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## ABSTRACT

This document presents data summarizing the indicators of educational quality in the Austin (Texas) Independent School District (AISD) and, where possible, compares the AISD data to data from other urban districts, the state, and the nation. Data are presented on student achievement overall, for college-bound students and among different ethnic groups, as well as district rates fcr school attendance, college attendance aspiration, high school graduation, grade retention, and dropouts. On almost all quality indicators the AISD scored above average, including: (l) scores above the national average at grades $K-12$ in all tests areas; (2) Fixit-Level Texas Educational Assessment $0_{i}^{-}$Minimum Skills (TEAMS) scores above the state average and first among the eight urban districts in Texas; (3) one and one-half to two times the national average percentage of students scoring above the 90th percentile; (4) t'o and one-half to four times the average percentile for urban districts scoring above the 90 th percentile; (5) scores above the state and national ?verages on the Scholastic Aptitude Test; and (6) four to seven times the average number of National Merit Scholarship recognition awards for a district of its size. The one area showing need for improvement was basic skills, especially mathematics in grades $1,3,5,7$, and 9. (JGL)
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## SUMMARY OF QUALITY INDICATORS

When we examine the most common indicators of quality for public school systems, AISD compares favorably. Many different indicators of quality may be used to evaluate the success of an educational system. While various measures of student achievement are fundamental and form the "bottom line" in education, other measures such as the dropout rate and the percentage of graduates going to college are also important. The following points summarize a variety of quality indicators for AISD. More detailed information is attached. Comparisons with other districts, the state, or the nation are included when available.

## Achievement

## High Student Achievement Levels

1. Scudent achievement has risen markedly in the last decade, with minority students in particular showing significant gains. (Figures 1-4)
2. AISD students consistently achieve above the national average at grades $\mathrm{K}-12$ in all test areas. (Figures $5 \& 6$ )
3. On the Exit-Level TEAMS, AISD students outscore the state average, and AISD ranks number one among the eight urban districts. (Figures $7 \& 8$ )
4. The percentage of AISD students scoring above the 90 th percentile is about one and a half to two times the national average and two and a half to four times the average for urban districts. (Figure 9)

College-Bound Students
5. AISD students have traditionally outperformed the state and national averages on the SAT. (Figures $10 \& 11$ )
6. The number of our students recognized in the National Merit Scholarship competition is four to seven times the average for a school system the size of Austin. (Figure 12)

## Student Diversity

7. In general Austin's diverse population presents a real challenge to teachers who have such a wide range of achievers in their classrooms. (Figures 13-16)
8. AISD students speak 45 home languages other than English. (Figure 17)
9. In their classrooms, Aus+in teachers appear to have students with a greater diversity of income, home language, achievement levels, and ethnicity than any other teachers in Texas.

## Improvement Needed in Basic Skills

10. Although it is the expectation of the District administration that AISD should rank number one among Texas urban districts (the Big Eight), the rankings on the 1986 TEAMS ranged from one to six with the most common ranking being three. (Figura 18)
11. On the TEAMS, Austin students are more likely to be below their counterparts statewide in mathematics than in reading or writing. (Figure 19)
12. Black students in AISD score below Black students statewide on the TEAMS in 14 of 17 comparisons. Anglo and Hispanic students exceed the state average in 7 of 17 comparisons. (Figure 19)

## Other Outcomes

13. The average daily attendance in A.ISD was $94.5 \%$ for 1985-86 compared with a state average of $93.4 \%$.
14. An estimated $63 \%$ of last year's graduates planned to attend college. This is above the state average.
15. Of AISD 12th graders, $97 \%$ graduated in 1985-86 compared with 93.28 statewide.
16. About $7 \%$ of current AISD students are repeating a grade from last year. At grades $1,7,8$, and 9 the rate exceeds $10 \%$ (Figure 20)
17. In 1985-86 the annual high school dropout rate was 10.7\%. Over a four-year period we are likely to lose $30 \%$ or more of our students who were ninth graders the first year. (Figure 21)

Figure 1. HISPANIC STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: ITBS COMPOSITE SCORES, 1980 AND 1986.
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Figure 2. BLACK STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: ITBS COMPOSITE SCORES, 1980 AND 198E.
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Figure 3. ANGLO/OTHER STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT: ITBS COMPOSITE SCGRES, 1980 AND 1986.
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Figure 4: TEST AVERAGE CHANGES IN 1985-1986.

