

Arlington Independent School District

District Improvement Plan

2024-2025



Table of Contents

Comprehensive Needs Assessment	3
Demographics	3
Student Achievement	4
Priority Problem Statements	7
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation	9
Goals	11
Goal 1: Literacy Performance	11
Goal 2: Mathematics Performance	15
Goal 3: Science Performance	19
Goal 4: College Career and Military Readiness (CCMR)	21
Goal 5: Safety & Discipline	23
Goal 6: Culture and Systems	25
Goal 7: Attendance	29
State Compensatory	30
Budget for District Improvement Plan	30
Assurances	31
Statutorily Required Assurances	31
District Funding Summary	32

Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Demographics

Demographics Summary

	AISD Count	AISD Percent	State Count	State Percent
African American	15,016	26.80%	705,310	12.80%
Hispanic	26,920	48.00%	2,915,219	53.00%
White	9,304	16.60%	1,410,571	25.60%
American Indian	238	0.40%	17,920	0.30%
Asian	2,805	5.00%	280,306	5.10%
Pacific Islander	112	0.20%	8,696	0.20%
Two or More Races	1,706	3.00%	166,128	3.00%
Economically Disadvantaged	42,237	75.30%	3,415,987	62.10%
Emergent Bilingual	17,353	30.90%	1,269,408	23.10%
At-Risk	36,385	64.80%	2,935,164	53.30%
Special Education	6,005	10.70%	693,061	12.60%

Student Achievement

Student Achievement Summary

	All Students	Econ Disadv	Non-Econ Disadv	EB/EL (Current)	EB/EL (Current & Monitored)	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continuously Enrolled	Non-Continuously Enrolled	Highly Mobile	Foster	Homeless	Migrant
All Subjects													
Percent of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	67%	62%	83%	61%	62%	39%	68%	69%	62%	51%	64%	51%	56%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	38%	32%	60%	30%	32%	17%	41%	41%	32%	22%	50%	22%	33%
At Masters GL Standard	13%	9%	26%	9%	10%	3%	15%	15%	10%	5%	14%	5%	11%
Number of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	52,842	37,791	15,051	16,843	17,637	4,272	1,221	38,743	14,099	1,111	9	1,097	5
At Meets GL Standard or Above	30,324	19,532	10,792	8,424	9,129	1,830	745	23,142	7,182	488	7	478	3
At Masters GL Standard	10,460	5,711	4,749	2,490	2,898	381	275	8,263	2,197	102	2	99	1
Total Tests	78,910	60,789	18,121	27,727	28,554	10,899	1,798	56,202	22,708	2,174	14	2,154	9
Reading/Language Arts (RLA)													
Percent of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	67%	62%	84%	59%	60%	36%	69%	69%	62%	53%	67%	53%	67%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	43%	36%	65%	32%	34%	17%	43%	45%	36%	26%	50%	25%	67%
At Masters GL Standard	14%	10%	28%	9%	10%	3%	15%	15%	10%	5%	17%	5%	33%
Number of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	21,963	15,833	6,130	6,933	7,245	1,678	512	16,049	5,914	485	4	479	2
At Meets GL Standard or Above	13,892	9,133	4,759	3,804	4,104	788	320	10,464	3,428	234	3	229	2
At Masters GL Standard	4,550	2,520	2,030	1,029	1,218	158	113	3,585	965	44	1	42	1
Total Tests	32,649	25,356	7,293	11,735	12,053	4,684	744	23,152	9,497	914	6	906	3
Mathematics													

	All Students	Econ Disadv	Non-Econ Disadv	EB/EL (Current)	EB/EL (Current & Monitored)	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continuously Enrolled	Non-Continuously Enrolled	Highly Mobile	Foster	Homeless	Migrant
Percent of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	65%	60%	81%	63%	64%	39%	67%	67%	59%	46%	40%	46%	50%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	34%	28%	54%	31%	32%	17%	39%	37%	26%	18%	20%	18%	25%
At Masters GL Standard	12%	8%	23%	10%	11%	3%	16%	13%	8%	4%	0%	4%	0%
Number of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	17,255	12,416	4,839	5,779	6,015	1,516	423	12,857	4,398	346	2	342	2
At Meets GL Standard or Above	9,054	5,834	3,220	2,825	3,020	645	250	7,119	1,935	137	1	135	1
At Masters GL Standard	3,090	1,739	1,351	958	1,059	136	100	2,489	601	30	0	30	0
Total Tests	26,578	20,604	5,974	9,186	9,436	3,907	636	19,112	7,466	746	5	739	4
Science													
Percent of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	67%	62%	82%	59%	60%	45%	69%	68%	64%	52%	100%	52%	0%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	33%	27%	54%	24%	26%	16%	43%	35%	27%	18%	100%	18%	0%
At Masters GL Standard	9%	6%	21%	5%	6%	3%	13%	11%	6%	2%	50%	2%	0%
Number of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	7,887	5,619	2,268	2,558	2,687	685	185	5,636	2,251	166	2	164	0
At Meets GL Standard or Above	3,883	2,408	1,475	1,038	1,148	239	117	2,937	946	59	2	57	0
At Masters GL Standard	1,120	545	575	229	280	44	35	894	226	8	1	7	0
Total Tests	11,824	9,070	2,754	4,308	4,446	1,516	270	8,304	3,520	321	2	318	1
Social Studies													
Percent of Tests													
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	73%	68%	86%	63%	65%	50%	68%	75%	69%	59%	100%	59%	100%
At Meets GL Standard or Above	44%	37%	64%	30%	33%	20%	39%	47%	39%	30%	100%	30%	0%
At Masters GL Standard	22%	16%	38%	11%	13%	5%	18%	23%	18%	10%	0%	10%	0%
Number of Tests													

