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INTRODUCTION

Prior to release from Court supervision, the Dallas Independent School District (Dallas ISD) adopted a Declaration of Commitments and Covenants that enumerated thirteen commitments expressing the district’s pledge to maintain certain policies and programs formerly mandated by the Court. Commitment number 11 states, “The General Superintendent shall be required to report to the Board of Trustees annually on these commitments and covenants.” Commitments 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 are associated with academic programs (Early Childhood Education, Magnet Schools, Talented and Gifted, Learning Centers, and Bilingual/ESL, respectively) and Commitments 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are associated with the district’s mission and nondiscrimination policies.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine the degree to which the district has adhered to its pledge to maintain certain academic programs outlined in the Commitments and Covenants and describe the academic performance of students in those programs. Commitments that address the district’s mission and nondiscrimination policies are Board policy issues and will not be addressed in this report.

MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS/AREAS AND RESULTS

This section addresses the research questions and methods used to determine the status of Commitments 3 (Early Childhood Education), 5 (Magnet Schools), 6 (Gifted and Talented), 7 (Learning Centers), and 9 (Bilingual/ESL).
Early Childhood Education

Program Description
The Early Childhood Education (ECE) Department provides a comprehensive program of instruction for children ages zero (birth) to five. With a goal of preparing children in the Dallas community to enter kindergarten with school readiness skills necessary for a successful academic career while building the foundation for college and workforce readiness, the district/Early Childhood Department established a strong collaboration between profit, nonprofit, and faith based childcare agencies in the Dallas early childhood community. These agencies included Head Start of Greater Dallas, ChildCare Group, and others. Internally, the department implemented programs such as Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Parent and Family Literacy, and School Readiness Integration to increase parental involvement and literacy among both parents and children such that all students will acquire school readiness skills by the end of the third grade as required by the No Child Left Behind Act.

Commitment 3
The Dallas Independent School District shall maintain a strong Early Childhood Program at each campus that includes PK-3 students. This program shall be based on current educational best practices, including but not limited to a diagnostic and prescriptive approach, a program facilitator at each campus which includes PK-3 students, emphasis on small group and individualized instruction, a comprehensive program that includes curriculum guides and supporting materials, appropriate staffing, increased parent involvement and training and a strong emphasis on mastery of essential skills by the end of the third grade level.

Research Questions/Areas

1. Document the existence of an Early Childhood program at all schools that include PK-3 students.
2. Identify the number of schools, student demographics, and staffing ratios in the Early Childhood program.
3. Identify best practices were used to deliver program services.
4. What activities did the Early Childhood Education Department and the individual campuses do to increase parental involvement and training?
5. Document the existence of written curricula along with supporting curriculum guides and materials at each campus.
6. Identify program changes implemented after fulfilling the three-year Commitments and Covenants.
7. Did students acquire mastery of essential skills on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and what measures were used to identify student needs?
Methodology

Student demographic and achievement data were extracted from the district’s student and achievement databases. Additional information was obtained by the Early Childhood evaluator.

Results

- An Early Childhood Education program was implemented on 141 campuses.
  - 88 schools had full-day programs.
  - 53 schools had half-day programs.
- The program served a total of 8,561 predominately disadvantaged students (PK).
  - Of these, 19.9% were African American, 77.7% were Hispanic, and 2.4% White, Asian, and Native Americans.
  - At grade PK, the student/teacher ratio was 11:1.
- Best practices used in PK classrooms:
  - Use of a diagnostic prescriptive approach to plan and guide instruction.
  - Curriculum planning guides for every content area.
  - Tiered professional development.
  - Small/whole group and individualized instruction.
  - Teaching and learning that focuses on the Principals of Learning.
  - A vertically aligned curriculum that is rigorous and coherent.
  - Parent education and involvement.
  - Building teacher capacity.
  - Monthly training of alternative certification teachers.
- Activities to increase parental involvement included:
  - AVANCE (children zero to three years of age and family),
  - HIPPY (children three or four years of age and family),
  - Dallas Achieves: Collaborative childcare services, professional development and parent and family literacy programs,
    - Childcare services were provided through School Readiness Integration (SRI) Partnerships (11 sites served about 242 students).
    - Five Dallas ISD and Head Start of Greater Dallas collaborative classrooms at Seagoville elementary school.
    - Published “Key Steps to School Readiness: Understanding the Development of Young Children” guide and distributed to 405 licensed child care centers within Dallas County.
    - Professional Development opportunities are open to staff at 405 licensed child care centers within Dallas County (In the Summer of 2009, 30 licensed facilities pre-registered their staff to participate in professional development offered by the district).
  - Virtual PK program in every PK classroom, and
• A parent involvement and education specialist conducted parent training sessions at schools and community sites as requested.

• Program changes implemented after fulfilling the three-year Commitments and Covenants included:
  • Program focus changed from grades PK-3 to ages 0 to 5.
  • Increased collaboration between the district’s Early Childhood program, Head Start of Greater Dallas, ChildCare Group, Dallas Achieves and other for-profit, non-profit, and faith-based childcare agencies.
  • Developed a centralized waiting list of children to be served.
  • Developed more comprehensive curriculum guides.
  • Instituted tiered professional development.

• Diagnostic measures included Dial 3, teacher-made tests, benchmark tests, and classroom observations. C-PALLS+ was introduced to 56 schools in 2009-2010 and used again in 2010-11.

• The overall TAKS passing rate (all students) at grade 3 was 84.3% in reading and 80.7% in mathematics, compared to 84.8% in reading and 78.2% in mathematics for 2009-2010.

• TAKS Reading passing rates by ethnicity were 77.9% for African Americans, 85.9% Hispanic and 91.1% Whites while mathematics passing rates were 73.6% for African Americans, 82.4% Hispanics and 89.7% Whites (Figures 1 and 2). Overall, reading passing rates decreased slightly for African American and White students and increased slightly for Hispanic students. Mathematics passing rates increased for African American and Hispanic students.

![Figure 1: A comparison of grade 3 passing rates on the TAKS Reading test by ethnicity.](image-url)
Figure 2: A comparison of grade 3 passing rates on the TAKS Mathematics test by ethnicity.

- TAKS Reading commended rates by ethnicity were 27.1% for African Americans, 39.9% Hispanics and 56.9% Whites, while mathematics commended rates were 20.4% for African Americans, 24.4% Hispanics and 40.6% Whites (Figures 3 and 4). Reading commended rates decreased slightly for African Americans and Whites, while Hispanics commended rates increased. Mathematics commended rates increased for all ethnic groups. Overall, the reading commended rate for the district was 36.7% and mathematics was 24.2%, both slightly increased from 2009-10.

Figure 3: A comparison of grade 3 commended rates on the TAKS Reading test by ethnicity.
Eighty-six percent (86%) of LEP and 83.8% of Economically Disadvantaged students met standard on TAKS Reading, while 82.0% of LEP and 80.1% of Economically Disadvantaged students met standard on TAKS Mathematics. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of Special Education students met standard on both TAKS Reading and Mathematics (Figures 5 and 6).

Figure 5: A comparison of grade 3 passing rates on the TAKS Reading test by LEP, Disadvantaged and Special Education student groups.
Figure 6: A comparison of grade 3 passing rates on the TAKS Mathematics test by LEP, Disadvantaged and Special Education student groups.

- TAKS Reading commended rates for LEP students were 40.7%, for Economically Disadvantaged 36.2% and for Special Education 16.2%, while mathematics commended rates were 22.6% for LEP students, 23.0% for Economically Disadvantaged and 13.6% for Special Education (Figures 7 and 8). Reading commended rate decreased slightly for Special Education students, while LEP and Economically Disadvantaged commended rates increased. Mathematics commended rates increased for all groups. District reading and mathematics commended rates were 37.6% and 24.2%, respectively.

