus for the coming year. Discussions about any irregularities can be noted at this time.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of all students receiving Rtl services will be reviewed by current staff and folders will be handed over to receiving staff.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 14 Rtl folder exchange

Timeline

Goal 1 - Strategy 15 Review test scores			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: May, 2011 August, 2011	Brief Description: Data obtained during the school year will be presented to the receiving school and reviewed by the current staff.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of all data gathered in the 2010-2011 school year will be made available to the receiving staff.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 1 - Strategy 15 Review test scores
Timeline

Goal 2: Provide a safe environment in district facilities and at district related events.

Correlates with:

State Objectives			
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	8) School Environment		
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments			
Effective School Correlates			
1) Safe and Orderly Environment	2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	4) Clear and Focused Mission	7) Home-School Relations
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	4) Professional Development	6) Parental Involvement	

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 2 - Strategy 1 Emergency Operation Plans			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals	Brief Description: Emergency Operation Plans will be readily available on each campus.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of our teachers will have their emergency "GO" packs available for any emergency.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2009 May, 2010			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Transportation Dept.	Number of FTE's: 1.00	District Budget	\$5,000.00
Teachers	None		\$5,000.00
Supplies	Cost: \$1,500.00		
Staff			
District Admin. Staff			
Community Leader			
Central Office			
Campus Admin. Staff			

Goal 2 - Strategy 1 Emergency Operation Plans														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A u g	S e p	O c t	N o v	D e c	J a n	F e b	M a r	A p r	M a y	J u n	J u l	Evaluation
Implement an emergency evacuation in conjunction with the city emergency operations in response to a mock disaster.	Principals			X						X				100% of staff will follow Emergency Operation plan for his/her campus.

Goal 2 - Strategy 2 Safety audits			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Safety Audit committee	Brief Description: Three district staff members will audit each campus for safety compliance.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of campuses will pass the safety audit.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2009			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Custodial/Maint. Dept.	Number of FTE's: 0.50	District Budget	\$2,000.00
Campus Admin. Staff	None Cost: \$2,000.00		\$2,000.00

Goal 2 - Strategy 2		Safety audits												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
3 staff members make up the Safety Audit Team. This team will use a template to evaluate each campus for safety compliance.	Safety Audit Team					X								100% compliance

Goal 2 - Strategy 3				Decrease discretionary placements to DAEP			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Principals		Brief Description: Percent of Discretionary DAEP placements will be below the state standard of 5.0%.		Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of students assigned to the DAEP will participate in the "Why Try" behavior management program.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: March 2010 December 2010							
Resources Required: Supplies		FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None		Source of Funds: Title Budget		Amount \$750.00 <hr/> \$750.00	

Goal 2 - Strategy 3															Decrease discretionary placements to DAEP
Timeline															
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation	
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u		
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l		
All students will participate in the "Why Try" program	Campus Adm./DAEP Instructor								X					Decrease in DAEP placements	

Goal 2 - Strategy 4 Discretionary DAEP placements will decrease			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: April 2010 August 2010	Brief Description: District and campus administrators will meet with municipal judges, justices of the peace, and local law enforcement to raise awareness of the consequences of off-campus disciplinary actions.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of city/county officials will be aware of statistics regarding student court referrals.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 2 - Strategy 4 Discretionary DAEP placements will decrease														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Meet with city/county officials to discuss importance of supporting district officials with convictions for offenses.	District/campus administrators													50% increase in convictions for offenses brought before court.

Goal 2 - Strategy 5				Provide professional development			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Principals		Brief Description: Provide professional development for middle school and high school administration and staff regarding cultural diversity to address issues of disproportionate discretionary placements of African American and Hispanic students.			Evaluation Benchmark: Percent of discretionary placements for African American and Hispanic students will decrease by 5%.		
Leader Progress Report Dates: October 2010							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
Outside Consultant		Number of FTE's: None		None		\$0.00	
		None				\$0.00	
		Cost: None					

Goal 2 - Strategy 5		Provide professional development												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	r	a	y	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Texas Behavior Support Initiative Implementation. On campus training for a campus team in principles and strategies for Schoolwide PBS. Provide on-site technical assistance to support individual campus strategies.	Principals													Discretionary placements will decrease by 10%.

Goal 2 - Strategy 6				Pre and Post assessments			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): DAEP staff		Brief Description: DAEP staff will use one the following instruments to get a baseline score for a student entering the DAEP program. The same instrument will be utilized in order to conduct a post assessment to determine the student's progress while in the DAEP program. Assessments available to be used: TAKS released Study Island I-Stations Lexia			Evaluation Benchmark: Students who are placed in to the DAEP program for 45 days or more will receive a pre and post assessment to determine his/her progress.		
Leader Progress Report Dates: September, 2010 December, 2010 March, 2011 May, 2011							
Resources Required: None		FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None		Source of Funds: None		Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00	

Goal 2 - Strategy 6 Pre and Post assessments

Timeline

Goal 2 - Strategy 7 Graduation rates			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): DAEP staff and Principals</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: October, 2010 December, 2010 January, 2011 February, 2011 April, 2011 May, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Students placed in the DAEP program will graduate with his/her class. Staff at the DAEP will ensure that students keep up with classwork that is assigned in the regular class so that the student will not get behind.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: Classroom assignments will be completed and turned in at least 80% of the time.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: None</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: None</p>	<p>Amount \$0.00 <hr/>\$0.00</p>

Goal 2 - Strategy 7	Graduation rates
Timeline	

Goal 3: Qualified and highly effective personnel will be recruited, developed and retained.

Correlates with:

State Objectives			
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum	6) School Personnel
8) School Environment	10) Technology		
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
1) Students will Reach High Standards	2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments
5) All Students will Graduate from High School			
Effective School Correlates			
1) Safe and Orderly Environment	2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission
5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task			
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
2) Ensure Planning is Incorporated	3) Use Effective Methods	4) Support Regular Education Program	5) Highly Qualified Teachers
6) Opportunities for Professional Development	7) Strategies for Parental Involvement		
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	3) Instructional	4) Professional Development	6) Parental Involvement
8) Include Teachers in Decisions	9) Identify and Assist with Student Difficulties		

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 3 - Strategy 1				HQ staff will be recruited and retained			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Asst. Supt. for Personnel		Brief Description: The district will strive to enhance the quality of its professional and non-professional workforce.		Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of all professional and non-professional staff will meet the Highly Qualified status as appropriate for his/her job assignment.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: Sept..15, 2009 November 13, 2009 December 15, 2009 May 24, 2010 August, 2010							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
Teachers		Number of FTE's: 15.00		Title Budget		\$30,000.00	
Parent Support		Fully Title Funded					
District Staff		Cost: \$30,000.00					
District Admin. Staff							
Central Office							
Campus Admin. Staff							

Goal 3 - Strategy 1															HQ staff will be recruited and retained														
Timeline																													
Activity		Person Responsible		A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation													
				u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u														
				g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l														
Signing bonuses will be given to HQ staff hired in high need areas such as Foreign Language, Science, Math, and Elementary Bilingual.		Asst. Supt. for Personnel			X		X	X		X		X	X			100% of HQ teachers will stay in Borger ISD for at least 2 years.													

Goal 3 - Strategy 2 Increase Budget Emphasis on Instruction			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Business Manager</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: October, 2009 April, 2010 Sept, 2010 April, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Demonstrate the effective and efficient use of taxpayers dollars and increase monies spent on the teaching and learning process.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: Spend at least 67% of budget on instructional initiatives.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: Teachers District Admin. Staff Central Office Campus Admin. Staff</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: General Budget</p>	<p>Amount \$1,200,000.00 <hr/>\$1,200,000.00</p>

Goal 3 - Strategy 2															Increase Budget Emphasis on Instruction														
Timeline																													
Activity		Person Responsible		A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation													
				u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u														
				g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l														
Increase money spent on the teaching and learning process.		Business Manager				X							X			Reach 67% of budget on instructional issues.													

Goal 3 - Strategy 3 Counselors will use DMAC for 4 year plans			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Counselors Leader Progress Report Dates: January 2011 May 2011	Brief Description: BHS Counselors will use the DMAC software to put 4 year plans in to place. This will ensure consistency and efficiency for CTE students in special populations as well as other populations.	Evaluation Benchmark: Be able to pull 4 year plan for any student 100% of the time.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 3 - Strategy 3	Counselors will use DMAC for 4 year plans
Timeline	

Goal 4: Parents will make Borger ISD the district of choice for their children.

Correlates with:

State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	4) Curriculum	5) Prepare Students	6) School Personnel
7) Student Performance			
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
1) Students will Reach High Standards	2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments
5) All Students will Graduate from High School			
Effective School Correlates			
1) Safe and Orderly Environment	2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission
7) Home-School Relations			
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
4) Support Regular Education Program	5) Highly Qualified Teachers		
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
3) Instructional	4) Professional Development	5) Professional Staff	6) Parental Involvement
7) Student Transition to Elementary Programs	8) Include Teachers in Decisions	9) Identify and Assist with Student Difficulties	

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 4 - Strategy 1				Improve public confidence			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s):		Brief Description:		Evaluation Benchmark:			
Supt., Asst. Supt., Principals		Reduce the number of out of district transfers.		Out of district transfers will be reduced by 20%			
Leader Progress Report Dates:							
Aug., 2009							
Sept., 2009							
Oct., 2009							
Nov., 2009							
Dec., 2009							
Jan., 2010							
Feb., 2010							
March, 2010							
April, 2010							
May, 2010							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
District Admin. Staff		Number of FTE's: 0.25		Title Budget		\$2,500.00	
Campus Admin. Staff		Partially Title Funded					
		Cost: \$2,500.00					

Goal 4 - Strategy 1		Improve public confidence												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	a	u	l
Provide ongoing staff development with follow-up monitoring and support to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified	Asst. Supt.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Professional development records from Region 16 and other sources.

