# Fort Worth ISD Student Outcome Goals and Goal Progress Measures

**District Mission:** Preparing **all** Students for Success in College, Career, and Community Leadership.

## **Goal 1 Early Literacy**

Percent of students in grade 3 reading on or above grade level, as measured by the STAAR on level standard for reading, will increase from 30 percent to 43 percent by 2019.

#### **Goal 1 Annual Targets**

School Year	Percentage
2015-16 (Baseline)	30%
2016–17	33%
2017–18	37%
2018–19	43%

#### Goal Progress Measure (GPM) 1.1

Percent of students in kindergarten-grade 3 reading on or above grade level as measured by

DATE ISSUED: 2/9/2018 LDU 2018.01 AE(EXHIBIT)-X

**GPM 1.2 Annual Targets** 

School Year	Percentage
2015–16	N/A
2016–17	(Baseline)
2017–18	Y%
2018–19	Y%

PM) 1.3

making progress as measured by the District's local assessindings and skills in reading will increase from 41 percent to

ear	Percentage
seline)	41%
7	47%
3	53%
)	59%

R Algebra I EOC examination by nt by 2019.

Percentage

DATE ISSUED: 2/9/2018

## **Goal Progress Measure (GPM) 2.1**

Percent of students in grades 6–8 performing on or above grade level standard on their STAAR math assessment will increase from 22 percent to 30 percent by 2019.

**GPM 2.1 Annual Targets** 

School Year	Percentage
2015–16 (Baseline)	22%
2016–17	24%
2017–18	27%
2018–19	30%

Fort Worth ISD 220905

## **Goal Progress Measure (GPM) 3.3**

Percent of graduates completing a CTE coherent sequence of courses will increase from 35 percent to 40 percent by 2019.

**GPM 3.3 Annual Targets** 

School Year	Percentage
2015–16 (Baseline)	35%
2016–17	36%
2017–18	38%
2018–19	40%

# Fort Worth ISD Board Constraints for the Superintendent and Constraint Progress Measures

**District Mission:** Preparing **all** Students for Success in College, Career, and Community Leadership.

#### **Constraint 1**

The Superintendent shall not allow a low level of campus culture satisfaction.

### Constraint Progress Measure (CPM) 1.1

Percent of teacher attendance, as measured by employee attendance data, will increase from 94.6 percent to 95.6 percent by 2019.

#### CPM 1.1 Annual Targets

School Year	Percentage
2016-17 (Baseline)	94.6%
2017–18	95.1%
2018–19	95.6%

#### **Constraint Progress Measure (CPM) 1.2**

Percent of campuses with positive staff responses on campus survey about the "Campus Direction" will increase from X percent to Y percent by 2019.

#### CPM 1.2 Annual Targets Constraint Progress Measure (CPM) 1.2

School Year	Percentage
2016–17 (New Measure)	Y%
2017–18	Y%
2018–19	Y%

**DATE ISSUED: 2/9/2018** 

School Year	Percentage
2016-17 (Baseline)	88.4%
2017–18	88.6%
2018–19	88.8%

## **Constraint Progress Measure (CPM) 1.4**

Percent of campus with students responding positively to campus surveys shall increase from X percent to Y percent by 2019.

## CPM 1.4 Annual Targets

**School Year** 

Percentage

DATE ISSUED: 2/9/2018 LDU 2018.01

## **Constraint Progress Measure (CPM) 3.1**

Percent of campuses meeting the District's standard of two weekly lessons on the District's progress monitoring system for reading will increase from X percent to Y percent by Z (2016–17 is the implementation year; these targets will be sent in June 2017 when baseline data are available).

CPM 3.1 Annual Targets

School Year	Percentage
2016–17 (Baseline)	Y%
2017–18	Y%
2018–19	Y%

## **Constraint Progress Measure (CPM) 3.2**

Percent of teachers continuing assignment at "District initiative" campuses, as measured by the District's annual staffing report, will increase from X percent to Y percent by Z.

#### CPM 3.2 Annual Targets

School Year	Percentage
2016–17 (New Measure)	Υ%
2017–18	Υ%

2018-

DATE ISSUED: 2/9/2018