| ELEMENTARY | UP | ITBS AVERAGES SAME | DOWN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BLACK | 21 | 7 | 5 |
| HISPANIC | 22 | 4 | 7 |
| OTHER | 22 | 11 | 0 |
| ALL STUDENTS | 19 | 10 | 4 |
| JUNIOR HIGH | UP | ITBS AVEpnges SAME | DOWN |
| BLACK | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| OTHER | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| ALL STUDENTS | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| HIGH SCHOOL | UP | tap averagas SAME | DOWM |
| BLACK | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| HISPANIC | 26 | 0 | 2 |
| OTHER | 19 | 5 | 4 |
| ALL STUDENTS | 21 | 3 | 4 |
| TOTAL <br> (all averages FOR ALL STUDENTS ) | 50 UP | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \text { SAME } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ \text { DOWN } \end{gathered}$ |

Figure 5. AISD MEDIAN PERCENTILES, 1985-86 ITBS, GRADES 1-8, COMPOSITE SCORES.

MEDIAN PEACENTILE


Figure 6. AISD MEDIAN PERCENTILES, 1985-86 TAP, GRADES 9-12, COMPOSITE SCORES.


Figure 7. PERCENTAGE OF ELEVENTH GRADERS MASTERING THE EXIT-LEVEL TEAMS, ©CTOBER, 1986.

| District | Mathematics | Language Arts | Passed aIT <br> Tests Taken |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austin | 93 | 90 | 87 |
| Corpus Christi | 87 | 86 | 81 |
| Dallas | 83 | 79 | 73 |
| El Paso | 91 | 88 | 83 |
| Fort Worth | 77 | 79 | 69 |
| Hnuston | 87 | 86 | 80 |
| San Antonio | 83 | 80 | 73 |
| Ysleta | 88 | 87 | 82 |
|  |  | 87 | 83 |
| Texas | 89 |  |  |

Figure 8. PERCENTAGE MASTERING EXIT-LEVEL TEAMS.


Figure 9. PERCENTAGE OF AISD STUDENTS SCORING AT OR ABOVE THE 90TH PERCENTILE ON THE ITBS OR TAP COMPOSITE. Ten percent of the norming group score at or above the 90 th percentile.

|  | AT OR ABOVE <br> GATIONAL NORMS | AT OR ABOVE <br> URBAN NORMS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 2 | 18.3 | $25.2 \%$ |
| 2 | 18.8 | $26.8 \%$ |
| 3 | 15.2 | $30.1 \%$ |
| 4 | 14.1 | $27.5 \%$ |
| 5 | 14.3 | $32.9 \%$ |
| 6 | 14.8 | $33.6 \%$ |
| 7 | 15.1 | $40.1 \%$ |
| 8 | 20.2 | $45.6 \%$ |
| 9 | 15.7 | $1 \% A$ |
| 10 | 19.3 | NA |
| 11 | 19.3 | NA |
| 12 | 18.4 | NA |

Figure 10. SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST NATIONAL AND AÏSD AVERAGES: VERBAL, 1972 TO 1986.

SAT Scale Score


Figure 11. SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST NATIONAL AND AISD AVERAGES: MATHEMATICS, 1972 TO 1986.


Figure 12. RATIO OF NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIP FINALISTS TO PREDICTED NUMBER. One half of one percent of PSAT takers are chosen as semifinalists.

| Juniors in... | Numbers <br> of Takers | Predicted Number <br> of Semifinalists | Number of <br> Semifinalists | Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1985-86$ | 1,413 | 7 | 51 | 7.3 |
| $10 \sim 4-85$ | 1,322 | 7 | 28 | 4.0 |
| $1983-84$ | 1,447 | 7 | 50 | 7.1 |
| $1982-83$ | 1,$23 ;$ | 6 | 40 | 6.7 |

Figure 13. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING IN VARIOUS PERCENTILE RANGES.
ITBS LANGUAGE, KINDEFGARITEN, FALL 1986.


Figure 14. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING IN VARIOUS PERCENTILE RANGES, ITBS COMPOSITE, GRADE 6. 1986.


Fijure i5. PEACENTAGE OF STUDENTS SCORING IN VARIOUS PERCENTILE RANGEC. ITES COMPOSITE, GRADE 8, 1986.


Figure 16. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS S'JORING IN VARIOUS PERCENTILE RANGES, TAP COMPOSITE, GRADE 12. 1986.