Figure 7: A comparison of grade 3 commended rates on the TAKS Reading test by LEP, Disadvantaged and Special Education student groups.
The district maintained an Early Childhood education program in 141 schools. At grade PK, the program served a total of 8,561 students with a student/teacher ratio of 11:1. About 78% of the students served were Hispanic. Although the program continued to serve students in grades PK-3, the program’s focus was ages 0 to 5. For this population, program services were provided through community-based childcare agencies (School Readiness Integration (SRI) partnerships). The program continued to use many of the best practices outlined in the Model for Success best practices guide in PK classrooms with the addition of tiered professional development and the development of small professional PK Learning Communities. Likewise, the program continued to use traditional parental involvement activities such as HIPPY, parent conferences, Virtual classrooms and a Parent Involvement/Education specialist who conducted parent training at schools and community sites as needed.

The overall TAKS passing rates at grade 3 were 84.3% in reading and 80.7% in mathematics, compared to 84.8% in reading and 78.2% in mathematics for 2009-2010. TAKS Reading passing rates by ethnicity was 77.9% for African Americans, 85.9% Hispanic and 91.1% Whites, while mathematics passing rates were 73.6% for African Americans, 82.4% Hispanics and 89.7% Whites. TAKS Reading commended rates by ethnicity were 27.1% for African Americans, 39.9% Hispanics and 56.9% Whites, while mathematics commended rates were 20.4% for African Americans, 24.4% Hispanics and 40.6% Whites. Reading commended rate decreased slightly for African Americans and Whites while Hispanics commended rates increased. Mathematics commended rates increased for all ethnic groups.

Eighty-six percent (86%) of LEP and 83.9% of Economically Disadvantaged students met standard on TAKS Reading, while 82.0% of LEP and 80.1% of Economically Disadvantaged students met standard on TAKS Mathematics. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of Special Education students met standard on both TAKS Reading and Mathematics. TAKS Reading commended rates for LEP students was 40.7%, for Economically Disadvantaged 36.2% and for Special Education 16.2%, while mathematics commended rates were 22.6% for LEP students, 23.0% for Economically Disadvantaged and 13.6% for Special Education.

Figure 8: A comparison of grade 3 commended rates on the TAKS Mathematics test by LEP, Disadvantaged and Special Education student groups.
Magnet Schools

Program Description

The Magnet Schools Program originated as a part of the 1976 Desegregation Court Order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. The Court Order called for the implementation of magnet schools in grades nine through 12 (Academies in grades six through eight, vanguards in grades four and five, and two Montessori schools in grades PK through six). The magnet schools were expected to promote voluntary desegregation by offering unique educational opportunities through specialty curricula which could not be found within the district’s traditionally configured neighborhood schools. Upon release from the Court Order (June 5, 2003), the district adopted a Declaration of Commitments and Covenants which stated the district’s pledge to maintain certain programs and policies formerly mandated by the Court. The Magnet Schools Program was one of those programs.

Commitment 5

The Dallas Independent School District shall maintain a program of magnet schools, including Montessori schools. The program shall offer unique educational opportunities through specialty curricula that cannot be found within the neighborhood schools. The program shall include the vanguards, academies, and high schools designated as magnet schools or Montessori schools at the date the district is released from supervision of the Court. The district shall maintain the Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center as a center for high school magnet programs. The district shall be diligent in its efforts to identify all eligible or qualified students, and to encourage parents and students to participate in the programs. It shall be the policy of the district that properly identified students shall be served without regard to race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, or religion. The district shall carefully monitor the selection process so that no student or ethnic group is unfairly excluded. The district shall no less frequently than every three years evaluate all magnet and Montessori programs to determine appropriateness of the program, potential need for additional programs, and the degree to which the programs are ethnically diverse. Nothing herein shall limit the ability of the Board of Trustees to add additional programs or to modify or eliminate existing programs in accordance with the recommendations of the district's evaluation. The district shall maintain an advisory committee for each high school magnet school that will include specialists in the particular focus of the individual magnet school.

Research Questions/Areas

1. Document the existence of a magnet program, including Montessori schools, and the demographic characteristics of the students.
2. Explain the selection and monitoring procedures used to identify eligible students to participate in the program.
3. Document the existence of an advisory committee at each magnet high school.
4. How often is the magnet program evaluated to determine appropriateness, potential need for modification, and ethnic diversity?
5. Identify program/administrative changes implemented in the Magnet Schools Program after fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.
6. Identify magnet students’ performance on the TAKS Reading, Mathematics, and Writing tests.
Methodology

The district’s student database was utilized to extract enrollment, demographic, and achievement data. Information on curriculum development and modifications were obtained from previous evaluation reports.

Table 1 lists the magnet, academies and vanguard schools for the 2010-11 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnet</th>
<th>Academies</th>
<th>Vanguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booker T. Washington High School for the Performing and Visual Arts</td>
<td>William B. Travis Talented and Gifted Vanguard and Academy</td>
<td>William B. Travis Talented and Gifted Vanguard and Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Barefoot Sanders, Magnet Center for Public Service: Government, Law, and Law Enforcement at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center</td>
<td>George Bannerman Dealey Montessori International Academy</td>
<td>George Bannerman Dealey Montessori Vanguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie M. Collins Sorrells School of Education and Social Services at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center</td>
<td>Harry Stone Montessori Academy</td>
<td>Harry Stone Montessori Vanguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health Professions at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center</td>
<td>Henry W. Longfellow Career Exploration Academy</td>
<td>J. P. Starks Math, Science and Technology Vanguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business and Management at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center</td>
<td>Dallas Environmental Science Academy</td>
<td>K. B. Polk Talented and Gifted Vanguard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School for the Talented and Gifted at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center</td>
<td>Irma L. Rangel Young Women’s Leadership School</td>
<td>Mark Twain Leadership Vanguard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science and Engineering at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center</td>
<td>Oliver Wendell Holmes Humanities/Communications Academy*</td>
<td>Sidney Lanier Expressive Arts Vanguard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma L. Rangel Young Women’s Leadership School</td>
<td>William Hawley Atwell Law Academy*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline Career Development Center (CDC)*</td>
<td>Alex W. Spence Talented and Gifted Academy*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Humanities/Communications*</td>
<td>W. E. Greiner Exploratory Arts Academy*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science Magnet at Seagoville (opened 2011)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt Health Magnet (opened 2011)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin F. Kimball Math &amp; Science (opened 2011)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. G. Pinkston Law Magnet (opened 2011)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * indicates a magnet school within a school
The district maintained the original 10 magnet high schools (including six at the Yvonne Ewell Townview Center and one Career Development Center at Skyline High School) and opened four satellite magnet high schools. The district maintained 10 academy middle schools and seven vanguard elementary schools (Table 1).

Unique educational opportunities offered through the magnet schools included: Fine Arts, Humanities, Business, Health Services, Law, Science and Engineering, Environmental Sciences, Education and Social Services, Gifted and Talented, Young Women’s Leadership School, Male Leadership School, Skyline CDC (vocational trades), two Montessori Vanguards, and two Montessori Academies.

A review committee was used to monitor and determine applicants’ eligibility for the program and to rank-order the results. Thirty percent (30%) of the seats were allocated districtwide and 70% within each Learning Community. Board Policy limited the enrollment of out-of-district students while eligible district students were waiting for admission.

During the 2004-05 and the 2005-06 school years, new curricula were written for nine magnet schools. No additional curriculum changes have been made.

Seven Vanguard elementary schools served an ethnically diverse population of predominantly disadvantaged students (Total enrollment = 1,221 students).

- 47.3% Hispanic, 24.4% African American, 19.7% White, 5.5% Asian and 0.3% Native Americans.
- LEP students comprised 14.3% of the Vanguard enrollment.

Ten Academy schools served an ethnically diverse population of predominantly disadvantaged students (Total enrollment = 1,898 students).

- 56.1% Hispanic, 26.7% African American, 11.9% White, and 2.4% Asian and 0.9% Native Americans.
- LEP students comprised 2.6% of the Academy enrollment.

Fourteen magnet high schools including six at the Yvonne Ewell Townview Center, and one Career Development Center (CDC) at Skyline High School served an ethnically diverse population of predominantly disadvantaged students (Total enrollment = 5,740 students).

- 56.6% Hispanic, 26.7% African American, 11.2% White, and 2.5% Asian and 2.4% Native Americans.
- LEP students comprised 1.9% of the Magnet high school enrollment.