Goal 4 - Strategy 2 Encourage paraprofessionals to become teachers			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Asst. Supt. Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2009 January , 2010	Brief Description: Provide release time to enable paraprofessionals to seek certification.	Evaluation Benchmark: 1- 2 paraprofessionals enrolled in college coursework that will result in teacher certification.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 4 - Strategy 2 Encourage paraprofessionals to become teachers														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Provide information to paraprofessionals about the Aide Exemption program. This program allows teacher's aides to receive a tuition exemption after working for 1 school year as an aide.	Asst. Supt. For Personnel	X				X					X			2-3 teacher's aides will take advantage of the Aide Exemption program.

Goal 4 - Strategy 3				Tuition waiver for paraprofessionals			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Asst. Supt Personnel		Brief Description: Inform paraprofessionals about the college tuition waiver program for employees who have worked for a full school year.		Evaluation Benchmark: Provide information to 100% of paraprofessionals working toward a college degree.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: April, 2009 May, 2010							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
Staff		Number of FTE's: None		None		\$0.00	
		None				\$0.00	
		Cost: None					

Goal 4 - Strategy 3		Tuition waiver for paraprofessionals												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Provide up to date and appropriate forms to district staff to apply for the tuition waiver.	Asst. Supt. For Personnel									X	X			District staff will take advantage of tuition waiver opportunity.

Goal 4 - Strategy 4 Reduce Out of District Transfers			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Superintendent	Brief Description: BISD will decrease the number of out of district transfers.	Evaluation Benchmark: Create confidence in such a way that students will continue school career in BISD.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2009 January, 2010 May, 2010			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
District Staff	Number of FTE's: None	None	\$0.00
Campus Admin. Staff	None Cost: None		<hr/> \$0.00

Goal 4 - Strategy 4		Reduce Out of District Transfers												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	r	a	y	n
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Provide a survey to ascertain areas of improvement.	District Administrators						X							Compile survey results and implement plan to address weaknesses.

Goal 5: Borger ISD will create and maintain a strong, positive district culture making Borger ISD a school district of choice for educational professionals.

Correlates with:

State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	2) Student Potential	3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum
5) Prepare Students	6) School Personnel	7) Student Performance	8) School Environment
10) Technology			
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments	5) All Students will Graduate from High School
Effective School Correlates			
1) Safe and Orderly Environment	2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission
5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task	7) Home-School Relations		
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
2) Ensure Planning is Incorporated	3) Use Effective Methods	4) Support Regular Education Program	5) Highly Qualified Teachers
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	2) Student Opportunities	3) Instructional	4) Professional Development
5) Professional Staff	6) Parental Involvement	7) Student Transition to Elementary Programs	8) Include Teachers in Decisions
9) Identify and Assist with Student Difficulties	10) Federal, State, and Local Programs		

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 5 - Strategy 1 Promote positive culture			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Asst. Supt. and Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2009 May, 2010 December, 2010 May, 2011	Brief Description: Borger ISD will create and maintain a strong, positive district culture making our district a district of choice for educational professionals.	Evaluation Benchmark: Increase the number of applicants to the district by 15% over the previous year.	
Resources Required: Transportation Dept. District Admin. Staff Computers Campus Admin. Staff	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None Not Specified Cost: \$5,000.00	Source of Funds: District Budget	Amount <hr/> \$5,000.00 <hr/> \$5,000.00

Goal 5 - Strategy 1 Promote positive culture														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Technology Application teachers will accommodate students in lab or classroom situations to teach computer skills to students throughout the school year.	Principals					X					X			Students will be proficient with keyboarding skills and in using technology to complete tasks.
Recruit highly qualified applicants at job fairs and local universities.	Linda Rotramel								X	X	X	X	X	Fill all open positions with highly qualified staff. Fill high need positions to 100%.

Goal 5 - Strategy 2				Provide professional development			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Technology Director		Brief Description: Professional staff on all campuses will participate in training in using software such as Blackboard that will provide opportunities to complete workshops online.		Evaluation Benchmark: 90% of all professional staff will participate in Blackboard 101 training through Region 16.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: November, 2009 January, 2010 May, 2010							
<i>NEW INITIATIVE</i>							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
Teachers		Number of FTE's: None		District Budget		\$1,000.00	
Staff		None					
District Staff		Cost: None					
District Admin. Staff							
Contract Service							
Campus Admin. Staff							

Goal 5 - Strategy 2 Provide professional development														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Successfully provide the acquisition of technology skills through district developed on-line courses.	Instructional Technology				X		X				X			Professional staff will be able to complete workshop options offered via Blackboard or similar software.

Goal 5 - Strategy 3 Provide Trainer of Trainers			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Technology Director	Brief Description: Technology staff will attend TOT for Blackboard. This will allow Borger ISD the opportunity to offer our own professional development online.	Evaluation Benchmark: Provide professional development courses via Blackboard this school year so that 90% of all staff are proficient in basic technology skills.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: September, 2009 January, 2010 May, 2010			
<i>NEW INITIATIVE</i>			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: 2.00	Technology Budget	\$80,000.00
Staff	None	Title Budget	\$5,000.00
District Staff	Cost: \$80,000.00		<hr/> \$85,000.00
District Admin. Staff			
Contract Service			
Central Office			

Goal 5 - Strategy 3		Provide Trainer of Trainers												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Develop and provide professional development online for staff and/or students this school year.	Technology Director						X					X		Teachers or students will be able to take advantage of a district developed online course.

Goal 6: Facility assessments will be completed and plans will be made to repair, renovate or replace existing structures in a timely manner thus enabling the district to provide safe, clean, modern and well-equipped facilities for all children..

Correlates with:

State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	2) Student Potential	3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum
5) Prepare Students	7) Student Performance	8) School Environment	9) Instructional Techniques
10) Technology			
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
1) Students will Reach High Standards	2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments
5) All Students will Graduate from High School			
Effective School Correlates			
1) Safe and Orderly Environment	2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task
7) Home-School Relations			
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
2) Ensure Planning is Incorporated	3) Use Effective Methods	5) Highly Qualified Teachers	6) Opportunities for Professional Development
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
2) Student Opportunities	3) Instructional	4) Professional Development	7) Student Transition to Elementary Programs
8) Include Teachers in Decisions	10) Federal, State, and Local Programs		

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 6 - Strategy 1				All buildings will be well-equipped			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Superintendent		Brief Description: New facilities will be completed and repairs, renovations and the replacement of existing structures will be brought up to code standards.		Evaluation Benchmark: New structures will meet the required points to be considered a green building. All existing structures will meet codes.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: Jan., 2010 June 2010							
<i>NEW INITIATIVE</i>							
Resources Required:		FTE's Required:		Source of Funds:		Amount	
Outside Consultant		Number of FTE's: None		Local Revenue		\$8,000,000.00	
District Staff		Bonds				\$8,000,000.00	
District Admin. Staff		Cost: \$8,000,000.00					
Contract Service							

Goal 6 - Strategy 1															All buildings will be well-equipped														
Timeline																													
Activity		Person Responsible		A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation													
				u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u														
				g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l														
Build 2 new elementary campuses with a LEED certification. LEED stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design.		Superintendent							X					X		Obtain LEED certification with 100% clarity.													

Goal 7: Borger ISD will increase the number of parents involved with their children in the educational process.

Correlates with:

State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	2) Student Potential	3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum
5) Prepare Students	7) Student Performance	8) School Environment	10) Technology
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
1) Students will Reach High Standards	2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments
5) All Students will Graduate from High School			
Effective School Correlates			
2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission	7) Home-School Relations
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
4) Support Regular Education Program	5) Highly Qualified Teachers	6) Opportunities for Professional Development	7) Strategies for Parental Involvement
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	2) Student Opportunities	3) Instructional	4) Professional Development
5) Professional Staff	6) Parental Involvement	9) Identify and Assist with Student Difficulties	10) Federal, State, and Local Programs

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 7 - Strategy 1 Parents and staff share responsibility			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): VIP Coordinator	Brief Description: Parents will be trained to be efficient volunteers at each campus.	Evaluation Benchmark: Volunteers will sign-in at each campus and provide a needed service for that campus 100%of the time he/she is there.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2009 May, 2010			
<i>NEW INITIATIVE</i>			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: 2.50	District Budget	\$50,000.00
Staff	Not Specified		\$50,000.00
District Admin. Staff	Cost: \$50,000.00		
Campus Admin. Staff			

Goal 7 - Strategy 1															Parents and staff share responsibility															
Timeline																														
Activity		Person Responsible		A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation														
				u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u															
				g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l															
Work with each grade level or content area to develop a clear understanding of the curriculum calendar		Campus Administrators										X					All staff familiar with the curriculum for all levels													

Goal 7 - Strategy 2 Analyze programs and materials			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals	Brief Description: All programs and materials will be evaluated to ensure compatibility with the C-Scope Curriculum.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of materials purchased will be compatible with district's curriculum.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: March, 2010 May, 2010 August, 2010 April, 2011			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: None	General Budget	\$50,000.00
Campus Admin. Staff	None Cost: \$50,000.00		\$50,000.00

Goal 7 - Strategy 2		Analyze programs and materials												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Each core content area will analyze materials that are ordered to ensure compatibility with the balanced curriculum.	Principals								X		X			March, 2011 May, 2011

Goal 8: A well-balanced and appropriate curriculum will be provided so that all students will be encouraged and challenged to meet their full educational potential.