	All Students	Econ Disadv	Non-Econ Disadv	EB/EL (Current)	EB/EL (Current & Monitored)	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continuously Enrolled	Non-Continuously Enrolled	Highly Mobile	Foster	Homeless	Migrant
At Approaches GL Standard or Above	5,737	3,923	1,814	1,573	1,690	393	101	4,201	1,536	114	1	112	1
At Meets GL Standard or Above	3,495	2,157	1,338	757	857	158	58	2,622	873	58	1	57	0
At Masters GL Standard	1,700	907	793	274	341	43	27	1,295	405	20	0	20	0
Total Tests	7,859	5,759	2,100	2,498	2,619	792	148	5,634	2,225	193	1	191	1

Problem Statements Identifying Student Achievement Needs

Problem Statement 1 (Prioritized): Reading outcomes are negatively impacted by the percentage of students earning a score of 0 on the Extended Constructed Response portion of the redesigned STAAR Reading

Root Cause: A need to increase proficiency and use of the (Understanding the question) (U)RACER strategy, TEA scoring rubric knowledge, and connecting Step 2 (Speak in Complete Sentences), 6 (Structured Conversations) and 7 (Structured Reading/Writing Activities) of Sheltered Instruction in the writing process. Additionally, increased learning on iterative writing process with feedback.

Problem Statement 2 (Prioritized): 1st-2nd Grade Reading mClass data regresses when compared to Kindergarten End-of-Year outcomes.

Root Cause: There is a need to bridge the knowing/doing gap as teachers transition from the Balanced Literacy Model to the Science of Teaching Reading with a focus on explicit skills-based literacy instruction.

Problem Statement 3 (Prioritized): Need to increase L2 language proficiency with a focus on listening and speaking.

Root Cause: Deepen integration of Content-Based Literacy Instructional strategies.

Problem Statement 4 (Prioritized): Math outcomes have declined in achievement & growth on STAAR & NWEA MAP in grades 3-6.

Root Cause: Need for implementation for K-Algebra I math teachers on the Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) for mathematics, focusing on the implementation of the Concrete and Representation portion of the CRA model, unit planning leveraging data to drive decisions, teacher moves, and identifying/curating aligned resources.

Problem Statement 5 (Prioritized): Persistent under-performance in 5th and 8th grade science.

Root Cause:

Lack of consistently implemented instructional time for Science at all elementary levels and the need to increase teachers' abilities to plan and facilitate rigorous, TEKS-aligned science instructional tasks.

Problem Statement 6 (Prioritized): Under-performance in Advanced Placement and TSIA2 qualifying scores.

Root Cause: Need to increase proficiency in staff use of a strong data system to progress monitor has resulted in low student performance on AP exams and/or TSIA2 readiness as well as differentiate instruction in the classroom to support students' access to college-level tasks.

Priority Problem Statements

Problem Statement 1: Reading outcomes are negatively impacted by the percentage of students earning a score of 0 on the Extended Constructed Response portion of the redesigned STAAR Reading

Root Cause 1: A need to increase proficiency and use of the (Understanding the question) (U)RACER strategy, TEA scoring rubric knowledge, and connecting Step 2 (Speak in Complete Sentences), 6 (Structured Conversations) and 7 (Structured Reading/Writing Activities) of Sheltered Instruction in the writing process. Additionally, increased learning on iterative writing process with feedback.

Problem Statement 1 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 2: 1st-2nd Grade Reading mClass data regresses when compared to Kindergarten End-of-Year outcomes.

Root Cause 2: There is a need to bridge the knowing/doing gap as teachers transition from the Balanced Literacy Model to the Science of Teaching Reading with a focus on explicit skills-based literacy instruction.

Problem Statement 2 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 3: Need to increase L2 language proficiency with a focus on listening and speaking.

Root Cause 3: Deepen integration of Content-Based Literacy Instructional strategies.