The magnet program served an ethnically diverse population of predominantly disadvantaged students (Total enrollment = 8,859 students).

- 55.2% Hispanic, 26.4% African American, 12.5% White, and 2.9% Asian and 0.3% Native American.
- LEP students comprised 3.8% of the total magnet enrollment.

Administrative changes implemented after fulfilling the three-year Commitments and Covenants included: 1) Decentralization of administrative oversight, 2) Closure of M. Jackson Vanguard, 3) Darrell opened as a Vanguard, 4) Closure of Darrell as a Vanguard, 5) Stark opened as a Vanguard, 6) Four high schools restructured as satellite magnet schools – Seagoville, Roosevelt, Kimball and Pinkston, 7) Magnet principals
reported to Learning Communities’ Executive Directors, 8) Addition of one grade per year to Irma Rangel Young Women’s Leadership School until the school spans grades 6-12, and 9) Grade six moved from the Vanguards to the Academies, except at Montessori schools.

- Magnet high schools, academies and vanguards posted higher passing (met standard) and commended passing rates on the TAKS Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies tests than non-magnet students (Figures 9 through 24).
- In general, the percent of Magnet students achieving commended performance more than doubled that of other district students across all grade levels.
- Overall, 98.3% of Magnet students met standard on the TAKS Reading test, compared to 83.8% of the non-magnet students. Also, 34.1% of Magnet students were at the commended level, compared to 9.6% of the non-magnet students (Figures 9 and 10).

![Figure 9](image1.png)

Figure 9: A comparison of passing rates on the TAKS Reading test for district and magnet high school students.

![Figure 10](image2.png)

Figure 10: A comparison of commended rates on the TAKS Reading test for district and magnet high school students.
Overall, 92.0% of Magnet students met standard on the TAKS Mathematics test, compared to 64.0% of the non-magnet students. Also, 37.9% of Magnet students were at the commended level or above, compared to 9.8% of the non-magnet students (Figures 11 and 12).

Figure 11: A comparison of passing rates on the TAKS Mathematics test for district and magnet high school students.

Figure 12: A comparison of commended rates on the TAKS Mathematics test for district and magnet high school students.
Overall, 99.6% of Academy students met standard on the TAKS Reading test, compared to 78.8% of the non-academy students. Also, 65.9% of Academy students were at the commended level or above, compared to 31.2% of the non-academy students (Figures 13 and 14).

Figure 13: A comparison of passing rates on the TAKS Reading test for district middle school and Academy students (includes 6th grade Montessori).

Figure 14: A comparison of commended rates on the TAKS Reading test for district middle school and Academy students (includes 6th grade Montessori).
Overall, 98.3% of Academy students met standard on the *TAKS Mathematics* test, compared to 71.3% of the non-academy students. Also, 53.5% of Academy students were at the commended level or above, compared to 14.2% of the non-academy students (Figures 15 and 16).

Figure 15: A comparison of passing rates on the *TAKS Mathematics* test for district middle school and academy students (includes 6th grade Montessori).

Figure 16: A comparison of commended rates on the *TAKS Mathematics* test for district middle school and academy students (includes 6th grade Montessori).
Overall, 98.3% of Vanguard students met standard on the *TAKS Reading* test, compared to 83.8% of the non-vanguard students. Also, 65.9% of Vanguard students were at the commended level or above, compared to 31.2% of the non-vanguard students (Figures 17 and 18).

Figure 17: A comparison of passing rates on the *TAKS Reading* test for district elementary and Vanguard students (excludes grade 6 Montessori Vanguards).

Figure 18: A comparison of commended rates on the *TAKS Reading* test for district elementary and Vanguard students (excludes grade 6 Montessori Vanguard students).
Overall, 97.8% of Vanguard students met standard on the *TAKS Mathematics* test, compared to 83.1% of the non-vanguard students. Also, 54.6% of Vanguard students were at the commended level or above, compared to 28.4% of the non-vanguard students (Figures 19 and 20).

![Figure 19: A comparison of passing rates on the TAKS Mathematics test for district elementary and Vanguard students (excludes grade 6 Montessori Vanguards).](image1)

![Figure 20: A comparison of commended rates on the TAKS Mathematics test for district elementary and Vanguard students (excludes grade 6 Montessori Vanguards).](image2)
At grade 4, ninety-eight percent (98%) of magnet students met standard on the TAKS Writing test, compared to 88.7% of non-magnet student. At grade 7, 99.9% of magnet students met standard, compared to 88.0% of non-magnet students. While, 57.2% of magnet students achieved commended level or above, the commended level for non-magnet students was 23.0%, at grade 4. At grade 7, 70.3% of the magnet students achieved commended levels or above, compared to 20.8% of non-magnet students (Figures 21 and 22).

Figure 21: A comparison of passing rates on the TAKS Writing test for district and magnet students by grade.

Figure 22: A comparison of commended rates on the TAKS Writing test for district and magnet students by grade.
At grade 5, 98.3% of magnet students met standard on the TAKS Science test, compared to 77.2% of non-magnet student. At grade 8, 97.1% of magnet students met standard, compared to 64.9% of non-magnet students. While, 65.5% of magnet students achieved commended levels or above, 30.7% of non-magnet students also achieved commended levels, at grade 5. At grade 8, 60.2% of the magnet students achieved commended levels or above, compared to 14.9% of non-magnet students (Figures 23 and 24).

Figure 23: A comparison of passing rates on the TAKS Science test for district and magnet students by grade.

Figure 24: A comparison of commended rates on the TAKS Science test for district and magnet students by grade.
At grade 8, 99.8% of magnet school students met standard on the *TAKS Social Studies* test, compared to 91.8% of non-magnet student. At grade 10, 99.6% of magnet students met standard, compared to 92.4% of non-magnet students. While, 69.9% of magnet students achieved commended levels or above, 31.0% of non-magnet students also achieved commended levels, at grade 8. At grade 10, 71.0% of the magnet students achieved commended levels or above, compared to 34.9% of non-magnet students (Figures 25 and 26).

Figure 25: A comparison of passing rates on the *TAKS Social Studies* test for district and magnet students by grade.

Figure 26: A comparison of commended rates on the *TAKS Social Studies* test for district and magnet students by grade.
Magnet schools received the following AEIS ratings: Exemplary (15), Recognized (6), Acceptable (4), and Unacceptable (6). [Estimates of 2010-11 AEIS ratings] See Table 2.

Table 2

AEIS Rating for Magnet Schools, 2008-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker. T. Washington</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management Center</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Social Services</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Law</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Magnet</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talented and Gifted</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Women’s Leadership School (6-12)</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Magnet*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline CDC*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagoville Environmental (opened 2010)*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Health (opened 2010)*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball Math &amp; Science (opened 2010)*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkston Law (opened 2010)*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Schools (Academies)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Environmental Science Academy</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealey Montessori Academy</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Women’s Leadership School (6-12)</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow Academy</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Montessori Academy</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Academy</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greiner Academy*</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwell Academy*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Academy*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence Academy*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary (Vanguards)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealey Montessori Vanguard</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Vanguard</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starks, J.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Montessori Vanguard</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Vanguard</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanier Vanguard*</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Vanguard*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twain Vanguard*</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates a magnet school within a school and the rating is for the whole school. The Young Women’s Leadership School (6-12) is listed as a magnet high school and an academy but share the same rating.
The district maintained the original 10 magnet high schools (including six at the Yvonne Ewell Townview Center and one Career Development Center at Skyline High School) and opened four satellite magnet high schools. The district maintained the 10 academy middle schools and the seven vanguard elementary schools. Two Montessori middle schools and two Montessori elementary schools are included in the Academies and Vanguards. The magnet program served an ethnically diverse population of predominantly disadvantaged students with a total enrollment of 8,859 students (55.2% Hispanic, 26.4% African American, 12.5% White, 2.9% Asian and 0.3% Native Americans). Of these 3.8% were LEP students.