Correlates with:

State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
2) Student Potential	3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum	5) Prepare Students
6) School Personnel	7) Student Performance	8) School Environment	9) Instructional Techniques
10) Technology			
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
1) Students will Reach High Standards	2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	4) Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments
5) All Students will Graduate from High School			
Effective School Correlates			
2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission	5) Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
3) Use Effective Methods	4) Support Regular Education Program	5) Highly Qualified Teachers	6) Opportunities for Professional Development
7) Strategies for Parental Involvement	8) Coordinate and Integrate Services and Programs		
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	3) Instructional	4) Professional Development	5) Professional Staff
6) Parental Involvement	8) Include Teachers in Decisions	10) Federal, State, and Local Programs	

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 8 - Strategy 1		Well-Balanced curriculum	
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Asst. Supt. for Pers. and Curr.	Brief Description: A well-balanced curriculum will be implemented for grades K-12 in English Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% core curriculum teachers will implement instructional focus documents sequence.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: October 3, 2009 November 13, 2009 January 16, 2010 February 27, 2010 April 17, 2010 May 30, 2010			
<i>NEW INITIATIVE</i>			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Transportation Dept.	Number of FTE's: 12.00	District Budget	\$1,500.00
Time	Fully Title Funded	Title Budget	\$6,000.00
Teachers	Cost: \$6,000.00		<hr/> \$7,500.00
Staff			
Outside Consultant			
District Admin. Staff			
Contract Service			
Central Office			
Campus Admin. Staff			

Goal 8 - Strategy 1		Well-Balanced curriculum												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	r	a	y	n
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Attend conferences to keep up with the changes in the district's curriculum.	Asst. Supt. For Personnel				X							X		At least 2 administrators will attend the conference.
Provide staff development that emphasizes conceptual teaching, differentiated instruction, and higher order thinking skills.	Asst. Supt./Principals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		Stetson & Associates - Differentiated Instruction Data Walks Wavelength

Goal 8 - Strategy 2		Guidance lessons for students	
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Campus Counselors	Brief Description: Age appropriate guidance lessons will address conflict resolution and suicide prevention for students.	Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of students will have information as to who to contact for further information regarding suicide prevention or conflict resolution.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: October, 2010 December, 2010 March, 2011 May, 2011 August, 2011			
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 8 - Strategy 2 Guidance lessons for students

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 3 Bullying			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Principals</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2010 October, 2010 December, 2010 March, 2011 May, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Borger ISD has established an anonymous hotline for students to report bullying.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of students will have the information regarding the process to report any incidence of bullying.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: None</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: None</p>	<p>Amount \$0.00 <hr/>\$0.00</p>

Goal 8 - Strategy 3

Bullying

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 4 Dating violence			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Teachers, Counselors</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2010 December, 2010 May, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Teachers will be given information regarding dating violence. Teachers will know what signs to look for if a student is being abused. Teachers will refer the student to the campus counselor for further investigation.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of all secondary teachers will have information regarding dating violence.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: None</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: None</p>	<p>Amount</p> <p style="border-top: 1px solid black;">\$0.00</p> <p>\$0.00</p>

Goal 8 - Strategy 4 Dating violence

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 5				Dyslexia treatment program			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Principals		Brief Description: Students with dyslexia will have access to the Lexia or the Voyager program for remediation.		Evaluation Benchmark: Students will gain 1.5 years of growth in 1 school year using these programs.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2010 May, 2011 August, 2011							
Resources Required: None		FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None		Source of Funds: None		Amount	
						\$0.00	
						\$0.00	

Goal 8 - Strategy 5 Dyslexia treatment program

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 6				Integration of technology			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Principals		Brief Description: Technology will be integrated into instruction with the use of Study Island, Smart Board use, calculators and Blackboard programs.			Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of all students will be exposed to technology through classroom use of Smart Boards, calculators, Study Island or Blackboard.		
Leader Progress Report Dates: September, 2010 December, 2010 March, 2011 May, 2011							
Resources Required: None		FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None		Source of Funds: None		Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00	

Goal 8 - Strategy 6 Integration of technology

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 7 Staff Development			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Principals</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: September, 2010 December, 2010 March, 2011 May, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Campuses will conduct staff development regarding conflict resolution, classroom management, district discipline policy, Student Code of Conduct, Special Education and Gifted and Talented programs.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: 100% of staff will be familiar with special programs, discipline expectations and classroom management tenets.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: None</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: None</p>	<p>Amount</p> <p style="border-top: 1px solid black;">\$0.00</p> <p>\$0.00</p>

Goal 8 - Strategy 7 Staff Development

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 8				Gifted and Talented program			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>							
Leader(s): Principals		Brief Description: Consider a Future Problem Solving class at Borger High School. Begin the planning for such a program.		Evaluation Benchmark: Implement the planning stages of the Future Problem Solving program at the high school level.			
Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2010 May, 2011 August, 2011							
Resources Required: None		FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None		Source of Funds: None		Amount	
						\$0.00	
						\$0.00	

Goal 8 - Strategy 8 Gifted and Talented program

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 9		Physics Night	
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Teachers</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2010 May, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Students will demonstrate the application of physics with a special project. These projects will be demonstrated at a meeting that is open to the public.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: Increase the number of students participating in Physics Night by 10%.</p>	
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
None	Number of FTE's: None	None	\$0.00
	None		\$0.00
	Cost: None		

Goal 8 - Strategy 9 Physics Night

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 10 Increased enrollment in Pre-Ap and AP classes			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: May, 2011	Brief Description: The Pre-Ap and AP classes will challenge students to participate in more challenging classes and to take the appropriate test for the course.	Evaluation Benchmark: Increase number of students taking the AP tests by 10%.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 8 - Strategy 10 Increased enrollment in Pre-Ap and AP classes

Timeline

Goal 8 - Strategy 11 Pregnancy Related Services			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
<p>Leader(s): Principals</p> <p>Leader Progress Report Dates: December, 2010 May, 2011</p>	<p>Brief Description: Teen parents will be encouraged to participate in the Teen Parenting classes that are offered and will avail themselves of the counseling opportunities that are available.</p>	<p>Evaluation Benchmark: Teen parents will be aware of community resources available 90% of the time.</p>	
<p>Resources Required: None</p>	<p>FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None</p>	<p>Source of Funds: None</p>	<p>Amount</p> <hr/> <p>\$0.00 \$0.00</p>

Goal 8 - Strategy 11 Pregnancy Related Services

Timeline

Goal 9: By the end of the 2010-2011, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.

Correlates with:

Hot Topics			
1) SCE Program Purpose			
State Goals			
1) Performance - English	2) Performance - Mathematics	3) Performance - Science	4) Performance - Social Studies
State Objectives			
3) Dropout Prevention	4) Curriculum	5) Prepare Students	6) School Personnel
9) Instructional Techniques	10) Technology		
NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators			
2) LEP will become Proficient in English	3) Highly Qualified Staff	5) All Students will Graduate from High School	
Effective School Correlates			
2) Climate of High Expectations for Success	3) Instructional Leadership	4) Clear and Focused Mission	
Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools			
2) Ensure Planning is Incorporated	3) Use Effective Methods	4) Support Regular Education Program	5) Highly Qualified Teachers
6) Opportunities for Professional Development			
Title I - Schoolwide Programs			
1) Needs Assessment	3) Instructional	4) Professional Development	5) Professional Staff
8) Include Teachers in Decisions	9) Identify and Assist with Student Difficulties	10) Federal, State, and Local Programs	

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 9 - Strategy 1 Highly Qualified Staff			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Asst. Supt. for Personnel	Brief Description: All staff will be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.	Evaluation Benchmark: Personnel files, highly qualified worksheets, principal attestations, NCLB report	
Leader Progress Report Dates: September 15, 2010 February 1, 2011			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
District Staff	Number of FTE's: 2.00	District Budget	\$50,000.00
District Admin. Staff	None	Title Budget	\$25,000.00
Central Office	Cost: \$500.00		<hr/>
Campus Admin. Staff			\$75,000.00

Goal 9 - Strategy 1		Highly Qualified Staff												
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Conduct recruitment activities to ensure highly qualified personnel in all positions. Activities will include participating in job fairs, posting vacancies in multiple sites/organizations and maintaining active webpage.	Supt., Asst. Supt.		X		X			X			X			Fill 100% of district positions with Highly Qualified teachers.
Establish an effective teacher mentoring system in order to retain highly qualified staff.	Asst. Supt.		X			X					X			Maintain mentor conference logs for 100% of new teacher activities. Assign 100% of new teachers to mentor.
Analyze data from all teachers' certifications, testing, staff development, and service records to ensure that all meet highly qualified status.	Asst. Supt., Campus Principals	X			X								X	100% HQ on NCLB report. Personnel files Teacher interviews
Assist teachers in maintaining or attaining certification through alternative programs, GT certification, ESL certification, coursework, and TExES testing in order to assure all staff is highly qualified.	Asst. Supt, Ex. Dir. Elem. Instr. Principals	X												Reimburse 100% of cost of ESL test and certification. Personnel files # of teachers in ACP programs
Analyze data from paraprofessionals' files to ensure all instructional aides are highly qualified.	Asst. Supt., Campus Principals	X			X									100% on NCLB report Personnel files
Require all new instructional aides to complete PDA training.	Asst. Supt., Campus Principals										X			Certificates of attendance for 100% of aides.

Goal 9 - Strategy 1 Highly Qualified Staff														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
All new instructional aides will be required to be proficient on the Skills Profiler no later than six weeks after the hire date or have 48 college hours or degree.	Asst. Supt., Campus Principals	X	X											60% or higher on Skills Profiler 48 college hours Associate's Degree Bachelor's Degree
Encourage teachers to attain ESL/GT certification.	Asst. Supt., Exec. Dir. Elem.	X						X						100% teachers ESL certified 6 hours of GT training
Professional Development is provided for all teachers in the district.	Supt., Campus Principals	X						X						100% of staff will maintain file of certificates of completion for all professional development.
All teachers will have the opportunity to attend Staff Development throughout the year that will assist them in becoming HQ with special consideration given to those who are not HQ.	Supt., Campus Principals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100% Certificates of attendance Audit trails or travel receipts for travel expenses.

Goal 10: All identified homeless students will receive appropriate services according to McKinney-Vento. These students will be served on a high priority basis.