Problem Statement 3 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 4: Math outcomes have declined in achievement & growth on STAAR & NWEA MAP in grades 3-6.

Root Cause 4: Need for implementation for K-Algebra I math teachers on the Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) for mathematics, focusing on the implementation of the Concrete and Representation portion of the CRA model, unit planning leveraging data to drive decisions, teacher moves, and identifying/curating aligned resources.

Problem Statement 4 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 5: Persistent under-performance in 5th and 8th grade science.

Root Cause 5: Lack of consistently implemented instructional time for Science at all elementary levels and the need to increase teachers' abilities to plan and facilitate rigorous, TEKS-aligned science instructional tasks.

Problem Statement 5 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 6: Under-performance in Advanced Placement and TSIA2 qualifying scores.

Root Cause 6: Need to increase proficiency in staff use of a strong data system to progress monitor has resulted in low student performance on AP exams and/or TSIA2 readiness as well as differentiate instruction in the classroom to support students' access to college-level tasks.

Problem Statement 6 Areas: Student Achievement

Problem Statement 7: Increased behavior referrals, particularly highly disruptive and violent behaviors across the district.

Root Cause 7: Need for increased training and support opportunities focused on Science of Behavior, PBIS, and Restorative Practices to build capacity in teachers, administrators and support staff.

Problem Statement 7 Areas: District Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 8: Student attendance is below target and persistently so since Covid-19.

Root Cause 8: Response to compulsory attendance requirements, wellness, etc.

Problem Statement 8 Areas: Family and Community Engagement

Problem Statement 9: Developments and changes to plans can be more consistently communicated and systems for recognition of excellence more broadly applied.

Root Cause 9: Need to increase quality and consistency of internal communication and acknowledgment of good work.

Problem Statement 9 Areas: District Culture and Climate

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Data Documentation

The following data were used to verify the comprehensive needs assessment analysis:

Improvement Planning Data

- District goals
- Campus goals
- HB3 Reading and math goals for PreK-3
- HB3 CCMR goals
- Performance Objectives with summative review (prior year)
- Campus/District improvement plans (current and prior years)
- Planning and decision making committee(s) meeting data
- State and federal planning requirements

Accountability Data

- Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR) data
- Student Achievement Domain
- Student Progress Domain
- Closing the Gaps Domain
- Comprehensive, Targeted, and/or Additional Targeted Support Identification data
- Federal Report Card and accountability data
- RDA data
- Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) data

Student Data: Assessments

- STAAR current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR End-of-Course current and longitudinal results, including all versions
- STAAR released test questions
- STAAR Emergent Bilingual (EB) progress measure data
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and TELPAS Alternate results
- Postsecondary college, career or military-ready graduates including enlisting in U. S. armed services, earning an industry based certification, earning an associate degree, graduating with completed IEP and workforce readiness
- Advanced Placement (AP) and/or International Baccalaureate (IB) assessment data
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant information
- SAT and/or ACT assessment data
- Texas approved PreK - 2nd grade assessment data
- Texas approved Prekindergarten and Kindergarten assessment data

Student Data: Student Groups

- Race and ethnicity data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress between groups
- Special programs data, including number of students, academic achievement, discipline, attendance, and rates of progress for each student group
- Economically disadvantaged / Non-economically disadvantaged performance and participation data

- Male / Female performance, progress, and participation data
- Special education/non-special education population including discipline, progress and participation data
- Migrant/non-migrant population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance and mobility data
- At-risk/non-at-risk population including performance, progress, discipline, attendance, and mobility data
- Emergent Bilingual (EB) /non-EB data, including academic achievement, progress, support and accommodation needs, race, ethnicity, gender etc.
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs of Study data including completer, concentrator, explorer, participant, and non-participant achievements by race, ethnicity, gender, etc.
- Response to Intervention (RtI) student achievement data
- Dual-credit and/or college prep course completion data

Student Data: Behavior and Other Indicators

- Completion rates and/or graduation rates data
- Annual dropout rate data
- Attendance data
- Mobility rate, including longitudinal data
- Discipline records
- Violence and/or violence prevention records
- Tobacco, alcohol, and other drug-use data
- Student surveys and/or other feedback
- School safety data
- Enrollment trends

Employee Data

- Staff surveys and/or other feedback
- Teacher/Student Ratio
- Campus leadership data
- Campus department and/or faculty meeting discussions and data
- Evaluation(s) of professional development implementation and impact

Parent/Community Data

- Parent surveys and/or other feedback

Support Systems and Other Data

- Organizational structure data
- Processes and procedures for teaching and learning, including program implementation
- Communications data
- Budgets/entitlements and expenditures data
- Study of best practices

Goals

Revised/Approved: October 3, 2024







Goal 1: Literacy Performance




Performance Objective 1: All Kindergarten- 2nd grade students will increase their performance in reading on mCLASS from 64% to 72% at the "At Benchmark" level or above.