The program continued to use a review committee to determine students’ eligibility, while seats were awarded on a 30/70 split (30% districtwide and 70% within each Learning Community). Administrative changes implemented after fulfilling the three-year Commitments and Covenants included; 1) Decentralization of administrative oversight, 2) Closure of M. Jackson Vanguard, 3) Darrell opened as a Vanguard, 4) Closure of Darrell as a Vanguard, 5) Stark opened as a Vanguard, 6) Four high schools restructured as magnet schools – Seagoville, Roosevelt, Kimball and Pinkston, 7) Magnet principals reported to Learning Communities’ Executive Directors, 8) Addition of one grade per year to Irma Rangel Young Women’s Leadership School until the school spans grades 6-12, and 9) Grade six moved from the Vanguards to the Academies, except at Montessori schools.

Magnet students continued to score higher passing and commended rates on the **TAKS Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science** and **Social Studies** tests than their district counterparts. In general, the percent of Magnet students achieving commended performance more than doubled that of other district students across all grade levels.

Overall, 98.8% of all magnet students (grades 3-12) met standard on the **TAKS Reading** test, compared to 82.1% of the non-magnet students. Also, 47.9% of all magnet students were at the commended level or above, compared to 22.2% of the non-magnet students. For **TAKS Mathematics**, 94.4% all magnet students (grades 3-12) met standard, compared to 74.2% of the non-magnet students. Forty-four percent (44.0%) of all magnet students were at the commended level or above in mathematics, compared to 19.2% of the non-magnet students. On **TAKS Writing**, 99.3% of magnet students met standard, compared to 88.3% of non-magnet students, while 66.3% of magnet students attained commended levels or above and 22.0% of non-magnetic students reached commended levels. **TAKS Social Studies** met standard was 99.7% for magnet students and 92.0% for non-magnet students. Commended levels for social studies were 70.7% for magnet students and 33.1% for non-magnet students. **TAKS Science** met standard levels were 96.4% for magnet students and 70.7% for non-magnet students. Science commended levels were 42.7% for magnet students and 17.0% for non-magnet students.

Magnet schools received the following AEIS ratings: Exemplary (15), Recognized (6), Acceptable (4), and Unacceptable (6). [Estimates of 2010-11 AEIS ratings]
**Gifted and Talented and (Advanced Academic Services)**

**Program Description**

In November 1996, *The Texas State Plan for the Education of Gifted/Talented Students* was adopted by the State Board of Education to create a model for designing quality program services that meet the needs of advanced and gifted learners. In the Dallas Independent School District, these services consisted of three programs which served academically talented students: (1) the Gifted and Talented Program (G/T), grades Kindergarten through six; (2) the G/T Seminar (grades seven and eight) and a G/T elective class for grade six students in middle schools; and (3) Advanced Placement Courses, grades seven through 12. The G/T and Advanced Placement programs differ in that G/T instruction is typically interdisciplinary, while Advanced Placement coursework is content-specific. Each school was encouraged to use the state’s guidelines of 8-12% of their population to be identified as gifted and talented, while ensuring access and equity to all students in the school. There was no set percentage of students who could enroll for Pre-AP and AP courses, and these courses were not limited to students who were identified as gifted and talented.

The elementary G/T component served identified gifted students who were nominated, screened, and selected by an Admission, Review and Exit (ARE) committee for an interdisciplinary “pull-in” program. Identified students were to be served for a minimum of two hours each week, and schools were strongly encouraged to schedule between two and four hours per week for G/T instruction. In middle schools, the G/T Interdisciplinary Seminar was usually offered as an elective course. Secondary students took Advanced Placement coursework by enrolling in Pre-Advanced Placement (Pre-AP) courses at the middle school or high school level or Advanced Placement (AP) courses at the high school level. In addition, four magnet schools (Polk Vanguard, Spence Academy, Travis Vanguard and Academy, and the TAG Magnet High School) served identified gifted students from across the district.

**Commitment 6**

The Dallas Independent School District shall maintain programs for talented and gifted students in all elementary, middle, and high schools in accordance with the requirements of State law. The district shall be diligent in its efforts to identify all eligible or qualified students, and to encourage parents and students to participate in the programs. It shall be the policy of the district that properly identified students shall be served without regard to race, ethnicity, national origin, gender or religion. The district affirms the importance of encouraging and including ethnic minority students in high academic programs and courses. The district shall carefully monitor the selection process so that no student or ethnic group is unfairly excluded.

**Research Questions/Areas**

1. Document the context and student characteristics of the Gifted and Talented (G/T) program in accordance with program guidelines.
2. Describe the selection, placement, and monitoring process of students in the G/T program.
3. Identify program/administrative changes that were implemented in the program after fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.
4. What actions have the program undertaken to encourage parental participation?
5. Identify the achievement levels of G/T students on the *TAKS Reading, Mathematics, and Writing* tests.
Methodology

Demographic, enrollment, and TAKS testing results were taken from the Dallas ISD student databases. Additional context information was taken from Dallas ISD test data bases.

Results

The program consisted of three components: (1) A G/T program for students in grades kindergarten through five; (2) A G/T seminar for students in grades seven and eight, and a G/T elective class for middle school sixth grade students; and (3) Advanced placement courses for students in grades seven through 12. Although all components serve gifted learners, they are quite different. G/T instruction is typically interdisciplinary, while Advanced Placement instruction is content specific. An additional aspect of the program included parent/community participation.

- Students may be admitted into the program in two ways: (1) Nomination by test occurs when a student scores above the 88th percentile on the Mathematics Total or Reading Total subtest of a norm-referenced test (e.g., Iowa Tests of Basic Skills [ITBS] or Logramos); and (2) Nomination/recommendation by a teacher, parent, administrator, peer, community member, or by the student’s self-recommendation.

- An Admission Review and Exit (ARE) Committee of at least three local school educators trained in G/T education can also place students in the program.

- G/T program services were provided at 221 schools.
  - At grades KN through six, a total of 9,337 (11.6%) students received program services (68.6% were Hispanic, 20.5% African American, 8.3% White, 2.4% Asian, and 0.2% Native American).
  - At grades seven through 12, 9,215 (18.7%) students received program services (62.0% Hispanic, 25.4% African American, 9.8% White, 2.4% Asian, and 0.4% Native American).

- There have been no significant changes to the program since fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.

TAKS passing (met standard) and commended performance rates of G/T students exceeded those of other district students at all grade levels in all subjects (Figures 27-36). Overall, TAKS passing rates for G/T students were at least 96% for all TAKS tests, while commended rates were at least 53%.
TAKS Reading passing rates for G/T students were 98.9%, compared to 80.5% for the remainder of the district. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the G/T students attained commended performance on TAKS Reading, compared to 18% of the other district students (Figures 27-28).

Figure 27: Percent of G/T and other district students who met the passing standard on the TAKS Reading test.

Figure 28: Percent of G/T and other district students who achieved commended performance on the TAKS Reading test.
The TAKS Mathematics passing rate for G/T students was 97.3%, compared to 71.8% for the remainder of the district. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the G/T students scored at commended or above levels, compared to 15% of the other district students (Figures 29-30).

![Figure 29](image1.png)

Figure 29: Percent of G/T and other district students who met the passing standard on the TAKS Mathematics test.

![Figure 30](image2.png)

Figure 30: Percent of G/T and other district students who achieved commended performance on the TAKS Mathematics test.
TAKS Writing passing rates were 98.9% for G/T students and 87.9% for other district students. Commended passing rate for G/T students was 55.2%, compared to 18.1% for other district students (Figures 31-32).

![Figure 31: Percent of G/T and other district students who met the passing standard on the TAKS Writing test.](image)

![Figure 32: Percent of G/T and other district students who achieved commended performance on the TAKS Writing test.](image)
TAKS Social Studies passing rates were 99.8% for G/T students and 91.7% for other district students. The commended passing rate for G/T students was 73.1%, compared to 32.2% for other district students (Figures 33-34).

Figure 33: Percent of G/T and other district students who met the passing standard on the TAKS Social Studies test.

Figure 34: Percent of G/T and other district students who achieved commended performance on the TAKS Social Studies test.
TAKS Science passing rates were 96.3% for G/T students and 65.4% for other district students. Commended passing rate for G/T students was 52.9%, compared to 14.8% for other district students (Figures 35-36).