Correlates with:

Hot Topics		
1) SCE Program Purpose	2) State Compensatory Education	
State Objectives		
1) Partnering Parents with Educators	2) Student Potential	3) Dropout Prevention

Indicator: TAKS Reading

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
African American	85 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 86 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Hispanic	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 93.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	75 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78 %	2011
LEP	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Male	87 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.6 %	2011
Female	90 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 91 %	2011
At Risk	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Math

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	71 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 74.8 %	2011
African American	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Hispanic	61 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 66.8 %	2011
White	77 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 79.6 %	2011
Special Ed.	59 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 65.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011
Male	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
Female	73 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 76.4 %	2011
At Risk	55 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 62 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Writing

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
African American	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	94 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95 %	2011
Hispanic	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
White	93 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 94.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	83 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 86.2 %	2011
LEP	88 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 90.2 %	2011
Male	91 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 92.6 %	2011
Female	96 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 96.6 %	2011
At Risk	88 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 88.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Science

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	72 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 75.6 %	2011
African American	62 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 67.6 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
Hispanic	57 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 63.6 %	2011
White	80 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 82 %	2011
Special Ed.	39 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 49.2 %	2011
LEP	24 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 37.2 %	2011
Male	76 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 78.8 %	2011
Female	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
At Risk	58 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 64.4 %	2011

Indicator: TAKS Social Studies

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
African American	88 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 89.4 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	85 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87 %	2011
Hispanic	84 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.2 %	2011
White	97 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 97.4 %	2011
Special Ed.	69 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 73.2 %	2011
LEP	65 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 70 %	2011
Male	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
Female	93 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 93.8 %	2011
At Risk	89 %	2010	≥ 97 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011

Indicator: Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM STATE OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
African American	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Hispanic	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
White	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Special Ed.	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
LEP	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Male	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
Female	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011
At Risk	0 %	2010	≤ 0 %	2015-16	≤ 0 %	2011

Indicator: Completion: Graduated

Grade: All

Group	Current Performance ACCOUNTABILITY DATA		Desired Performance LONG TERM OBJECTIVES		Desired Performance ANNUAL OBJECTIVES	
	Rate	Year	Rate	Year	Rate	Year
All Students	87.4 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 88.9 %	2011
Economically Disadvantaged	95 %	2010	≥ 99 %	2015-16	≥ 95.8 %	2011
Hispanic	71.9 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.5 %	2011
White	95.3 %	2010	≥ 100 %	2015-16	≥ 96.2 %	2011
Special Ed.	84.6 %	2010	≥ 90 %	2015-16	≥ 85.7 %	2011
LEP	71.4 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 74.1 %	2011
Male	89.5 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 90.6 %	2011
Female	85.7 %	2010	≥ 95 %	2015-16	≥ 87.6 %	2011
At Risk	70.5 %	2010	≥ 85 %	2015-16	≥ 73.4 %	2011

Strategies

Goal 10 - Strategy 1 Migrant students			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Principals Leader Progress Report Dates: September 2010 May 2011	Brief Description: District contact will provide campus principals, appropriate campus staff and parents the Priority for Services criteria and updated NGS Priority for Services reports. Priority for Services criteria will be given at the beginning of the school year.	Evaluation Benchmark: Student movement forms and student information sheets provided to principals at the beginning of the year. 100% of the time.	
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 10 - Strategy 1 Migrant students

Timeline

Goal 10 - Strategy 2 Migrant students			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Parent Liaison	Brief Description: Migrant staff will complete COE's and update migrant student list for PEIMS data as migrant students enter.	Evaluation Benchmark: 0% fatal errors on PEIMS migrant data report.	
Leader Progress Report Dates: October 2010 June 2011			
Resources Required: None	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: None	Amount \$0.00 <hr/> \$0.00

Goal 10 - Strategy 2 Migrant students

Timeline

Goal 10 - Strategy 3 Migrant students			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Parent Liaison Leader Progress Report Dates: August, 2010 September, 2010 January, 2011 May, 2011	Brief Description: Staff will be trained annually in identification and recruitment of migrant students.	Evaluation Benchmark: Campus secretaries will be able to answer 100% of questions asked regarding migrant student enrollment.	
Resources Required: Supplies	FTE's Required: Number of FTE's: None None Cost: None	Source of Funds: Title Budget	Amount \$200.00 <hr/> \$200.00

Goal 10 - Strategy 3 Migrant students														
Timeline														
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	p	a	u	u	
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l	
Train new incoming staff as needed.	Parent Liaison	X					X							New staff is familiar with procedures regarding migrant students.

Goal 10 - Strategy 4 Migrant students			
<i>There are no Indicators/Objectives that support this Strategy</i>			
Leader(s): Parent Liaison	Brief Description: Migrant staff will visit homes during Parent/Teacher conferences each school year.	Evaluation Benchmark: Identify 100% of migrant students whose homes should be visited	
Leader Progress Report Dates: October, 2010 April, 2011			
Resources Required:	FTE's Required:	Source of Funds:	Amount
Teachers	Number of FTE's: None	Title Budget	\$1,000.00
Supplies	Partially Title Funded	General Budget	\$5,000.00
Parent Support	Cost: None		<hr/> \$6,000.00
Computers			
Campus Admin. Staff			

Goal 10 - Strategy 4															Migrant students	
Timeline																
Activity	Person Responsible	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Evaluation		
		u	e	c	o	e	a	e	a	r	a	u	u			
		g	p	t	v	c	n	b	r	r	y	n	l			
Extended day tutoring in core content areas.	Classroom teacher				X		X			X				Progress on skills		

APPENDIX I

SHARED DECISION MAKING COMMITTEE

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND DEVELOPMENT LOG

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

2010-11 Shared Decision Making Committee				
Position	Name	Subject/Grade	Contact Information	Signature
Classroom Teacher	Peggy Harris	Pre-K	peggy.harris@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Katie Francis	Kindergarten	katie.francis@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Bonnie Savage	1st grade	bonnie.savage@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Marcy McDonald	Crockett	marcy.mcdonald@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Janet Olin	2nd grade	janet.olin@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Cyndi Newell	4th grade	cyndi.newell@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Cathy McKinney	BMS	cathy.mckinney@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Paula Coleman	BMS	paula.coleman@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Corey Guest	Science Teacher	corey.guest@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Trilby Hutchison	HS Math	trilby.hutchison@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Tracy Sherman	English	tracy.sherman@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Tracy Howard	HS Science	tracy.howard@borgerisd.net	
Classroom Teacher	Priscilla Butler	BIS Special Ed	priscilla.butler@borgerisd.net	
Parent	Tanya Clement		clem55@aol.com	
Business Representative	Jeff Hutchison		teachingpastor@hotmail.com	
Community Representative	Mike Webb		mikewebb@cableone.net	
District Level Professional	Chance Welch		chance.welch@borgerisd.net	
District Level Professional	De' Lila Holder		delila.holder@borgerisd.net	
District Level Professional	Patti Brown		patti.brown@borgerisd.net	

Ex-officio member	Linda Rotramel	linda.rotramel@borgerisd.net
Non-Classroom Professional Staff	Ken Rosser	ken.rosser@borgerisd.net

District Improvement Plan Plan Implementation and Development Log	
Date	Purpose
Monday, November 09, 2009	District Site-Based meeting to evaluate previous year's plan. Training conducted regarding policies/procedures, roles and responsibilities, etc.
Monday, November 09, 2009	District Site-Based meeting to evaluate previous year's plan. Training conducted regarding policies/procedures, roles and responsibilities, etc.
Monday, November 09, 2009	Review District Site Based Plan and implement 2009-2010 plan.
Thursday, February 11, 2010	Hold public meeting to review school report card.
Thursday, February 11, 2010	Hold public meeting to review school report card.
Monday, November 08, 2010	District Site-Based meeting to evaluate previous year's plan. Training conducted regarding policies/procedures, roles and responsibilities, etc.
Monday, November 08, 2010	Review District Site Based Plan and implement 2010-2011 plan.
Monday, November 08, 2010	District Site-Based meeting to evaluate previous year's plan. Training conducted regarding policies/procedures, roles and responsibilities, etc.
Thursday, November 11, 2010	Review District Site Based Plan and implement 2010-2011 plan.
Thursday, November 11, 2010	Review and approve District Improvement Plan.

Needs Assessment

Summative Evaluation for 2009-10

Borger ISD has reviewed the 2008-2009 plan. The site-based committee is proud of the goals that were accomplished during the 2008-2009 school year. It will be our intent to maintain the goals that were met and strive to meet and/or exceed the goals that were not met.

Objective Accomplishments

TAKS Reading - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	94%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	94.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	88%

Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	92%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	92.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	85%

Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	90%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	91%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	80%

Partial Progress toward the Objective

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	91%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	91.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	80%

Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	96%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	96.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	93%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	64%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	69.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	75%
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	75%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	78%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	62%
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS English/Lang. Arts - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	94%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	94.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	92%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	92.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	90%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	91%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	91%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	91.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	96%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	96.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	64%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	69.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	75%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	78%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Math - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	82%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	83.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	71%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	81%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	82.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	61%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	75%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	78%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	62%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	75%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	78%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	61%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	86%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	86.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	77%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	40%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	50%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	59%
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	53%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	60.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	88%
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Writing - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	99%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	99.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	94%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10 99%
 Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 99.2%
 Actual Performance for 2010-11 95%
Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10 99%
 Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 99.2%
 Actual Performance for 2010-11 94%
Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10 99%
 Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 99.2%
 Actual Performance for 2010-11 95%
Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10 99%
 Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 99.2%
 Actual Performance for 2010-11 93%
Accomplished the Objectives

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Science - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10 78%
 Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 80.4%
 Actual Performance for 2010-11 72%
Partial Progress toward the Objective

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10 65%
 Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 70%
 Actual Performance for 2010-11 62%
Partial Progress toward the Objective

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	64%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	69.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	57%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	64%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	69.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	57%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	85%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	86%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	80%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Social Studies - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	98%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	98.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	93%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	99%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	99.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	88%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	94.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	85%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	94.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	84%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	99%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	99.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	97%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8) - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	0%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	0%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	0%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	0%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	0%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Completion: Graduated - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	94.8%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	95.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	87.4%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	66.7%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	70.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	97.5%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	98%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	95%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	89.5%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	91.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	71.9%
<i>Partial Progress toward the Objective</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	97.7%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	98.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	95.3%
<i>Accomplished the Objectives</i>	