High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: mCLASS

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Implement One-way Dual Language program Grade 2 bilingual campuses and collaborate with campus and district key stakeholders to strengthen implementation in grades PK-1.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Fidelity Walkthrough Data showing 90% of tracked components being implemented in PK-2 OWDL classrooms in all bilingual campuses by the end of the 24-25 school year.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of World Languages</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 3</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 263 - Title III LEP, - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: All 1st and 2nd grade teachers will be trained in Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) and Decoding strategies that support practices aligned to the Science of Teaching Reading.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 90% of grade 1 and 2 teachers attend and implement learning from professional learning as evidenced by classroom observations.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of Curriculum & Instruction</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 2</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 162 - Special Education, - 211 - Title I-A</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Develop and implement science-based Texas Reads, Texas Leads (TXRL) K-3 Literacy Plans which detail strategic moves, decision points, and district investments to meet academic outcomes goals for early reading proficiency.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Refine and support the coherent implementation of the AISD Comprehensive Literacy Plan using rigorous structured literacy instruction daily using high-quality, science-based materials across elementary campuses.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of Curriculum & Instruction</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 2</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 15%	 20%	 40%	

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Achievement
<p>Problem Statement 2: 1st-2nd Grade Reading mClass data regresses when compared to Kindergarten End-of-Year outcomes. Root Cause: There is a need to bridge the knowing/doing gap as teachers transition from the Balanced Literacy Model to the Science of Teaching Reading with a focus on explicit skills-based literacy instruction.</p> <p>Problem Statement 3: Need to increase L2 language proficiency with a focus on listening and speaking. Root Cause: Deepen integration of Content-Based Literacy Instructional strategies.</p>







Goal 1: Literacy Performance








Performance Objective 2: All students will increase their performance in reading on STAAR/EOC from 70% to 72% at the approaches level or above, from 45% to 46% at the meets level or above, and from 15% to 17% at the masters level.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: STAAR Reading and English I and II STAAR EOC

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Reading Language Arts teachers in grades 3-10 will be trained on the writing process and tools to support the recursive writing process and focused feedback for student revision of writing (Extended Constructed Responses) including STAAR rubrics, Writable grading tool and using sheltered-instruction strategies (steps 2, 6, 7).</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Observed classrooms will demonstrate student's receipt and use of constructive feedback to become more proficient writers thereby decreasing the volume of zeros earned on the Extended/Short Constructed Response portions of reading STAAR.</p> <p>10% decrease in the volume of zeros earned on the Extended/Short Constructed Response portions of reading STAAR for students in grades 3-10.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coordinator of Reading Language Arts Lead Specialist of World Languages</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 263 - Title III LEP, - 211 - Title I-A, - 199 - State Comp</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Introduce Content-Based Language Instruction (CBLI) model using a PK-12 cohort pilot with training for district-wide implementation in summer 2025.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 90% of cohort teachers will implement, provide feedback and refine system for 25-26 district-wide implementation.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Lead Specialist of World Languages</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 3</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 263 - Title III LEP, - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Develop and implement protocols to support campus leadership and teachers to analyze, design and curate high-quality writing tasks aligned to the standards across the content areas.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 90% of campuses will participate in applying the protocol in PLCs and providing feedback on writing tasks designed across content areas.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Director of Teaching & Learning Executive Directors of School Leadership</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1 Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 70%	 85%	 90%	
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:

Student Achievement
<p>Problem Statement 1: Reading outcomes are negatively impacted by the percentage of students earning a score of 0 on the Extended Constructed Response portion of the redesigned STAAR Reading Root Cause: A need to increase proficiency and use of the (Understanding the question) (U)RACER strategy, TEA scoring rubric knowledge, and connecting Step 2 (Speak in Complete Sentences), 6 (Structured Conversations) and 7 (Structured Reading/Writing Activities) of Sheltered Instruction in the writing process. Additionally, increased learning on iterative writing process with feedback.</p> <p>Problem Statement 3: Need to increase L2 language proficiency with a focus on listening and speaking. Root Cause: Deepen integration of Content-Based Literacy Instructional strategies.</p>







Goal 2: Mathematics Performance

Performance Objective 1: All K-2 AISD students will increase their performance in math on NWEA MAP from 55% to 69% at the "Average" level or above.