Figure 35: Percent of G/T and other district students who met the passing standard on the TAKS Science test.

Figure 36: Percent of G/T and other district students who achieved commended performance on the TAKS Science test.
Status

The G/T program consisted of three components: (1) A G/T program for students in grades Kindergarten through six; (2) A G/T seminar for students in grades seven and eight, and a G/T elective class for middle school sixth grade students; and (3) Advanced placement courses for students in grades seven through 12. Although all components serve gifted learners, they are quite different. G/T instruction is typically interdisciplinary, while Advanced Placement instruction is content specific. An additional aspect of the program included parent/community participation. Students may be admitted into the program in two ways: (1) Nomination by test occurs when a student scores above the 88th percentile on the Mathematics Total or Reading Total subtest of a norm-referenced test (e.g., Iowa Tests of Basic Skills [ITBS] or Logramos); and (2) Nomination/recommendation by a teacher, parent, administrator, peer, community member, or by the student’s self-recommendation. Selection, or placement in the program, was made by an ARE Committee of at least three local school educators who had received Gifted and Talented training. Multiple screening and assessment measures were used to monitor and improve the selection process to ensure that no student or ethnic group was unfairly excluded.

The program served a predominately disadvantaged population (Hispanics and African Americans). However, Asians and Whites were proportionately over represented when compared to district proportions.

Actions taken to encourage parent/community participation included parent/community training, PTA meetings, advertising in local newspapers, and parent-teacher conferences. There have been no significant changes to the program since fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.

TAKS Reading passing rates for G/T students were 98.9%, compared to 80.5% for the remainder of the district. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the G/T student’s attained commended performance on TAKS Reading, compared to 18% of the other district students.

TAKS Mathematics passing rate for G/T students was 97.3%, compared to 71.8% for the remainder of the district. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the G/T students scored at commended or above levels, compared to 15% of the other district students.

TAKS Writing passing rates were 98.9% for G/T students and 87.9% for other district students. Commended passing rate for G/T students was 55.2%, compared to 18.1% for other district students.

TAKS Social Studies passing rates were 99.8% for G/T students and 91.7% for other district students. Commended passing rate for G/T students was 73.1%, compared to 32.2% for other district students.

TAKS Science passing rates were 96.3% for G/T students and 65.4% for other district students. Commended passing rate for G/T students was 52.9%, compared to 14.8% for other district students.

TAKS passing (met standard) and commended performance rates of G/T students exceeded those of other district students at all grade levels in all subjects. Overall, TAKS passing rates for G/T students were at least 96% for all TAKS tests, while commended rates were at least 53%.
**Learning Centers**

**Program Description**

The Learning Centers were originally court-ordered efforts to provide quality educational programs in neighborhood schools for disadvantaged children in order to narrow the achievement difference between majority and minority students. The Centers were established in the 1980’s as an alternative to busing students from South and West Dallas to schools in other parts of the district. The concept of the Learning Center is based upon the philosophy that a history of educational deprivation under conditions of poverty can be overcome. Sixteen Centers have been established as Learning Centers since 1984-85; including 12 elementary (grades four and five) and four middle Learning Centers (grades six through eight). The Centers offered a unique combination of programs and staffing, including an extended school day, a mathematics improvement plan, parent involvement programs, and additional administrative and support staff.

**Commitment 7**

The Dallas Independent School District shall maintain the South Dallas, West Dallas, and East Dallas Learning Centers. The district shall provide a Learning Center Management Plan to address administrative, staffing, evaluation, instruction, and other issues important to the mission of these centers to support and further the achievement of the students. The district recognizes that these Learning Centers may develop exemplary practices that may be utilized in other district schools whose students are similar to those enrolled in the Learning Centers. The district may make revisions to the Learning Center Management Plan to focus on funding, personnel, and programs on the specific needs of the students enrolled at a particular campus. These Learning Centers shall continue to develop educational programs and practices to promote the long-term eradication of the under-education of this identified population.

**Research Questions/Areas**

1. Document the existence and locations of the Learning Centers.
2. Document the existence of a Learning Center Management Plan and the frequency at which the plan is updated.
3. Identify program/administrative changes to the Learning Centers that were implemented after fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.
4. What exemplary programs and practices have been developed and implemented in the Learning Centers to promote the long-term eradication of the under-education of Learning Center students that may be utilized in other district schools whose student population is similar to that of the Learning Centers?
5. Identify the achievement levels of Learning Center students on the TAKS by grade.
**Methodology**

Dallas ISD student data bases were used to gather demographic information and test data.

**Results**

- The district maintained 15 Learning Centers. In 2010 Sequoyah was closed and students were moved to Carver.
  - 11 elementary Centers (grades 4-5) and four middle school Centers (grades 6-8)
  - East Secondary Learning Community (3)—Anderson, Dade, and Spence
  - West Secondary Learning Community(1)—Edison
  - Northeast Elementary Learning Community (4)—Chavez, Dunbar, Kennedy, and Ray
  - Northwest Elementary Learning Community (3)—Carver, Earhart, and Martinez
  - Southeast Elementary Learning Community (4) King, Rhoads, Rice, and Thompson
- The Learning Centers enrolled 4,409 students. At the elementary Centers enrollment was 1,526, while middle school Centers enrolled 2,883 students.
  - 42% African Americans
  - 55% Hispanics
  - 1% Whites
  - 1% Asians and
  - 1% Native Americans
  - 27% LEP
- Program changes implemented after fulfilling the three-year Commitments and Covenants included:
  - May 2009 Board decisions that essentially eliminated the Learning Centers program included:
    - Elimination of all key staff implementing programs unique to the Learning Centers.
    - Cut funding for extended instructional day programs.
    - Cut funding for before and after school programs.
    - Revised the Learning Centers staffing formula such that the Learning Centers are essentially the same as all other district schools; essentially eliminating the Learning Centers concept that has been in place for about 25 years.
- At elementary Centers, pupil/teacher ratios increased from 18:1 to 20:1.
- At middle Centers, pupil/teacher ratios increased from 18:1 to 20:1.
- In 2010 Sequoyah was closed and students were moved to Carver.
Learning Center students performed at a similar rate to district students on the *TAKS Reading* test at both elementary and middle schools (Figure 37). For comparison purposes neither Learning Center nor magnet students were included in district totals.

- 84.1% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 83.6% of district students in grades 4 through 5.
- 77.2% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 79.0% for district students in grades 6 through 8.

![Figure 37: A comparison of TAKS Reading passing rates for Learning Center and district students by grades 4-5 and 6-8 combined.](image)

District students performed at a slightly higher rate on the *TAKS Reading* commended than did Learning Center students at both grades 4-5 and grades 6 through 8 (Figure 38). Learning Center 4-8 commended level was 22.2%, while district commended level for the same grades was 24.7%.

- 26.5% of elementary Learning Center students attained commended level, compared to 28.4% of district students in grades 4 and 5.
- 19.6% of middle Learning Center students attained commended level, compared to 20.9% for district students in grades 6 through 8.

![Figure 38: A comparison of TAKS Reading rates for Learning Center and district students by grades 4-5 and 6-8 combined.](image)
• *TAKS* Reading results by grade indicated that Learning Center students essentially matched or surpassed district student performance at grades 5 and 8, but performed slightly below district students in grades 4 (± 1\%age point) and grade 6 (± 4\%age point) (Figure 39).

![TAKS Reading Pass Rates](image)

**Figure 39:** A comparison of *TAKS Reading* passing rates for Learning Center and district students by grade.

• Overall, elementary Learning Center students performed marginally better on the *TAKS Mathematics* test (+2\%age points) than elementary district students, while middle district students performed at a slightly higher rate than Learning Center students (± 1\%age point) [Figure 40].
  
  • 85.7\% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 84.3\% of district students in grades 4 through 5.
  
  • 70.4\% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 71.4\% for district students in grades 6 through 8.