Explanation of Performance

Needs Assessment Focus

Indicators Rated		Priority Rating	Satisfaction Rating
1	(AEIS) Percent of high performing students and the Comparable Improvement quartile for math	High	Low
2	(AEIS) Percent of 8th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS SCIENCE	High	Low
3	(AEIS) Percent of 5th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS MATH (Spanish version)	High	Low
4	(AEIS) Percent of 6th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS READING (Spanish version)	High	Low
5	(AEIS) Percent of 6th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS MATH (Spanish version)	High	Low
6	(AEIS) Percent of 4th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS WRITING (Spanish version)	High	Low
7	Percent of students passing BIOLOGY EOC Examination	High	Low
8	Percent of students passing ALGEBRA I EOC Examination	High	Low
9	Percent of students MASTERING TAAS/TAKS MATH	High	Low
10	Annual Student RETENTION RATES	High	Low
11	Percent passing REPORT CARD GRADES FOR MATH	High	Low
12	Percent passing REPORT CARD GRADES FOR SCIENCE	High	Low
13	Percent of students ENROLLED IN ADVANCED MATH AND SCIENCE	High	Low
14	Percent of students ENROLLED IN CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY COURSES	High	Low
15	DISCIPLINE REFERRAL RATES	High	Low
16	(AEIS) Mean Scores of SAT/ACT	Med	Low
17	(AEIS) Percent of graduates scoring high enough on TAAS/TAKS-EXIT to predict success on TASP	High	Med
18	(AEIS) Percent of graduates completing RECOMMENDED HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS	High	Med
19	(AEIS) Percent of 5th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS READING (Spanish version)	High	Med

20	(AEIS) Percent of High School students completing and receiving credit for at least one ADVANCED ACADEMIC COURSE	High	Med
21	(AEIS) Percent of High School students enrolled in ADVANCED ACADEMIC COURSES	High	Med
22	Percent of examinees scoring 3 or higher on ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS	High	Med
23	Percent of students passing ENGLISH II EOC Examination	High	Med
24	Percent of students demonstrating good CITIZENSHIP SKILLS	High	Med
25	Percent of students demonstrating appropriate SELF-DISCIPLINE	High	Med
26	Percent of students PARTICIPATING IN CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	High	Med
27	(AEIS) Percent of High School graduates scoring at or above state criteria on SAT/ACT	Med	Med
28	Percent of High School students taking ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS	Med	Med
29	Percent of total ADVANCED PLACEMENT EXAMS with scores of 3 or higher	Med	Med
30	Percent of students demonstrating ability to WORK PRODUCTIVELY IN A WORK TEAM	Med	Med
31	Percent of students PARTICIPATING IN CAMPUS RECYCLING PROJECTS	Med	Med
32	Percent of students passing UNITED STATES HISTORY EOC Examination	High	High
33	Percent of students MASTERING TAAS/TAKS READING	High	High
34	Percent of students MASTERING TAAS/TAKS WRITING	High	High
35	Percent of students demonstrating master of selected TECHNOLOGICAL SKILLS	High	High
36	Percent of students demonstrating skills for creating and delivering a multi-media presentation	High	High
37	(AEIS) Percent of high performing students and the Comparable Improvement quartile for reading	Med	High
38	(AEIS) Percent of 8th grade students passing TAAS/TAKS SOCIAL STUDIES	Med	High
39	Percent of students able to validly respond in the world view of another culture given hypothetical situations	Med	High

Process Chart



- Curriculum Design:** Borger ISD is using the C-Scope curriculum. C-Scope is based on conceptual teaching strategies. The purpose of this curriculum is to ensure that vertical alignment is achieved 12-K.
- Resources:** Resources to C-Scope will be programs already in place in the district such as Reading Recovery, Read 180, MLS Lab and textbooks, etc.
The Inova system will be used to disaggregate data for use in developing differentiated instruction for students so that each and every student will add value to his/her education each school year.
- Policies and Procedures:** Policies and procedures will support the implementation and use of the C-Scope Curriculum throughout the district.
- Staff and Staff Development:** Staff development will be geared to conceptual teaching strategies and Bloom's Taxonomy using higher order thinking as prompted in C-Scope. The implementation of higher order thinking skills will be tracked through the use of Walk-throughs for each campus.
- Measurement:** The Inova program will be implemented to group students for TAKS tutorials and overall TAKS score improvements.
Walk-throughs will be utilized in assessing staff development needs for each campus.
- Student Performance Indicator:** Borger ISD's student performance goal will be to attain the level of Recognized as a district.
- Instructional Methods:** Conceptual teaching strategies and higher order thinking skills with 12-K vertical alignment.
- Learning Environment:** The learning environment at Borger ISD will be from bell to bell using research-based instructional strategies. The classroom will be arranged so as to facilitate the learning expectations. Rules and

routines will support learning. The teaching will be on grade level with content as well as rigor. Well-developed routines show that the classroom is both a work environment and a friendly, welcoming environment. Exemplary student work will be current and on display.

Students: Students will be observed to determine if he/she is aware of the learning objective and is actively engaged in the learning process. Teachers and administrators have a clear, consistent, and shared understanding of what students are expected to know and to be able to do at various grade levels.

Parents, Community and Business: Persons who are significant in the lives of the student, including parents, siblings, peers, public audiences, and younger students, are positioned to observe, participate in, and benefit from student performances, as well as the products of those performances, and to affirm the significance and importance of the activity to be undertaken.

Summative Evaluation for year 2010-11

Borger ISD has reviewed the 2009-2010 plan. The site-based committee is proud of the goals that were accomplished during the 2008-2009 school year. It will be our intent to maintain the goals that were met and strive to meet and/or exceed the goals that were not met.

Objective Accomplishments

TAKS Reading - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	88%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	89.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	85%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	86%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	80%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	82%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	80%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	82%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	93.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	75%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	78%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	62%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	67.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10	87%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	88.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	90%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	91%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	80%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	82%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Math - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	71%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	74.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	61%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	66.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	62%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	67.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	61%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	66.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	77%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	79.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	59%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	65.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	88%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	88.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10	69%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	73.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	73%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	76.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	55%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	62%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Writing - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	94%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	95%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	95%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	95.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	94%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	95%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	95%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	95.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	94.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	83%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	86.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	88%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	90.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10	91%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	92.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	96%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	96.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	88%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	88.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Science - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	72%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	75.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	62%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	67.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	57%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	63.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	57%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	63.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	80%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	82%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	39%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	49.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	24%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	37.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10	76%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	78.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	69%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	73.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	58%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	64.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

TAKS Social Studies - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	93.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	88%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	89.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	85%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	87%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	84%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	85.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	97%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	97.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	69%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	73.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	65%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	70%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	93.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	93%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	93.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	89%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	90.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8) - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: African American

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10 0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11 NA
No Progress Rating Selected

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10 0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11 NA
No Progress Rating Selected

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10 0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11 NA
No Progress Rating Selected

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10 0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11 NA
No Progress Rating Selected

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10 0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11 NA
No Progress Rating Selected

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10 0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11 0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11 NA
No Progress Rating Selected

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	0%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	0%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Completion: Graduated - Grade: All Grades

Analysis Group: All Students

Actual Performance for 2009-10	87.4%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	88.9%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Economically Disadvantaged

Actual Performance for 2009-10	95%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	95.8%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Hispanic

Actual Performance for 2009-10	71.9%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	74.5%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: White

Actual Performance for 2009-10	95.3%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	96.2%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Special Ed.

Actual Performance for 2009-10	84.6%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	85.7%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: LEP

Actual Performance for 2009-10	71.4%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	74.1%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Male

Actual Performance for 2009-10	89.5%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	90.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: Female

Actual Performance for 2009-10	85.7%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	87.6%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

Analysis Group: At Risk

Actual Performance for 2009-10	70.5%
Projected Annual Objective for 2010-11	73.4%
Actual Performance for 2010-11	NA
<i>No Progress Rating Selected</i>	

Explanation of Performance

APPENDIX II

DETAILED GOAL DEFINITIONS

OTHER REFERENCE MATERIALS

Hot Topics

Hot Topic 1: SCE Program Purpose

Borger ISD provides compensatory education services which are supplemental to the regular education program for students identified as at risk of dropping out of school. Our school district has chosen to use its supplemental SCE funds to support the schoolwide program for upgrading the entire educational program.

Hot Topic 2: State Compensatory Education

Borger ISD identifies students as At-Risk who meet the following criteria:

1. Did not perform satisfactorily on Readiness test.
2. Failed 2 or more core subjects during a semester in preceding or current school year or is not maintaining a 70 in 2 or more subjects in the current semester.
3. Was not advanced from one grade to the next for one or more school years.
4. Did not perform satisfactorily on state assessment. Or has failed TAKS in prior year, and currently has passed; however, has not passed by the 110% rule.
5. Is pregnant or a parent.
6. Is/was in AEP (preceding or current year).
7. Is/was expelled in preceding or current school year.
8. Is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release.
9. Was previously reported to PEIMS as a drop-out.
10. Is an LEP student.
11. Is in custody or care of Dept. of Protective & Regulatory Services or has in current school year been referred to DPRS by school official, officer of juvenile court, or officer of the law.
12. Is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. 11302, and its amendments.
13. Resided in preceding or current year in residential placement facility in the district, including a foster group home.

State Goals

Goal 1: Performance - English

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

Goal 2: Performance - Mathematics

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

Goal 3: Performance - Science

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

Goal 4: Performance - Social Studies

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

State Objectives

Objective 1: Partnering Parents with Educators

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

Objective 2: Student Potential

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

Objective 3: Dropout Prevention

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

Objective 4: Curriculum

A well balanced and appropriate curriculum will be provided to all students.

Objective 5: Prepare Students

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

Objective 6: School Personnel

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

Objective 7: Student Performance

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

Objective 8: School Environment

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

Objective 9: Instructional Techniques

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

Objective 10: Technology

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

NCLB/ESEA Goals and Indicators

Goal 1: Students will Reach High Standards

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

1.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)

1.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each individual student group, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)

1.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

Goal 2: LEP will become Proficient in English

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

2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

2.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.

2.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

Goal 3: Highly Qualified Staff

By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the SEA).

3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34).

3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified (see criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Goal 4: Safe, Drug Free Learning Environments

All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Goal 5: All Students will Graduate from High School

All students will graduate from high school.