High Priority


HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: NWEA MAP

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Train campus leadership and instructional coaches district-wide in the application of NWEA MAP Learning Continuum to drive instructional design/implementation.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: School leaders will strategically implement continuum in K-2 classrooms based on individual campus needs.</p> <p>Teachers will use the MAP Learning Continuum to group students by RIT bands and plan specific instruction (such as the pre-teach of learning objectives or learning statements) to address unit-specific student gaps.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Director of Curriculum & Instruction Coordinator of Professional Learning</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 4</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: K-2 bilingual teachers will receive training and support in the implementation of language development strategies through math content, as specifically outlined in the One-Way Dual Language (OWDL) components and in Sheltered Instruction.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: OWDL math bridge component directly supports cross-linguistic transfer, and Sheltered Instruction strategies directly provide comprehensible input and language development. Fidelity of implementation of both of these should result in both content and linguistic increased student performance for K-2 bilingual students.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of World Languages Elementary Math Specialist</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 3, 4</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 263 - Title III LEP, - 211 - Title I-A</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

 No Progress

 Accomplished

 Continue/Modify

 Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Achievement

Problem Statement 3: Need to increase L2 language proficiency with a focus on listening and speaking. **Root Cause:** Deepen integration of Content-Based Literacy Instructional strategies.

Problem Statement 4: Math outcomes have declined in achievement & growth on STAAR & NWEA MAP in grades 3-6. **Root Cause:** Need for implementation for K-Algebra I math teachers on the Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) for mathematics, focusing on the implementation of the Concrete and Representation portion of the CRA model, unit planning leveraging data to drive decisions, teacher moves, and identifying/curating aligned resources.







Goal 2: Mathematics Performance

Performance Objective 2: All grades 3-9 AISD students will increase their performance in math on STAAR/EOC from 64% to 70% at the approaches level or above, from 34% to 37% at the meets level or above, and from 12% to 13% at the masters level.

High Priority

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: Mathematics STAAR and Algebra I STAAR EOC

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Train campus leadership and instructional coaches district-wide in the application of NWEA MAP Learning Continuum to drive instructional design/implementation.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: School leaders will strategically implement continuum in grade 3-9 math classrooms based on individual campus needs.</p> <p>Teachers will use the MAP Learning Continuum to group students by RIT bands and plan specific instruction (such as the pre-teach of learning objectives or learning statements) to address unit-specific student gaps.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Director of Curriculum & Instruction</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 4</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Train Grades 7, 8, and Algebra 1 math teachers on the Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) for mathematics.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 90% of teachers will attend and implement research-based instructional practices training.</p> <p>Teachers will demonstrate increased proficiency in mathematical pedagogy and research-based instructional strategies (unit planning, modeling, student discourse, teacher response to student misconceptions, activation for student prior knowledge).</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coordinator of Mathematics</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 4</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				



No Progress



Accomplished



Continue/Modify



Discontinue

Performance Objective 2 Problem Statements:







Student Achievement








Problem Statement 4: Math outcomes have declined in achievement & growth on STAAR & NWEA MAP in grades 3-6. **Root Cause:** Need for implementation for K-Algebra I math teachers on the Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) for mathematics, focusing on the implementation of the Concrete and Representation portion of the CRA model, unit planning leveraging data to drive decisions, teacher moves, and identifying/curating aligned resources.

Goal 3: Science Performance

Performance Objective 1: All AISD students will increase their performance in science on STAAR/EOC from 64% to 70% at the approaches level or above, from 33% to 37% at the meets level or above, and from 9% to 12% at the masters level.

Evaluation Data Sources: Science STAAR and Biology STAAR EOC

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Elementary school leadership and instructional coaches will be trained on the Assessing Rigor in Elementary Science rubric to identify the current level of science content rigor and to articulate professional learning priorities for campus grade 5 science teachers to address student learning needs.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Articulated professional learning priorities will be established and supported to increase classroom science instruction rigor by one rubric level.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coordinator of Science Executive Directors of School Leadership</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 5</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Grade 5 elementary science teachers will participate in comprehensive training to enhance their understanding of science content and pedagogy that will focus on (1) the overlap between the new and old TEKS, specifically addressing content that will be assessed on the 5th grade STAAR, including concepts taught in 3rd and 4th grades; and (2) the implementation engaging student lab investigations that enable learners to experience scientific phenomena and concepts first-hand.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 90% of Grade 5 science teachers will participate and report/demonstrate increased self-efficacy and proficiency in teaching aligned content and conducting lab investigations</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coordinator of Science Executive Directors of School Leadership</p> <p>Results Driven Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 5</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Create exemplar elementary master schedules that articulate how to incorporate the recommended 60 minutes of daily Science instructional time into the school day across grades 3-5 for the 25-26 SY.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 25-26 Master schedules will include 60 minutes of daily science instruction for grades 3-5.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Directors of School Leadership</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 5</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 50%	 50%	 80%	
 No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:







Student Achievement
<p>Problem Statement 5: Persistent under-performance in 5th and 8th grade science. Root Cause: Lack of consistently implemented instructional time for Science at all elementary levels and the need to increase teachers' abilities to plan and facilitate rigorous, TEKS-aligned science instructional tasks.</p>




Goal 4: College Career and Military Readiness (CCMR)





Performance Objective 1: All 12th grade AISD students will increase their CCMR percentage from 88% to 90%.