![TAKS Mathematics Pass Rates](image)

**Figure 40:** A comparison of *TAKS Mathematics* passing rates for Learning Center and district students by grades 4-5 and 6-8 combined.
• Learning Center students performed at a slightly higher rate on the TAKS Mathematics commended at grades 4-5 (+2%age points) and at the same rate for grades 6 through 8 (Figure 41). Learning Center 4-8 commended level was 20.9%, while district commended level for the same grades was 22.5%.

• 32.2% of elementary Learning Center students attained commended level, compared to 30.4% of district students in grades 4 through 5.

• 14.1% of middle Learning Center students attained commended level, compared to 14.3% for district students in grades 6 through 8.

Figure 41: A comparison of TAKS Mathematics commended rates for Learning Center and district students by grades 4-5 and 6-8 combined.

• Learning Center students performed slightly better than district students on the TAKS Mathematics test in grades 5, and 8, and not as well as district students at grades 6 and 7 (Figure 42).

Figure 42: A comparison of TAKS Mathematics passing rates for Learning Center and district students by grade.
Learning Center and district students had similar passing rates (± 1% age points) on the TAKS Writing test at grades 4 and 7 (Figure 43).

- 87.1% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 88.8% of district students in grade 4.
- 87.4% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 88.1% for district students in grade 7.

Figure 43: A comparison of TAKS Writing passing rates for Learning Center and district students by grade.

Learning Center and district students had similar commended rates (± 2% age points) on the TAKS Writing test at grade 4 and (± 3% age points) at grade 7 (Figure 44).

- 21.7% of elementary Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 23.1% of district students in grade 4.
- 23.7% of middle Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 20.5% for district students in grades 7.

Figure 44: A comparison of TAKS Writing commended rates for Learning Center and district students by grade.
• Learning Center students and district students performed at similar levels on the TAKS Science test (Figure 45).
  • 76.7% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 77.3% of district students in grade 5.
  • 64.0% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 65.0% for district students in grade 8.

![Figure 45: A comparison of TAKS Science passing rates for Learning Center and district students at grades 5 and 8.](image)

• Learning Center and district students had differences in commended rates (± 4%age points) on the TAKS Science test at grade 5 and at grade 7 (Figure 46).
  • 34.9% of elementary Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 30.5% of district students in grade 5.
  • 11.0% of middle Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 15.3% for district students in grade 8.

![Figure 46: A comparison of TAKS Science commended rates for Learning Center and district students at grades 5 and 8.](image)
• District performance on the TAKS Social Studies test was above that of Learning Center students at grade 8, for both met standard and commended levels (Figure 47).
  • 89.8% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 91.8% of district students in grade 8.
  • 25.8% of middle Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 31.4% for district students in grade 8.

Figure 47: A comparison of TAKS Social Studies passing and commended rates for Learning Center and district students at grade 8.

Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS)

• AEIS ratings for 2010-11 Learning Centers are presented in Table 3 [Estimates of 2010-11 AEIS ratings].
  o 1 school rated as Unacceptable.
  o 10 schools rated as Acceptable
  o 2 schools rated as Recognized.
  o 2 schools rated as Exemplary
Table 3
Learning Centers AEIS Ratings, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earhart</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoyah&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>%Exemplary</th>
<th>12.5</th>
<th>25.0</th>
<th>13.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%Recognized</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Acceptable</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Unacceptable</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Dade was closed as an elementary Learning Center in 2006-07 and reopened as middle Learning Center.

<sup>2</sup>Spence became middle Learning Center in 2006-07.

<sup>3</sup>Sequoyah was closed and students moved to Carver.
The district maintained 15 Learning Centers in East, West, and South Dallas, inclusive. The Centers served a predominately disadvantaged population and employed exemplary programs and practices that promote the long-term eradication of the under-education of disadvantaged students. However, the Board adopted a revised staffing formula and eliminated funding to various programs specific to the Learning Centers. These decisions essentially eliminated the Learning Centers’ program and made those schools (Learning Centers) essentially the same as other district schools. For additional information, see Final Evaluation Report on the Learning Centers (EA09-155-2).

The Learning Centers enrolled 4,409 students. At the elementary Centers enrollment was 1,526, while middle school Centers enrolled 2,883 students. Forty-two Percent (42%) were African Americans, 55% Hispanic, 1% each for Whites, Asians and Native Americans. Twenty-seven percent (27%) were LEP students.

Learning Center students performed at a similar rate to district students on the TAKS Reading test at both elementary and middle schools, 84.1% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 83.6% of district students in grades 4 through 5 and 77.2% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 79.0% for district students in grades 6 through 8. District students performed at a slightly higher rate on the TAKS Reading commended than did Learning Center students at both grades 4-5 and grades 6 through 8.

Overall, elementary Learning Center students performed marginally better on the TAKS Mathematics test than elementary district students while middle district students performed at a slightly higher rate than Learning Center students, 85.7% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 84.3% of district students in grades 4 through 5 and 70.4% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 71.4% for district students in grades 6 through 8. Learning Center students performed at a slightly higher rate on the TAKS Mathematics commended level at grades 4-5 and at the same rate for grades 6 through 8.

Learning Center and district students had similar passing rates on the TAKS Writing test at grades 4 and 7, 87.1% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 88.8% of district students in grade 4 and 87.4% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 88.1% for district students in grade 7. Learning Center and district students had similar commended rates on the TAKS Writing test at grade 4 and 7.

Learning Center students and district students performed at similar levels on the TAKS Science test, 76.7% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 77.3% of district students in grade 5 and 64.0% of middle Learning Center students met standard, compared to 65.0% for district students in grade 8. Learning Center and district students had differences in commended rates (± 4%age points) on the TAKS Science test 34.9% of elementary Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 30.5% of district students in grade 5 and 11.0% of middle Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 15.3% for district students in grade 8.

District performance on the TAKS Social Studies test was above that of Learning Center students at grade 8, for both met standard and commended levels, 89.8% of elementary Learning Center students met standard, compared to 91.8% of district students in grade 8 and 25.8% of middle Learning Center students attained commended status, compared to 31.4% for district students in grade 8.

AEIS ratings for Learning Centers were: Exemplary (2), Recognized (2), Acceptable (10) and Unacceptable (1).
Elementary and Secondary Bilingual Education and ESL Programs

Program Description

According to the Texas Education Commissioner’s Rules, Title 19 TAC section 89, Subchapter BB, states each school district which has an enrollment of 20 or more limited English proficient (LEP) students in any language classification in the same grade level shall offer a bilingual education (BE) program in pre-kindergarten through the elementary grades (PK-6). All LEP students for whom the district is not required to offer a BE program shall be provided an English as a Second Language (ESL) program regardless of the students’ grade levels, home language, or number of such students as stated in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC), Chapter 89, 1996.

Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001) ensures the civil rights of LEP students regarding access to the school’s curriculum while learning English. Supporting a comprehensive approach to meeting the needs of LEP students, it holds campuses, districts, and states accountable for the achievement of LEP students. It requires all LEP students to participate annually in the state’s academic skills and English language proficiency assessments, which are aligned with the state’s academic standards.

Following Federal, State, and local policies concerning the education of LEP students, the Dallas Independent School District Multi-Language Enrichment Program (M-LEP) provides various BE/ESL programs in grades PK through 12 to meet the affective, linguistic and academic needs of LEP students. The goal of the program is to help LEP students acquire English proficiency and facilitate their timely integration into the mainstream curriculum to ensure equal educational opportunity.

Instructional models implemented at elementary schools included One-way Immersion Program (grades PK through 5), Two-way Immersion Program (grades PK through 5), Transitional Bilingual instruction (grade 6), the Newcomer Program (grades 4 through 6), and ESL (grades PK through 6). The Two-way Immersion (TWI) program was implemented in 20 elementary schools in grades PK-5. The One-way Immersion program, which is similar to the Two-way Immersion Program, but the classroom composition is different, was implemented in 143 schools at grades PK-5. Instructional models implemented at middle and high schools included ESL, Sheltered Classes, and English Language Institute (all in grades 6 through 12).