5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students in the aggregate and in each group who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma,

- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;

- calculated in the same manner as utilized in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school,

- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;

- calculated in the same manner as utilized in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

Effective School Correlates

Correlate 1: Safe and Orderly Environment

The First Generation: In the effective school, there is an orderly, purposeful, businesslike atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. The school climate is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

The Second Generation: In the first generation, the safe and orderly environment correlate was defined in terms of the absence of undesirable student behavior (e.g., students fighting). In the second generation, the concept of a school environment conducive to learning for all must move beyond the elimination of undesirable behavior. The second generation will place increased emphasis on the presence of certain desirable behaviors (e.g., cooperative team learning). These second generation schools will be places where students actually help one another.

Moving beyond simply the elimination of undesirable behavior will represent a significant challenge for many schools. For example, it is unlikely that a school's faculty could successfully teach its students to work together unless the adults in the school model collaborative behaviors in their own professional working relationships. Since schools as workplaces are characterized by their isolation, creating more collaborative/cooperative environments for both the adults and students will require substantial commitment and change in most schools.

First, teachers must learn the "technologies" of teamwork. Second, the school will have to create the "opportunity structures" for collaboration. Finally, the staff will have to nurture the belief that collaboration, which often requires more time initially, will assist the schools to be more effective and satisfying in the long run.

But schools will not be able to get students to work together cooperatively unless they have been taught to respect human diversity and appreciate democratic values. These student learnings will require a major and sustained commitment to multicultural education. Students and the adults who teach them will need to come to terms with the fact that the United States is no longer a nation with minorities. We are now a nation of minorities. This new reality is currently being resisted by many of our community and parent advocacy groups, as well as by some educators.

Correlate 2: Climate of High Expectations for Success

The First Generation: In the effective school, there is a climate of expectation in which the staff believe and demonstrate that all students can attain mastery of the essential school skills, and the staff also believe that they have the capability to help all students achieve that mastery.

The Second Generation: In the second generation, the emphasis placed on high expectations for success will be broadened significantly. In the first generation, expectations were described in terms of attitudes and beliefs that suggested how the teacher should behave in the teaching-learning situation. Those descriptions sought to tell teachers how they should initially deliver the lesson. High expectations meant, for example, that the teacher should evenly distribute questions asked among all students and should provide each student with an equal opportunity to participate in the learning process. Unfortunately, this "equalization of opportunity," though beneficial, proved to be insufficient to assure mastery for many learners. Teachers found themselves in the difficult position of having had high expectations and having acted upon them--yet some students still did not learn.

In the second generation, the teachers will anticipate this and they will develop a broader array of responses. For example, teachers will implement additional strategies, such as reteaching and regrouping, to assure that all students do achieve mastery. Implementing this expanded concept of high expectations will require the school as an organization to reflect high expectations. Most of the useful strategies will require the cooperation of the school as a whole; teachers cannot implement most of these strategies working alone in isolated classrooms.

High expectations for success will be judged, not only by the initial staff beliefs and behaviors, but also by the organization's response when some students do not learn. For example, if the teacher plans a lesson, delivers that lesson, assesses learning and finds that some students did not learn, and still goes on to the next lesson, then that teacher didn't expect the students to learn in the first place. If the school condones through silence that teacher's behavior, it apparently does not expect the students to learn, or the teacher to teach these students.

Several changes are called for in order to implement this expanded concept of high expectations successfully. First, teachers will have to come to recognize that high expectations for student success must be "launched" from a platform of teachers having high expectations for self. Then the school organization will have to be restructured to assure that teachers have access to more "tools" to help them achieve successful learning for all. Third, schools, as cultural organizations, must recognize that schools must be transformed from institutions designed for "instruction" to institutions designed to assure "learning."

Correlate 3: Instructional Leadership

The First Generation: In the effective school, the principal acts as an instructional leader and effectively and persistently communicates that mission to the staff, parents, and students. The principal understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program.

The Second Generation: In the first generation, the standards for instructional leadership focused primarily on the principal and the administrative staff of the school. In the second generation, instructional leadership will remain important; however, the concept will be broadened and leadership will be viewed as a dispersed concept that includes all adults, especially the teachers. This is in keeping with the teacher empowerment concept; it recognizes that a principal cannot be the only leader in a complex organization like a school. With the democratization of organizations, especially schools, the leadership function becomes one of creating a "community of shared values." The mission will remain critical because it will serve to give the community of shared values a shared sense of "magnetic north," an identification of what this school community cares most about. The role of the principal will be changed to that of "a leader of leaders," rather than a leader of followers. Specifically, the principal will have to develop his/her skills as coach, partner, and cheerleader. The broader concept of leadership recognizes that leadership is always delegated from the followership in any organization. It also recognizes what teachers have known for a long time and what good schools have capitalized on since the beginning of time: namely, expertise is generally distributed among many, not concentrated in a single person.

Correlate 4: Clear and Focused Mission

The First Generation: In the effective school, there is a clearly articulated school mission through which the staff shares an understanding of and commitment to the instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability. Staff accepts responsibility for students' learning of the school's essential curricular goals.

The Second Generation: In the first generation, the effective school mission emphasized teaching for learning for all. The two issues that surfaced were: "Did this really mean all students or just those with whom the schools had a history of reasonable success?" When it became clear that this mission was inclusive of all students, especially the children of the poor (minority and nonminority), the second issue surfaced. It centered itself around the question: "Learn what?" Partially because of the accountability movement and partially because of the belief that disadvantaged students could not learn higher-level curricula, the focus was on mastery of mostly low-level skills.

In the second generation, the focus will shift toward a more appropriate balance between higher-level learning and those more basic skills that are truly prerequisite to their mastery. Designing and delivering a curriculum that responds to the demands of accountability, and is responsive to the need for higher levels of learning, will require substantial staff development. Teachers will have to be better trained to develop curricula and lessons with the "end in mind." They will have to know and be comfortable with the concept of "backward mapping," and they will need to know "task analysis." These "tools of the trade" are essential for an efficient and effective "results-oriented" school that successfully serves all students.

Finally, a subtle but significant change in the concept of school mission deserves notice. Throughout the first generation, effective schools proponents advocated the mission of teaching for learning for all. In the second generation, the advocated mission will be learning for all. The rationale for this change is that the "teaching for" portion of the old statement created ambiguity (although this was unintended) and kept too much of the focus on "teaching" rather than "learning." This allowed people to discount school learnings that were not the result of direct teaching. Finally, the new formulation of learning for all opens the door to the continued learning of the educators as well as the students.

Correlate 5: Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task

The First Generation: In the effective school, teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in the essential skills. For a high percentage of this time, students are engaged in whole class or large group, teacher-directed, planned learning activities.

The Second Generation: In the second generation, time will continue to be a difficult problem for the teacher. In all likelihood, the problems that arise from too much to teach and not enough time to teach it will intensify. In the past, when the teachers were oriented toward "covering curricular content" and more content was added, they knew their response should be to "speed up." Now teachers are being asked to stress the mission that assures that the students master the content that is covered. How are they to respond? In the next generation, teachers will have to become more skilled at interdisciplinary curriculum and they will need to learn how to comfortably practice "organized abandonment." They will have to be able to ask the question, "What goes and what stays?" One of the reasons that many of the mandated approaches to school reform have failed is that, in every case, the local school was asked to do more! One of the characteristics of the most effective schools is their willingness to declare that some things are more important than others; they are willing to abandon some less important content so as to be able to have enough time dedicated to those areas that are valued the most.

The only alternative to abandonment would be to adjust the available time that students spend in school, so that those who need more time to reach mastery would be given it. The necessary time must be provided in a quality program that is not perceived as punitive by those in it, or as excessive by those who will have to fund it. These conditions will be a real challenge indeed!

If the American dream and the democratic ideal of educating everyone is going to move forward, we must explore several important policies and practices from the past. Regarding the issue of time to learn, for example, if the children of the disadvantaged present a "larger educational task" to the teachers and if it can be demonstrated that this "larger task" will require more time, then our notions of limited compulsory schooling may need to be changed. The current system of compulsory schooling makes little allowance for the fact that some students need more time to achieve mastery. If we could get the system to be more mastery-based and more humane at the same time, our nation and its students would benefit immensely.

Correlate 6: Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

The First Generation: In the effective school, student academic progress is measured frequently through a variety of assessment procedures. The results of these assessments are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

The Second Generation: In the first generation, the correlate was interpreted to mean that the teachers should frequently monitor their students' learning and, where necessary, the teacher should adjust his/her behavior. Several major changes can be anticipated in the second generation. First, the use of technology will permit teachers to do a better job of monitoring their students' progress. Second, this same technology will allow students to monitor their own learning and, where necessary, adjust their own behavior. The use of computerized practice tests, the ability to get immediate results on homework, and the ability to see correct solutions developed on the screen are a few of the available "tools for assuring student learning."

A second major change that will become more apparent in the second generation is already under way. In the area of assessment, the emphasis will continue to shift away from standardized norm-referenced, paper-pencil tests and toward curricular-based, criterion-referenced measures of student mastery. In the second generation, the monitoring of student learning will emphasize "more authentic assessments" of curriculum mastery. This generally means that there will be less emphasis on the paper-pencil, multiple-choice tests, and more emphasis on assessments of products of student work, including performances and portfolios.

Teachers will pay much more attention to the alignment that must exist between the intended, taught, and tested curriculum. Two new questions are being stimulated by the reform movement and will dominate much of the professional educators' discourse in the second generation: "What's worth knowing?" and "How will we know when they know it?" In all likelihood, the answer to the first question will become clear relatively quickly, because we can reach agreement that we want our students to be self-disciplined, socially responsible, and just. The problem comes with the second question, "How will we know when they know it?" Educators and citizens are going to have to come to terms with that question. The bad news is that it demands our best thinking and will require patience if we are going to reach consensus. The good news is that once we begin to reach consensus, the schools will be able to deliver significant progress toward these agreed-upon outcomes.

Correlate 7: Home-School Relations

The First Generation: In the effective school, parents understand and support the school's basic mission and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school to achieve this mission.

The Second Generation: During the first generation, the role of parents in the education of their children was always somewhat unclear. Schools often gave "lip service" to having parents more actively involved in the schooling of their children. Unfortunately, when pressed, many educators were willing to admit that they really did not know how to deal effectively with increased levels of parent involvement in the schools.