HB3 Goal

Evaluation Data Sources: CCMR Dashboard outcomes

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: District support staff will engage in and support an Advanced Placement data-driven PLC model with campus leaders and teachers to formulate goals, strategies, and identify needed next steps to attain determined student performance and participation outcomes.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of HS campuses will participate PLCs will generate concrete action-steps with supports to address students' individual needs within AP courses.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of Advanced Academics</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Integrate Advanced Placement differentiation training into the professional learning framework and implement to support Advanced Placement learners' readiness for college-level work.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Student retention and exam participation and performance rates will improve by 5%.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of Advanced Academics</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Campuses will use the Economic Mobility System (EMS) Dashboard to identify, monitor/adjust and inform individualize student interventions/support to increase student performance on the TSIA2 assessment.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of HS campuses will utilize the EMS platform and develop intervention plans focused on TSIA2 readiness The number of qualifying TSIA2 math and English scores will increase by 2%.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of Postsecondary Partnerships</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 50%	 70%	 90%	

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:







Student Achievement
<p>Problem Statement 6: Under-performance in Advanced Placement and TSIA2 qualifying scores. Root Cause: Need to increase proficiency in staff use of a strong data system to progress monitor has resulted in low student performance on AP exams and/or TSIA2 readiness as well as differentiate instruction in the classroom to support students' access to college-level tasks.</p>











Goal 5: Safety & Discipline

Performance Objective 1: AISD will increase the Procedural Effectiveness factor score from the Campus Safety Working Conditions domain on the AISD Staff survey from 3.9 to 4.1.

High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 24-25 Staff Survey Results

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Provide professional learning in Science of Behavior, PBIS, and Restorative Practices to build capacity in teachers, administrators and support staff.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 1. 90% of teachers, administrators, and support staff will complete at least two professional learning sessions focused on Science of Behavior, PBIS, and Restorative Practices.</p> <p>2. Campuses will implement effective communication strategies aligned to positive behavior supports.</p> <p>3. Teachers will implement campus and classroom PBIS Tier I systems of support.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coordinator of PBIS</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 1</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 288- Title IV</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 <p>40%</p>	 <p>60%</p>	 <p>85%</p>	
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: PBIS, Restorative Practices specialists and campus leadership will collaboratively design and implement behavior support action plans aligned to individual campus needs.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of campuses will develop and implement their individualized action plan with accompanied supports.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Directors in the Office of School Leadership</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 1</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 288- Title IV</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 <p>45%</p>	 <p>70%</p>	 <p>85%</p>	

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Design and deliver systemic processes that will support the implementation of social-emotional learning curriculum and key practices in all campuses by defining clear roles, schedules, and resources.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% campuses will schedule daily SEL lessons and practices, orient teachers to resources and implement.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Coordinator of PBIS Director of Guidance and Counseling</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 1</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 288- Title IV</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 4: Implement system-wide safety protocols aligned to state-wide school safety standards.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campuses will maximize efforts to ensure students physical safety and emotional well-being. Reduce/eliminate TEA safety audit findings.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Chief Operations Officer Director of Security</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 1</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
<p style="text-align: center;">  No Progress  Accomplished  Continue/Modify  Discontinue </p>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:







District Culture and Climate
<p>Problem Statement 1: Increased behavior referrals, particularly highly disruptive and violent behaviors across the district. Root Cause: Need for increased training and support opportunities focused on Science of Behavior, PBIS, and Restorative Practices to build capacity in teachers, administrators and support staff.</p>










Goal 6: Culture and Systems




Performance Objective 1: AISD will increase the Employee Retention and Satisfaction Index on the AISD Staff survey from 3.9 to 4.0.





High Priority

Evaluation Data Sources: 24-25 Staff Survey Results

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Establish a district-capacity cadre to support campus-level Leader in Me implementation at 12 campuses to include identification of the campus Light House Team, development of a campus implementation plan and training of all staff in the 7-habits.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: 100% of campus Light House Teams will complete the Leader in Me professional learning sessions and establish implementation plan including the campus launch and training of the 7-Habits.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Director of School Improvement</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 216- SIG - School Improvement Grant funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Design a comprehensive leadership development plan that includes differentiated professional learning opportunities and a proposal for district staff appraisal system.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Implementation of a cohesive professional learning and development plan aligned to the Arlington ISD Leadership Definition.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Chief Academic Officer Chief Human Resource Officer Director of Professional Learning</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 2</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