Commitment 9

The district shall maintain bilingual and English as a Second Language programs in grades PK-12 in a comprehensive effort to meet the affective, linguistic, and academic needs of LEP students. In elementary schools, the program shall focus on teaching English and subject matter through developmental bilingual classrooms, shared teaching, ESL self-contained classes, and send-in ESL teachers. In secondary schools, the ESL program shall provide LEP students with sequential instruction in ESL, sheltered English, and other sheltered content courses in mathematics, science, and social studies. The programs shall be based upon current best practices and shall be designed to help LEP students acquire English proficiency and facilitate their integration into the mainstream curriculum to ensure equal educational opportunity. The district shall encourage teachers to seek ESL certification and will provide professional development opportunities for the same.
Research Questions/Areas

1. Identify the number of schools and the demographic characteristics of students in Bilingual (BE) and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs in grades PK-12.
2. At the elementary level, identify instructional models used to focus on teaching developmental English.
3. Identify the effectiveness of ESL and Sheltered courses at helping LEP students acquire English proficiency and facilitate their integration into the mainstream curriculum.
4. Identify incentives used to encourage teachers to seek ESL certification and professional development opportunities.
5. Identify program funding and changes implemented after fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.
6. Identify performance levels of LEP students on the TAKS and Woodcock Muñoz Language Survey.

Methodology

A review of the 2010-11 Final Evaluation Report for the Multi-Language Enrichment Program (EA11-126-2) was used to document the existence of the BE/ESL program. Student demographic and achievement data were obtained from the district’s student database.

Results

- The district maintained a BE/ESL program in grades PK-12 to meet the affective, linguistic and academic needs of LEP students.
  - Transitional Bilingual Program—grade 6
  - Newcomer Program—grades 4-6
  - ESL—grades PK-6
  - ESL/Sheltered—grades 6-12
  - One-Way Immersion Program—grades PK-5
  - Two-Way Immersion Program—grades PK-4
  - English Language Institute (ELI)—grades 6-12
- A total 53,429 (up from 51,157 last year) LEP or English Language Learners (ELL) were served.
  - 658 were enrolled in the Transitional Bilingual Program (Transitional program was only in elementary schools with sixth grade),
  - 4,811 were enrolled in the ESL Program,
  - 56 were enrolled in the Newcomer/English Language Institute Programs,
  - 36,715 were enrolled in the One-way Immersion Program,
  - 1,956 were enrolled in the Two-way Immersion Program, and
• 9,233 were enrolled in Sheltered Courses.

• At the secondary level the M-LEP department developed a four to five year sequence of ESL and Sheltered courses that students followed until they met exit criteria and moved into mainstream instruction.

• The only significant change to the program since fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants has been the introduction of the Two-way Immersion program in grades PK through 5.

LEP students' WMLS performance indicated that a high percentage of LEP students meet exit criterion on the WMLS (WMLS ≥ 4) at grades 1 through 4. In fact, these were students who indicated a language other than English spoken at home on the language survey, but placed out due to their English language skills (WMLS ≥ 4). The One-way and Two-way Immersion programs were designed for LEP students to exit the program at grade 5 (Figure 48). There was an overall decline in the percentage of students meeting the exit criterion from grades 6-12. Eighty-four percent (84%) of the students tested on the WMLS at grades 1-12 failed to acquire language proficiency, compared to 77% in 2010. Exit ed LEP students continued to outperform LEP and district students on TAKS Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Social Studies and Science tests across all grade levels.

Figure 48: Percent of LEP students scoring at WMLS ≤3 and WMLS ≥4 by grade.
Exited LEP student’s outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Reading test across all grade levels (Figures 49 and 50). Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 77.4%, Exited LEP students were 94.3% and district students were 83.7%. Commended levels were 23.3% for LEP students, 22.8% for Exited LEP students and 24.5% for district students.

Figure 49: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP and district passing rates on the TAKS Reading test by grade.

Figure 50: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP and district commended rates on the TAKS Reading test by grade.
In general, Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the *TAKS Mathematics* test across all grade levels (exception met standard grades 9 and 10) [Figures 51 and 52]. Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 74.5%, Exited LEP students were 82.8% and district students were 76.2%. Commended levels were 20.3% for LEP students, 21.9% for Exited LEP students and 21.5% for district students.

![Figure 51: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district passing rates on the TAKS Mathematics test by grade.](image)

![Figure 52: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district commended rates on the TAKS Mathematics test by grade.](image)
Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels on the *TAKS Writing* test at grade seven. The Immersion program allows students to exit at grades five or higher, therefore there are no Exited LEP students at grade four. (Figure 53). Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 79.6%, Exited LEP students were 97.5% and district students were 88.6%. Commended levels were 7.5% for LEP students, 33.0% for Exited LEP students and 23.9% for district students.

![Figure 53: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district passing rates on the TAKS Writing test by grade.](image-url)
• Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Science test at grades five, eight and ten (Figures 54 and 55). Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 62.2%, Exited LEP students were 82.9% and district students were 73.6%. Commended levels were 16.8% for LEP students, 18.9% for Exited LEP students and 20.4% for district students.

Figure 54: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district passing rates on the TAKS Science test by grade.

Figure 55: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district commended rates on the TAKS Science test by grade.
Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Social Studies test at grades eight and ten (Figures 56 and 57). Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 83.9%, Exited LEP students were 97.0% and district students were 91.1%. Commended levels were 17.7% for LEP students, 42.9% for Exited LEP students and 34.2% for district students.

Figure 56: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district passing rates on the TAKS Social Studies test by grade.

Figure 57: A comparison of Exited LEP, LEP, and district commended rates on the TAKS Social Studies test by grade.
The Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) attainment standards set in September 2010 required 13% of grades one through four ELL students to score Advanced High and 25% of grades five through 12 to score Advanced High. Twenty-five percent (25%) of students in grades one through four scored Advanced High and about 39% of the students in grades five through 12 scored Advanced High (Figure 57).

Figure 58: Comparison of spring 2010 and spring 2011 percent of grades three through 12 ELL students reaching Advanced High on TELPAS composite rating.
The district maintained a BE/ESL program in grades PK-12 to meet the affective, linguistic, and academic needs of LEP or ELL students. Instructional models implemented at elementary schools included One-way Immersion Program (grades PK through 5), Two-way Immersion Program (grades PK through 5), Transitional Bilingual instruction (grade 6), the Newcomer Program (grades 4 through 6), and ESL (grades PK through 6). The Two-way Immersion (TWI) program was implemented in 20 elementary schools in grades PK-4. The One-way Immersion program, which is similar to the Two-way Immersion Program, but the classroom composition is different, was implemented in 143 schools at grades PK-5. Instructional models implemented at middle and high schools included ESL, Sheltered Classes, and English Language Institute (all in grades 6 through 12). The only significant change to the program since fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants has been the introduction of the Two-way Immersion program in grades PK through 5.

WMLS results indicated that an extremely high percentage of LEP students met exit criterion on the WMLS ($\text{WMLS} \geq 4$) at grades 1 through 4. In fact, these were students who indicated a language other than English spoken at home on the language survey, but placed out of the program due to their English language skills ($\text{WMLS} \geq 4$). Eighty-four percent (84%) of the students tested on the WMLS at grades 1-12 failed to acquire language proficiency, compared to 77% in 2010. Exited LEP students continued to outperform LEP and district students on TAKS Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Social Studies and Science tests across all grade levels, with the exception of grades 9 and 10 mathematics.

Exited LEP student’s outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Reading test across all grade levels. Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 77.4%, Exited LEP students were 94.3% and district students were 83.7%. Commended levels were 23.3% for LEP students, 22.8% for Exited LEP students and 24.5% for district students.

In general, Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Mathematics test across all grade levels (exception met standard grades 9 and 10). Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 74.5%, Exited LEP students were 82.8% and district students were 76.2%. Commended levels were 20.3% for LEP students, 21.9% for Exited LEP students and 21.5% for district students.

Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels on the TAKS Writing test at grade seven. The Immersion program allows students to exit at grades five or higher, therefore there are no Exited LEP students at grade four. Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 79.6%, Exited LEP students were 97.5% and district students were 88.6%. Commended levels were 7.5% for LEP students, 33.0% for Exited LEP students and 23.9% for district students.

Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Science test at grades five, eight and ten. Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 62.2%, Exited LEP students were 82.9% and district students were 73.6%. Commended levels were 16.8% for LEP students, 18.9% for Exited LEP students and 20.4% for district students.