In the second generation, the relationship between parents and the school must be an authentic partnership between the school and home. In the past when teachers said they wanted more parent involvement, more often than not they were looking for unqualified support from parents. Many teachers believed that parents, if they truly valued education, knew how to get their children to behave in the ways that the school desired. It is now clear to both teachers and parents that the parent involvement issue is not that simple. Parents are often as perplexed as the teachers about the best way to inspire students to learn what the school teaches. The best hope for effectively confronting the problem--and not each other--is to build enough trust and enough communication to realize that both teachers and parents have the same goal--an effective school and home for all children!

Title I - Targeted Assistance Schools

Goal 1: Use Resources to Help Meet Standards

Use such program's resources under this part to help participating children meet such State's challenging student academic achievement standards expected for all children.

Goal 2: Ensure Planning is Incorporated

Ensure that planning for students served under this part is incorporated into existing school planning.

Goal 3: Use Effective Methods

Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that -

- Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as an extended school year, before- and after-school, and summer programs and opportunities;
- Help provide an accelerated, high-quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
- Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours for instruction provided under this part.

Goal 4: Support Regular Education Program

Coordinate with and support the regular education program, which may include services to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First or State-run preschool programs to elementary school programs.

Goal 5: Highly Qualified Teachers

Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers.

Goal 6: Opportunities for Professional Development

In accordance with subsection (e)(3) and section 1119, provide opportunities for professional development with resources provided under this part, and, to the extent practicable, from other sources, for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff, who work with participating children in programs under this section or in the regular education program.

Goal 7: Strategies for Parental Involvement

Provide strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with section 1118, such as family literacy services.

Goal 8: Coordinate and Integrate Services and Programs

Coordinate and integrate Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

Title I - Schoolwide Programs

Goal 1: Needs Assessment

A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school (including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined) that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards as described.

Goal 2: Student Opportunities

- (i) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement;
- (ii) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that -
 - *strengthen the core academic program in the school;
 - *increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;
 - *include strategies for meeting the educational needs of historically underserved populations;
- (iii)
 - *include strategies to address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low-achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State student academic achievement standards who are members of the target population of any program that is included in the schoolwide program, which may include -
 - counseling, pupil services, and mentoring services;
 - college and career awareness and preparation, personal finance education, and innovative teaching
 - the integration of vocational and technical education programs; and
 - *address how the school will determine if such needs have been met;
- (iv) Are consistent with, and are designed to implement, the State and local improvement plans, if any.

Goal 3: Instructional

Instruction by highly qualified teachers.

Goal 4: Professional Development

High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Goal 5: Professional Staff

Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

Goal 6: Parental Involvement

Strategies to increase parental involvement such as family literary services.

Goal 7: Student Transition to Elementary Programs

Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.

Goal 8: Include Teachers in Decisions

Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.

Goal 9: Identify and Assist with Student Difficulties

Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of academic achievement standards required shall be provided with effective, timely additional assistance which shall include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.

Goal 10: Federal, State, and Local Programs


Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

APPENDIX III

AEIS GRAPHS


Report of TAKS Reading

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of TAKS Math

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of TAKS Writing

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of TAKS Overall

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of SDAA II Reading

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of SDAA II Math

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of SDAA II Writing

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of SDAA II Overall

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Attendance

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Completion: Graduated

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Completion: Received GED

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Completion: Continued HS

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Completion: Dropped Out (4-yr)

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Graduating Seniors Taking SAT/ACT

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Graduating Seniors Scoring At or Above Criterion

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group




Report of Mean SAT Scores

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group



Report of Mean ACT Scores

Graph of Current Performance by Analysis Group



APPENDIX IV

Review of Individual Campuses

Review Of Borger High School

- Goal 1:** All populations will demonstrate academic success by meeting the state standard or surpassing the state average on T.A.K.S., T.A.K.S. - A, T.A.K.S. - M, T.A.K.S. ALT. or other state assessments.
- Goal 2:** Increase and maintain the attendance rate for all student populations to 97% or higher.
- Goal 3:** Improve and maintain a completion rate of 97% for all student populations.
- Goal 4:** Actively pursue students to enroll and participate in Advanced Placement and Concurrent Courses.
- Goal 5:** Train 100% of the instructional staff on the identification and implementation of campus resources to meet student needs.
- Goal 6:** Improve and maintain academic success by creating a Collaborative Learning Community among the Instructional staff, incorporating vertical and horizontal alignment.
- Goal 7:** Improve instruction and the delivery of the curriculum by implementing and utilizing technology with the focus on student learning.
- Goal 8:** Provide a safe and orderly school environment that equitably enforces the Student code of Conduct and provides students with a safe, drug-free environment.
- Goal 9:** Increase and maintain parent and community involvement in the planning and implementation of the Campus Improvement Plan.

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

Correlation of Borger High School Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Student Achievement	X		X	X					
2) Increase Attendance Rates	X		X	X					
3) Completion Rate	X		X	X					
4) Advanced Placement/Concurrent Courses	X		X	X					
5) Staff Development - Student Needs	X		X	X					
6) Collaborative Learning Community	X	X	X	X					
7) Technology Aides Instruction	X								
8) Safe School Environment	X	X	X	X					
9) Parent/Community Involvement	X	X	X	X					

**Review Of
Borger Intermediate School**

- Goal 1:** Because individual assessment is an important indicator of quality teaching and successful learning, it is our goal to be a TEA Recognized school by having at least 80% of students within all student groups of Borger Intermediate School demonstrating academic knowledge and skills by meeting passing standards on each area of the TAKS and, when applicable, the TELPAS (Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System).
- Goal 2:** Because the school climate is an important aspect of successful teaching and learning, Borger Intermediate School will be characterized by respect, safety, order, empathy, and open communication.
- Goal 3:** Because we believe that every student is of equal value and importance and that every student can learn, Borger Intermediate School will recognize and meet the special needs of specific populations evidenced by these students demonstrating progress on report cards and state assessment instruments.
- Goal 4:** Because a well-rounded education is important for personal and academic development, Borger Intermediate School will provide opportunities for student participation in a variety activities in order to enhance skills in the areas of technology, physical development and health, music, theater, visual arts, and academics.
- Goal 5:** Because we believe that daily attendance is important for academic success, student attendance will be 96% or higher.
- Goal 6:** Because it is our desire that all students succeed academically, we will strive to keep the student retention rate below 3%.
- Goal 7:** Because we believe all teachers and staff can improve and develop as educators, Borger Intermediate School will provide teachers and staff opportunities for participation in professional development that will enhance knowledge in curriculum, technology, academic acceleration, student discipline, classroom management, collaboration, peer coaching, best practices, and education issues in general.

Correlation of Borger Intermediate School Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Assessment Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2) School Environment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Special Needs of Specific Populations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4) Student Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5) Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6) Retention	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7) Staff Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Borger Intermediate School Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Assessment Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2) School Environment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Special Needs of Specific Populations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4) Student Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5) Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6) Retention	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7) Staff Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Borger Intermediate School Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Assessment Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2) School Environment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Special Needs of Specific Populations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4) Student Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5) Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6) Retention	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7) Staff Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Borger Intermediate School Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Assessment Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2) School Environment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Special Needs of Specific Populations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4) Student Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5) Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6) Retention	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7) Staff Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Borger Intermediate School Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Assessment Program	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2) School Environment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Special Needs of Specific Populations	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4) Student Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5) Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6) Retention	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
7) Staff Development	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Review Of
Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan

- Goal 1:** In the area of student achievement, 80% of the Borger Middle School students will demonstrate academic skills by meeting passing standards on the TAKS (Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) in the content areas of reading, writing, math, science, and social studies.
- Goal 2:** In the area of student performance, Borger Middle School student attendance will be at least 96%.
- Goal 3:** In the area of technology, Borger Middle School will provide students with technological experiences and learning activities through a well-balanced and appropriate curriculum that will increase the effectiveness of student learning.
- Goal 4:** In the area of school safety Borger Middle School will provide a safe and orderly environment conducive learning that enhances the learning of all students.
- Goal 5:** In the area of parent and community involvement, Borger Middle School will encourage parent and community involvement in the educational process to increase student learning and success.
- Goal 6:** In the area of student development, Borger Middle School will provide opportunities for participation in activities that develop and enhance skills in the areas of sports, music, art, and community service.
- Goal 7:** In the area of staff development, Borger Middle School will provide opportunities for participation in training that will enhance knowledge and skills in specific curricular fields, technology, student discipline, parental relations, and general education issues.

Relation of Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan Goals To District G									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Academics		X			X	X			
2) Student Attendance/Retention	X		X						
3) Technology		X				X			
4) School Environment	X			X			X		
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X					
6) Student Development				X					
7) Staff Development		X	X		X	X			

Relation of Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan Goals To District G									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Academics		X			X	X			
2) Student Attendance/Retention	X		X						
3) Technology		X				X			
4) School Environment	X			X			X		
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X					
6) Student Development				X					
7) Staff Development		X	X		X	X			

Relation of Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan Goals To District G								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Academics		X			X	X		
2) Student Attendance/Retention	X		X					
3) Technology		X				X		
4) School Environment	X			X			X	
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X				
6) Student Development				X				
7) Staff Development		X	X		X	X		

Relation of Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan Goals To District G								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Academics		X			X	X		
2) Student Attendance/Retention	X		X					
3) Technology		X				X		
4) School Environment	X			X			X	
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X				
6) Student Development				X				
7) Staff Development		X	X		X	X		

Relation of Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan Goals To District G								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Academics		X			X	X		
2) Student Attendance/Retention	X		X					
3) Technology		X				X		
4) School Environment	X			X			X	
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X				
6) Student Development				X				
7) Staff Development		X	X		X	X		

Review Of Crockett

- Goal 1:** Crockett Elementary will increase TAKS reading scores to 90% mastery in each subgroup.
- Goal 2:** Crockett Elementary will increase TAKS math scores to 90% mastery in each subgroup.
- Goal 3:** Crockett Elementary will increase TAKS Writing scores to 90% mastery in each subgroup.
- Goal 4:** Crockett Elementary will increase parental involvement by 10% in 2010-2011 and another 10% in 2011-2012.
- Goal 5:** The staff of Crockett Elementary will provide a safe, caring, supportive environment for all students.
- Goal 6:** 100% of the Crockett Elementary staff will participate in professional development that will enhance the learning of the students.
- Goal 7:** Crockett Elementary will seek to obtain and maintain an average of 98% daily attendance.
- Goal 8:** Crockett Elementary will be provided technical assistance through central office involvement in campus improvement goals and activities. Support includes, but is not limited to:
 - SIP Application Support
 - Instructional Support
 - Funding
 - Leadership