Figure 17. LEP POPULATIONS IN BIG EIGHT -- TOTAL LANGUAGES REPRESENTED AND PERCENTAGE SPANISH, VIETNAMESE AND OTHER, 1985-86.

| DISTRICT | TOTAL <br> LANGUAGES | $\%$ <br> SPANISH | $\%$ <br> VIETNAMESE | $\%$ <br> OTHER |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austin | 45 | $87 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Corpus <br> Christi <br> Dallas | 16 | $98 \%$ | $i \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| El Paso | 50 | $91 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Ft. Worth | 15 | $98 \%$ | - | $2 \%$ |
| Houston | 42 | $80 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| San Antonio | 10 | $87 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Ysleta | 8 | $99 \%$ | - | $1 \%$ |

Figure 18. AISD RANK AMONG URBAN EIGHT ON TEAMS, 1986.

| Test | AISD <br> Rank |
| :--- | :--- |
| Grade 1 |  |
| Mathematics | 3 |
| Reading | 2 |
| Writing | 2 |
| Grade 3 |  |
| Mathematics | 3 |
| Reading | 2 |
| Writing | 2 |
| Grade 5 |  |
| Mathematics | 3 |
| Reading | 3 |
| Writing | 2 |
| Grade 7 | 6 |
| Mathematics | 1 |
| Reading | 3 |
| Writing |  |
| Grade 9 | 4 |
| Mathematics | 3 |
| Reading | 3 |
| Writing | 1 |
| Exit Level | 1 |
| Mathematics |  |
| Language irts |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Figure 19. COMPARISON OF Al:i) STUDENTS WITH THE STATE PERCENT MASTERY ON TEAMS BY ETHNICITY, 1986.

| Grade | Ma thematics |  |  | Reading |  |  | Writing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | H | A | B | H | A | B | H | A |
| 1 | - | $=$ | + | - | - | - | - | + | - |
| 3 | - | - | - | - | + | - | = | + | = |
| 5 | - | - | - | - | $=$ | + | - | - | $=$ |
| 7 | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | - | + |
| 9 | - | - | + | - | + | $=$ | - | - | - |
| Exit | + | + | + | + | + | + | NA | NA | NA |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & B=\text { Black } \\ & H=H i \text { spanic } \\ & A=\text { Anglo } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\left.\begin{array}{l} + \text { is Above } \\ - \text { is Below } \\ =\text { is At } \end{array}\right\}$ |  |  | State |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 20. NJMBER AND PERCENT RETAINED BY GRADE, 1986-87.

| Grade | Number <br> Retained | First Six Weeks <br> Enrollment | Percentage <br> Retained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $k$ | 88 | 5,349 | $1.6 \%$ |
| 1 | 639 | 5,930 | $10.8 \%$ |
| 2 | 184 | 4,910 | $3.7 \%$ |
| 3 | 107 | 4,651 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 4 | 127 | 4,476 | $2.8 \%$ |
| 5 | 80 | 4,190 | $1.9 \%$ |
| 6 | 29 | 4,238 | $.7 \%$ |
| 7 | 629 | 4,850 | $13.0 \%$ |
| 8 | 437 | 4,001 | $10.9 \%$ |
| 9 | 1,143 | 5,172 | $22.1 \%$ |
| 10 | 394 | 4,164 | $9.5 \%$ |
| 11 | 205 | 3,606 | $5.7 \%$ |
| 12 | 56 | 3,131 | $1.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4,118 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Figure 21. ANNUAL 1983-84, 1984-85, AND 1985-86 HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT RATES, 'BY ETHNICITY, SEX, AND GRADE.

| Group | $\begin{gathered} \text { Annuai Rate, } \\ \text { 1983-84 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Annua Rate, } \\ & 1984-85 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Annual Rate, } \\ & 1985-86 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | $\%$ |
| Black | 286 | 9.7 | 322 | 10.6 | 314 | 9.8 |
| Hispanic | 554 | 13.8 | 663 | 16.0 | 661 | 15.3 |
| Anglo/Other | 754 | 7.5 | 963 | 9.1 | 936 | 9.0 |
| Female | 701 | 8.5 | 880 | 10.1 | 883 | 10.0 |
| Male | 893 | 10.3 | 1,068 | 11.8 | 1,028 | 11.3 |
| Grade 9 | 661. | 11.4 | 825 | 13.0 | 911 | 14.2 |
| Grade 10 | 4i9 | 10.0 | 497 | 11.2 | 456 | 10.1 |
| Grade 11 | 349 | 9.7 | 432 | 12.1 | 354 | 9.5 |
| Grade 12 | 165 | 4.9 | 194 | 5.7 | 190 | 5.8 |
| Total | 1,594 | 9.4 | 1,948 | 11.0 | 1,911 | 10.7 |
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