Exited LEP students outperformed LEP and district students on both the met standard and commended levels of the TAKS Social Studies test at grades eight and ten. Overall, met standard levels for LEP students were 83.9%, Exited LEP students were 97.0% and district students were 91.1%. Commended levels were 17.7% for LEP students, 42.9% for Exited LEP students and 34.2% for district students.

The Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) attainment standards set in September 2010 required 13% of grades one through four ELL students to score Advanced High and 25% of grades five through 12 to score Advanced High. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of students in grades one through four scored Advanced High and approximately 25% of the students in grades three through 12 scored Advanced High.
SUMMARY

Early Childhood Education

The district maintained an Early Childhood education program in 141 schools. At grade PK, the program served a total of 8,561 students with a student/teacher ratio of 11:1. About 78% of the students served were Hispanic. Although the program continued to serve students in grades PK-3, the program’s focus was ages 0 to 5. For this population, program services were provided through community-based childcare agencies (School Readiness Integration (SRI) partnerships). The program continued to use many of the best practices outlined in the Model for Success best practices guide in PK classrooms with the addition of tiered professional development and the development of small professional PK Learning Communities. Likewise, the program continued to use traditional parental involvement activities such as HIPPY, parent conferences, Virtual classrooms and a Parent Involvement/Education specialist who conducted parent training at schools and community sites as needed. The most commonly used diagnostic and prescriptive measures continued to be Dial 3, benchmarks and teacher-made tests, C-PALLS+ was used in 2009-2010 at 56 schools in and again in 2010-11. The overall TAKS passing rate (all students) at grade 3 was 84.3% in reading and 80.7% in mathematics, compared to 84.8% in reading and 78.2% in mathematics for 2009-2010. The majority of students tested at grade three acquired mastery (met standard) in reading and mathematics.

Magnet Schools

The district maintained the original 10 magnet high schools (including six at the Yvonne Ewell Townview Center and one Career Development Center at Skyline High School) and opened four additional magnet high schools. The district maintained 10 academy middle schools and the seven vanguard elementary schools. Two Montessori middle schools and two Montessori elementary schools are included in the Academies and Vanguards. The magnet program served an ethnically diverse population of predominantly disadvantaged students with a total enrollment of 8,859 students (55.2% Hispanic, 26.4% African American, 12.5% White, 2.9% Asian and 0.3% Native Americans). Of these 3.8% were LEP students.

The program continued to use a review committee to determine students’ eligibility, while seats were awarded on a 30/70 split (30% districtwide and 70% within each Learning Community). Administrative changes implemented after fulfilling the three-year Commitments and Covenants included; 1) Decentralization of administrative oversight, 2) Closure of M. Jackson Vanguard, 3) Darrell opened as a Vanguard, 4) Closure of Darrell as a Vanguard, 5) Stark opened as a Vanguard, 6) Four high schools restructured as magnet schools – Seagoville, Roosevelt, Kimball and Pinkston, 7) Magnet principals reported to Learning Communities’ Executive Directors, 8) Addition of one grade per year to Irma Rangel Young Women’s Leadership School until the school spans grades 6-12, and 9) Grade six moved from the Vanguards to the Academies, except at Montessori schools.

Magnet high schools, academies and vanguards posted higher passing (met standard) and commended rates on the TAKS Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies tests than non-magnet students.

In general, the percent of Magnet students achieving commended performance more than doubled that of other district students across all grade levels.

Magnet schools received the following AEIS ratings: Exemplary (15), Recognized (6), Acceptable (4), and Unacceptable (6) [Estimates of 2010-11 AEIS ratings].
Gifted and Talented

The G/T program consisted of three components: (1) A G/T program for students in grades Kindergarten through five; (2) A G/T seminar for students in grades seven and eight, and a G/T elective class for middle school sixth grade students; and (3) Advanced placement courses for students in grades seven through 12. Although all components serve gifted learners, they are quite different. G/T instruction is typically interdisciplinary, while Advanced Placement instruction is content specific. An additional aspect of the program included parent/community participation. Students may be admitted into the program in two ways: (1) Nomination by test occurs when a student scores above the 88th percentile on the Mathematics Total or Reading Total subtest of a norm-referenced test (e.g., *Iowa Tests of Basic Skills* [ITBS] or *Logramos*); and (2) Nomination/recommendation by a teacher, parent, administrator, peer, community member, or by the student's self-recommendation. Selection, or placement in the program, was made by an ARE Committee of at least three local school educators who had received Gifted and Talented training. Multiple screening and assessment measures were used to monitor and improve the selection process to ensure that no student or ethnic group was unfairly excluded.

The program served a predominately disadvantaged population (Hispanics and African Americans). However, Asians and Whites were proportionately over represented when compared to district proportions.

Actions taken to encourage parent/community participation included parent/community training, PTA meetings, advertising in local newspapers, and parent-teacher conferences. There have been no significant changes to the program since fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants.

*TAKS* passing (met standard) and commended performance rates of G/T students exceeded those of other district students at all grade levels in all subjects. Overall, *TAKS* passing rates for G/T students were at least 96% for all *TAKS* tests, while commended rates were at least 53%. In general, the percent of G/T students achieving commended performance more than doubled that of other district students across all grade levels.

Learning Centers

The district maintained 15 Learning Centers in East, West, and South Dallas, inclusive. The Centers served a predominately disadvantaged population and employed exemplary programs and practices that promote the long-term eradication of the under-education of disadvantaged students. However, in May 2009 the Board adopted a revised staffing formula and eliminated funding to various programs specific to the Learning Centers. These decisions essentially eliminated the Learning Centers’ program and made those schools (Learning Centers) essentially the same as other district schools. For additional information, see Final Evaluation Report on the Learning Centers (EA09-155-2).

The Learning Centers enrolled 4,409 students. At the elementary Centers enrollment was 1,526, while middle school Centers enrolled 2,883 students. Forty-two Percent (42%) were African Americans, 55% Hispanics, 1% each for Whites, Asians and Native Americans. Twenty-seven percent (27%) were LEP students.

*TAKS* results indicated that, in general, elementary Learning Center students had a slight performance advantage over elementary district students, but did not do as well at the middle school level. AEIS ratings for Learning Centers were Exemplary (2), Recognized (2), Acceptable (10) and Unacceptable (1) [Estimates of 2010-11 AEIS ratings].
Bilingual/ESL

The district maintained a BE/ESL program in grades PK-12 to meet the affective, linguistic, and academic needs of LEP or ELL students. Instructional models implemented at elementary schools included One-way Immersion Program (grades PK through 5), Two-way Immersion Program (grades PK through 5), Transitional Bilingual instruction (grade 6), the Newcomer Program (grades 4 through 6), and ESL (grades PK through 6). The Two-way Immersion (TWI) program was implemented in 20 elementary schools in grades PK-4. The One-way Immersion program, which is similar to the Two-way Immersion Program, but the classroom composition is different, was implemented in 143 schools at grades PK-5. Instructional models implemented at middle and high schools included ESL, Sheltered Classes, and English Language Institute (all in grades 6 through 12).

The only significant change to the program since fulfilling the Commitments and Covenants has been the introduction of the Two-way Immersion program in grades PK through 5.

LEP students’ WMLS performance indicated that a high percentage of LEP students met exit criterion on the WMLS (WMLS ≥ 4) at grades 1 through 4. However, the Two-way Immersion program was designed for LEP students to exit the program at grade 5. There was an overall decline in the percentage of students meeting the exit criterion from grades 6-12. Eighty-four percent (84%) of the students tested on the WMLS at grades 1-12 failed to acquire language proficiency, compared to 77% in 2010.

Exited LEP students continued to outperform LEP and district students on TAKS Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Social Studies and Science tests across all grade levels, with the exception of grades 9 and 10 mathematics.

The Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) attainment standards set in September 2010 required 13% of grades one through four ELL students to score Advanced High and 25% of grades five through 12 to score Advanced High. Twenty-five percent (25%) of students in grades one through four scored Advanced High and approximately 39% of the students in grades five through 12 scored Advanced High.