Strategy 3 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 3: Gather feedback from students, staff and families monthly utilizing Thought Exchange.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased stakeholder participation and voice embedded into the decision-making process.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Chief Communications Officer</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 2</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 4 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 4: Identify preliminary areas of recognition and focus based on student experience survey results.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Promote an inclusive culture of respect, support, and continuous improvement for all students, staff, and families.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Assistant Superintendent of Research & Accountability</p> <p>Problem Statements: District Culture and Climate 2</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 5 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 5: Develop a 2025-2026 academic calendar that prioritizes and maximizes professional learning opportunities throughout the school year.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Adoption of an academic calendar that creates space for teachers and staff to routinely engage in professional learning and PLCs to increase student achievement and promote staff well-being and retention.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Director of Engagement Equity & Access Director of Professional Learning</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 - District Culture and Climate 1</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				

Strategy 6 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 6: Conduct a Curriculum Management Audit to identify key areas for improvement including organizational analysis, policy direction, curriculum quality/equity and implementation effectiveness across campuses.</p> <p>Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Provision of comprehensive system-wide recommendations to facilitate long/short-term improvement planning.</p> <p>Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Chief Academic Officer</p> <p>Equity Plan</p> <p>Problem Statements: Student Achievement 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</p> <p>Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
	 15%	 25%	 75%	

 No Progress
  Accomplished
  Continue/Modify
  Discontinue

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Student Achievement
<p>Problem Statement 1: Reading outcomes are negatively impacted by the percentage of students earning a score of 0 on the Extended Constructed Response portion of the redesigned STAAR Reading Root Cause: A need to increase proficiency and use of the (Understanding the question) (U)RACER strategy, TEA scoring rubric knowledge, and connecting Step 2 (Speak in Complete Sentences), 6 (Structured Conversations) and 7 (Structured Reading/Writing Activities) of Sheltered Instruction in the writing process. Additionally, increased learning on iterative writing process with feedback.</p> <p>Problem Statement 2: 1st-2nd Grade Reading mClass data regresses when compared to Kindergarten End-of-Year outcomes. Root Cause: There is a need to bridge the knowing/doing gap as teachers transition from the Balanced Literacy Model to the Science of Teaching Reading with a focus on explicit skills-based literacy instruction.</p> <p>Problem Statement 3: Need to increase L2 language proficiency with a focus on listening and speaking. Root Cause: Deepen integration of Content-Based Literacy Instructional strategies.</p> <p>Problem Statement 4: Math outcomes have declined in achievement & growth on STAAR & NWEA MAP in grades 3-6. Root Cause: Need for implementation for K-Algebra I math teachers on the Research Based Instructional Strategies (RBIS) for mathematics, focusing on the implementation of the Concrete and Representation portion of the CRA model, unit planning leveraging data to drive decisions, teacher moves, and identifying/curating aligned resources.</p> <p>Problem Statement 5: Persistent under-performance in 5th and 8th grade science. Root Cause: Lack of consistently implemented instructional time for Science at all elementary levels and the need to increase teachers' abilities to plan and facilitate rigorous, TEKS-aligned science instructional tasks.</p> <p>Problem Statement 6: Under-performance in Advanced Placement and TSIA2 qualifying scores. Root Cause: Need to increase proficiency in staff use of a strong data system to progress monitor has resulted in low student performance on AP exams and/or TSIA2 readiness as well as differentiate instruction in the classroom to support students' access to college-level tasks.</p>
District Culture and Climate
<p>Problem Statement 1: Increased behavior referrals, particularly highly disruptive and violent behaviors across the district. Root Cause: Need for increased training and support opportunities focused on Science of Behavior, PBIS, and Restorative Practices to build capacity in teachers, administrators and support staff.</p>











District Culture and Climate

Problem Statement 2: Developments and changes to plans can be more consistently communicated and systems for recognition of excellence more broadly applied. **Root Cause:** Need to increase quality and consistency of internal communication and acknowledgment of good work.

Goal 7: Attendance

Performance Objective 1: All AISD students will increase their attendance from 93.0% to 94.0%.

Evaluation Data Sources: EOY Attendance data based on PEIMS submission.

Strategy 1 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 1: Implement "Don't miss this!" attendance awareness campaign to educate and build stakeholder commitment. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Increased understanding and commitment to ensure families send students to school daily. Increased attendance Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Chief Communications Officer</p> <p>Problem Statements: Family and Community Engagement 1 Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
Strategy 2 Details	Reviews			
<p>Strategy 2: Campus leadership will receive training on effective practices that promote increased community commitment to student attendance and develop/implement a campus plan to incentivize student attendance. Strategy's Expected Result/Impact: Campus will implement customized strategies to increase stakeholder commitment to student attendance. Increased student attendance. Staff Responsible for Monitoring: Executive Directors of School Leadership</p> <p>Problem Statements: Family and Community Engagement 1 Funding Sources: - 199 - General Funds, - 199 - State Comp, - 211 - Title I-A</p>	Formative			Summative
	Nov	Jan	Mar	June
				
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">  No Progress </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Accomplished </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Continue/Modify </div> <div style="text-align: center;">  Discontinue </div> </div>				

Performance Objective 1 Problem Statements:

Family and Community Engagement
<p>Problem Statement 1: Student attendance is below target and persistently so since Covid-19. Root Cause: Response to compulsory attendance requirements, wellness, etc.</p>

State Compensatory

Budget for District Improvement Plan

Total SCE Funds: \$30,882,099.00

Total FTEs Funded by SCE: 0

Brief Description of SCE Services and/or Programs

Programs supported by state compensatory education funds are designed to close the learning gap among at-risk students including extended learning opportunities, accelerated instruction, etc.