Correlation of Crockett Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) TAKS Reading									
2) TAKS Math									
3) TAKS Writing		X							
4) Parental Involvement									
5) Safe School		X							
6) Professional Development									
7) Attendance									
8) Technical Assistance									

Correlation of Crockett Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) TAKS Reading									
2) TAKS Math									
3) TAKS Writing	X								
4) Parental Involvement									
5) Safe School	X								
6) Professional Development									
7) Attendance									
8) Technical Assistance									

Correlation of Crockett Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) TAKS Reading								
2) TAKS Math								
3) TAKS Writing	X							
4) Parental Involvement								
5) Safe School	X							
6) Professional Development								
7) Attendance								
8) Technical Assistance								

Review Of Gateway

- Goal 1:** Gateway Elementary will contribute to higher TAKS scores in the areas of Reading and Math at the 3rd grade level.
- Goal 2:** Gateway Elementary will seek to maintain an average daily attendance of at least 96%.
- Goal 3:** Gateway Elementary will provide a safe and orderly environment to maximize time for teachers to teach and for students to learn.
- Goal 4:** Gateway Elementary will develop health and fitness goals and objectives based on assessment data, attendance rates, academic disadvantages to ensure that students are reaching required moderate or vigorous physical activity
- Goal 5:** Teachers and staff will have the opportunity to participate in professional development
- Goal 6:** Gateway Elementary will stay current with ever changing technology.
- Goal 7:** Gateway Elementary, having experienced favorable results in the past, will encourage the involvement of parents and community members in activities that assist students and improve student performance.

Correlation of Gateway Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Improve Student Achievement	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
2) Improve Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X	X		X		X	
4) Coordinated School Health	X	X		X	X		X	
5) Professional Development								
6) Technology								
7) Home/School Partnership	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Gateway Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Improve Student Achievement	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
2) Improve Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X	X		X		X	
4) Coordinated School Health	X	X		X	X		X	
5) Professional Development								
6) Technology								
7) Home/School Partnership	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Gateway Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Improve Student Achievement	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
2) Improve Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X	X		X		X	
4) Coordinated School Health	X	X		X	X		X	
5) Professional Development								
6) Technology								
7) Home/School Partnership	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Correlation of Gateway Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Improve Student Achievement	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
2) Improve Student Attendance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X	X		X		X	
4) Coordinated School Health	X	X		X	X		X	
5) Professional Development								
6) Technology								
7) Home/School Partnership	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Review Of
Paul Belton Early Childhood Center

- Goal 1:** Faculty and staff will use age-appropriate, research-based instructional strategies to teach children to process at a high cognitive level and become independent thinkers.
- Goal 2:** Students will develop age-appropriate academic skills at a high cognitive level.
- Goal 3:** PBECC will strive to maintain a 96% attendance rate in all programs.
- Goal 4:** PBECC will provide a safe and orderly environment to maximize time for teachers to teach and for students to learn.
- Goal 5:** Parent and community involvement is an integral part of a child's educational process. The PBECC will work to strengthen relationships with parents and members of the community by working to instill public trust, work to facilitate the lines of communication and provide an open and inviting environment.
- Goal 6:** All students at Paul Belton will be taught by highly qualified teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals

Correlation of Paul Belton Early Childhood Center Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Professional Development to Enhance Student Achievement	X		X	X	X				X
2) Age-Appropriate Academic Skills at a High Cognitive Level	X		X	X	X				X
3) Attendance Rate	X			X	X			X	
4) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X		X	X				
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X	X			X	
6) Highly Qualified Staff: by the end of 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.	X			X					

Correlation of Paul Belton Early Childhood Center Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Professional Development to Enhance Student Achievement	X		X	X	X			X
2) Age-Appropriate Academic Skills at a High Cognitive Level	X		X	X	X			X
3) Attendance Rate	X			X	X		X	
4) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X		X	X			
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X	X		X	
6) Highly Qualified Staff: by the end of 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.	X			X				

Correlation of Paul Belton Early Childhood Center Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Professional Development to Enhance Student Achievement	X		X	X	X			X
2) Age-Appropriate Academic Skills at a High Cognitive Level	X		X	X	X			X
3) Attendance Rate	X			X	X		X	
4) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X		X	X			
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X	X		X	
6) Highly Qualified Staff: by the end of 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.	X			X				

Correlation of Paul Belton Early Childhood Center Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Professional Development to Enhance Student Achievement	X		X	X	X			X
2) Age-Appropriate Academic Skills at a High Cognitive Level	X		X	X	X			X
3) Attendance Rate	X			X	X		X	
4) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X		X	X			
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X	X		X	
6) Highly Qualified Staff: by the end of 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.	X			X				

Correlation of Paul Belton Early Childhood Center Goals To District Goals									
Campus Goals	District Goals								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1) Professional Development to Enhance Student Achievement	X		X	X	X				X
2) Age-Appropriate Academic Skills at a High Cognitive Level	X		X	X	X				X
3) Attendance Rate	X			X	X		X		
4) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X		X	X				
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X	X		X		
6) Highly Qualified Staff: by the end of 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.	X			X					

Correlation of Paul Belton Early Childhood Center Goals To District Goals								
Campus Goals	District Goals							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) Professional Development to Enhance Student Achievement	X		X	X	X			X
2) Age-Appropriate Academic Skills at a High Cognitive Level	X		X	X	X			X
3) Attendance Rate	X			X	X		X	
4) Safe and Orderly Environment	X	X		X	X			
5) Parent and Community Involvement	X			X	X		X	
6) Highly Qualified Staff: by the end of 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers who are assisted by highly qualified paraprofessionals.	X			X				

APPENDIX V


Composite Review of Campuses

Correlation of Campus Goals To District Goals					
Campus	District Goals				
	1	2	3	4	5
Borger High School	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	6, 8, 9	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9	
Borger Intermediate School	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan	2, 4, 5	1, 3, 7	2, 7	4, 5, 6	1, 7
Crockett	3, 5				
Gateway	1, 2, 3, 4, 7	2, 3, 4, 7	1, 2, 3, 7	1, 2, 4, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 7
Paul Belton Early Childhood Center	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	4	1, 2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Correlation of Campus Goals To District Goals			
Campus	District Goals		
	6	7	8
Borger High School			
Borger Intermediate School	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Borger Middle School Campus Improvement Plan	1, 3, 7	4	
Crockett			
Gateway	1, 2, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 7	1, 2, 7
Paul Belton Early Childhood Center		3, 5	1, 2


Report of TAKS Reading

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS English/Lang. Arts

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of TAKS Math

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Writing

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Science

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Social Studies

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Overall

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Reading (Spanish)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Math (Spanish)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Writing (Spanish)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Science (Spanish)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Overall (Spanish)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SDAA II Reading

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SDAA II English/Lang. Arts

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SDAA II Math

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SDAA II Writing

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SDAA II Overall

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Tested, Total

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Tested, TAKS/SDAA II

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Tested, SDAA II Only

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Tested, Acct Subset

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Tested, Mobile

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Not Tested, Absent

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Not Tested, ARD Exempt

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS/SDAA II Particip., Not Tested, LEP Exempt

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Progress of Prior Yr. TAKS Failers, Reading/ELA

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Progress of Prior Yr. TAKS Failers, Math

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SSI Reading - Acc. Instruction Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SSI Reading - 2nd Admin. Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SSI Math - Acc. Instruction Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of SSI Math - 2nd Admin. Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Beg. Last Year/Beg. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Beg. Last Year/Int. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPT E Beg. Last Year/Adv. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTE Beg. Last Year/Adv. High This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Int. Last Year/Beg. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Int. Last Year/Int. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Int. Last Year/Adv. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTE Int. Last Year/Adv. High This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Adv. Last Year/Beg. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Adv. Last Year/Int. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTe Adv. Last Year/Adv. This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of RPTTE Adv. Last Year/Adv. High This Year

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TELPAS: % of K-2 showing progress

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TELPAS: % of 3-12 showing progress

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of TELPAS: % of K-2 attaining Advanced High


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% Attaining Advanced High

Report of TELPAS: % of 3-12 attaining Advanced High


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% Attaining Advanced High


Report of Attendance

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-8)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Completion: Graduated

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Completion: Received GED

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Completion: Continued HS

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Completion: Dropped Out (4-yr)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of % Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% Taking Advanced Courses/Dual Enrollment Completion

Report of RHSP/DAP


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% Enrolled in Recommended Programs


Report of AP/IB: % Students Tested

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of AP/IB: % Examinees At or Above Criterion


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% At or Above Criterion


Report of AP/IB: % Scores At or Above Criterion

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Graduating Seniors Taking SAT/ACT

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of Graduating Seniors Scoring At or Above Criterion


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% Scoring At or Above Criterion


Report of Mean SAT Scores

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Mean ACT Scores

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of AEA - TAKS Progress

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of AEA - SDAA II

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of AEA - Completion Rate II

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of AEA - Annual Dropout Rate (Grades 7-12)

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of Alternative - GED Completion


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% Completing All Requirements for GED Certificate of Completion

Report of Alternative - GED Sections


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



% of GED Sections Passed


Report of Alternative - Percent Courses Complete

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Percent Credits Completed

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of Alternative - Average Number of Courses Passed


Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Number of Courses Passed


Report of Alternative - Average Credits Passed

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Promotion Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Annual Completion Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Attendance Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Dropout Rate

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Recovered Dropouts

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of Alternative - Texas Learning Index

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt Special Ed. Reading

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt Special Ed. Math

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt Special Ed. Writing

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt Special Ed. Social Studies

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt Special Ed. Science

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt Special Ed. Overall

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt LEP Reading

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District




Report of TAKS Exempt LEP Math

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of TAKS Exempt LEP Writing

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District



Report of TAKS Exempt LEP

Composite Graph of Current Performance for All Schools in the District