Assurances

Statutorily Required Assurances

The LEA Plan must include assurances that the LEA will:

1. Ensure migratory children and formerly migratory children eligible to receive services are selected to receive services on the same basis as other children [Section 1112(c)(1)].
2. Provide services to eligible children attending private schools in accordance with section 1117, and timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials [Section 1112(c)(2)].
3. Participate, if selected, in the National Assessment of Educational Progress in reading and math in grades 4 and 8 [Section 1112(c)(3)].
4. Coordinate and integrate services with other English learners, children with disabilities, migratory children, American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children, and homeless children and youths to increase program effectiveness, eliminate duplication, and reduce fragmentation [Section 1112(c)(4)].
5. Collaborate with State or local child welfare agency to—
 - Designate a point of contact if the corresponding child welfare notifies the LEA, in writing, that the agency has designated an employee to serve as a point of contact for the LEA;
 - Develop and implement clear written procedures governing how transportation to maintain children in foster care in their school of origin (when in their best interest) will be provided, arranged, and funded for the duration of the time in foster care. [Section 1112(c)(5)]. (For details of what these procedures must ensure, see Children in Foster Care.)
6. Ensure all teachers and paraprofessionals working in Title I, Part A, supported programs meet applicable State certification and licensure requirements [Section 1112(c)(6)].
7. For LEAs using Title I, Part A funds to provide early childhood education services to low-income children, ensure that services comply with performance standards of the Head Start Act [Section 1112(c)(7)].
8. Notify the parents of each student attending any school receiving Title I, Part A funds of the Parents' Right-To-Know [Section 1112(e)(1)].
9. Notify the parents of each student attending any school receiving Title I, Part A funds of Testing Transparency [Section 1112(e)(2)].
10. Implement an effective means of outreach to parents of English learners [Section 1112(e)(3)(C)].

Signature indicates the 10 assurances are included in the LEA Plan Signature of Assurance

District Funding Summary

199 - General Funds					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1			\$0.00
1	1	2			\$0.00
1	2	1			\$0.00
1	2	2			\$0.00
1	2	3			\$0.00
2	1	1			\$0.00
2	1	2			\$0.00
2	2	1			\$0.00
2	2	2			\$0.00
3	1	1			\$0.00
3	1	2			\$0.00
3	1	3			\$0.00
4	1	1			\$0.00
4	1	2			\$0.00
4	1	3			\$0.00
5	1	1			\$0.00
5	1	2			\$0.00
5	1	3			\$0.00
5	1	4			\$0.00
6	1	2			\$0.00
6	1	3			\$0.00
6	1	4			\$0.00
6	1	5			\$0.00
6	1	6			\$0.00
7	1	1			\$0.00
7	1	2			\$0.00

199 - General Funds					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$675,784,138.00
+/- Difference					\$675,784,138.00
199 - State Comp					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	2	1			\$0.00
7	1	2			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$30,882,099.00
+/- Difference					\$30,882,099.00
210 - Title II-B					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
					\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$1,956,423.00
+/- Difference					\$1,956,423.00
211 - Title I-A					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2			\$0.00
1	2	1			\$0.00
2	1	2			\$0.00
7	1	2			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$17,049,567.00
+/- Difference					\$17,049,567.00
224 - IDEA-B Formula					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
					\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$10,403,048.00

224 - IDEA-B Formula					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
+/- Difference					\$10,403,048.00
263 - Title III LEP					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	1			\$0.00
1	2	1			\$0.00
1	2	2			\$0.00
2	1	2			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$1,663,879.00
+/- Difference					\$1,663,879.00
162 - Special Education					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
1	1	2			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$69,737,234.00
+/- Difference					\$69,737,234.00
225 - IDEA					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
					\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$210,852.00
+/- Difference					\$210,852.00
216- SIG - School Improvement Grant funds					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
6	1	1			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$250,000.00
+/- Difference					\$250,000.00

288- Title IV					
Goal	Objective	Strategy	Resources Needed	Account Code	Amount
5	1	1			\$0.00
5	1	2			\$0.00
5	1	3			\$0.00
Sub-Total					\$0.00
Budgeted Fund Source Amount					\$1.00
+/- Difference					\$1.00
Grand Total Budgeted					\$807,937,241.00
Grand Total Spent					\$0.00
+/- Difference					\$807,937,241.00