Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report

CPM 2.1 Caregiver Engagement

Board Meeting Date: March 13
Reporting Period: Fall 2025

Constraint 2	*The superintendent shall not allow families to be without meaningful partnerships with their home campus and district.*
CPM 2.1	*The number of campuses that develop and meet a goal in their Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) based on the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships will increase from BASELINE in June 2025 to Y by June 2029.*

District Initiatives Priority Alignment

District Initiative	Overview (Needs to be developed)	CPM Alignment
AISD Stronger Together	*Organizational Culture, Accountability, Communication, Outreach*	🟠
Early Learning	*Enrollment, Literary, Outreach, Partnerships, Expansion*	
Middle Years	*Engagement, Staffing, Funding, Scheduling and Support*	
Post Secondary Success	*College-Readiness, Equity, Enrollment, CTE and Graduation*	
Special Education	*Inclusiveness, Compliance, Sustainability*	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In 2018, the Austin ISD Board of Trustees adopted the below policy (GK — Community Relations)

The mission of the District is that Austin ISD exists to provide, in partnership with families and our community, a comprehensive educational experience that is high quality, challenging, and inspiring to all students to make a positive contribution to society. Therefore, it is imperative that parents, families, and the Austin community be engaged in the process that will promote a healthy system of public education and assist in educating all children to meet high academic expectations and standards.

"Parent, family, and community engagement" shall be defined as the engagement and inclusion of parents, families, and the community as partners with schools for the purpose of promoting success throughout a child's educational experience.

The contributions made by parents, families, and community members to children's education are invaluable. For this reason, all administrators, teachers, and other staff shall work to achieve the engagement and involvement of parents, families, and community members as partners in the schools.

The following standards for engagement are based on the Dual Capacity Framework (DCF) that provides a reference for parent, family, school, and community partnership programs:

1. ***Communicating****: Partnership programs shall use a variety of channels to connect schools, families, and communities in authentic ways in their language of preference.*
2. ***Parenting****: Partnership programs shall help all families establish home environments to support children as learners.*
3. ***Student Learning****: Partnership programs shall assist learning efforts in school, at home, and throughout the community in ways that link school to real life.*
4. ***Volunteering****: Partnership programs shall recruit, provide professional development, and organize parent, family, and community resources to support educational programs both within and outside the schools.*
5. ***School Decision-Making****: Partnership programs shall support and provide professional development to parents, families, and community members as partners with schools in making decisions that affect students and education.*
6. ***Collaborating Family, School, and Community Partnerships****: Partnership programs shall strengthen schools, parents, families, and student learning through community resources and supportive services.*

Each campus improvement plan shall include a parent, family, and community engagement component outlining programs planned or in place for the purpose of improving and ensuring partnership-driven parent, family, and community engagement and involvement. The components shall be developed in accordance with the District's parent, family and community engagement and involvement model, using the standards for the Dual Capacity Framework model for Family-School Partnerships for engagement.

Scorecard CPM 2.1 reinforces the district's vision and values around family engagement and partnerships. While the district has had the above expectations in place since 2018, there has been limited support or ongoing training provided to campus leaders to ensure shared understanding of the Dual Capacity-building

Framework and what it means for the type of family and caregiver engagement and partnerships we expect to see across all campuses.

Key Data Findings

Because we are using this year's data to establish our baseline and inform our target, overall, we are well-positioned to meet ambitious targets year over year. The majority (72.4%) of campuses overall developed caregiver engagement goals that landed in the "Approaches" category according to the Dual Capacity-building Framework Rubric (See Appendix 2) and 7.8% of campuses overall developed goals that demonstrate "Masters" level. Note the rubric does not include a "meets" category because it necessarily relies upon a qualitative analysis and it would be difficult to parse a meaningful distinction between a "Meets" and "Approaches" category given the large variation in how campuses currently articulate their goals.

For a campus to qualify as having developed and met a goal in their Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) based on the Dual Capacity-building Framework for Family-School Partnerships, they must have both developed a goal that achieves "Masters" level alignment with the DCF *and* have achieved that goal. Because the data at this time is based on the campus administrator's formative self assessment from November 2024, it is not unexpected that most campuses will not yet have fully accomplished their goals. The summative self-assessment will take place in June.

Notably, band 1 schools had the highest percentage of schools whose goals achieved "Approaches" (76.7%) and "Masters" (9.3%). Band 1 schools also had the largest number of schools that achieved "Masters" level on their caregiver engagement goals.

An area of concern is the fact that 21 campuses did not develop a Caregiver Engagement goal in their Campus Improvement Plan (CIP). Of those 21 campuses without Caregiver Engagement goals, six are band 1, six are band 2, five are band 3 and four are band 4.

When looking at campus administrators' formative self-reported progress toward their goals reported in November 2024, we see that band 1 and 2 campuses had the highest percentages of schools reporting "Some" or "Considerable" progress among all bands.

We also see that band 3 and 4 campuses had the highest level of "Accomplished" goals (7.4% and 7.3% respectively) while zero band 1 and 5% of band 2 campuses reported having accomplished their goals as of November 2024.

Only nine campuses developed goals for their 2024–25 CIPs that achieved "Masters" level and none have achieved that goal as of November 2024. All of those nine schools are elementary schools.

Outliers

The campuses listed on the table below represent all the band 2 and 3 campuses that achieved "Masters" level alignment with the DCF for their caregiver engagement goal *and* have made considerable progress as reported on the formative self-assessment in November 2024. Because no secondary schools achieved "Masters" level, we've also included two secondary schools — Webb MS and Navarro ECHS — because they had strong caregiver engagement goals that lacked some detail in their CIP, which precluded them from receiving "Masters" level; however after contacting the campus leaders, the reality of how they have been implementing the strategies would have earned them "Masters" level. This is likely the case for several other

schools and a simple training on how to more fully articulate caregiver engagement goals would likely address the issue.

Campus	Band	District Assessment of Goal Alignment with DCF	Self-assessment of Progress
Graham ES	2	Masters	Considerable
Navarro ECHS	2	Approaches	Considerable
Oak Springs ES	1	Masters	Considerable
Padron ES	1	Masters	Considerable
Webb MS	1	Approaches	Considerable
Winn Montessori	1	Masters	Considerable

Next Steps
- Develop training materials.
- Reach out to each of the 21 campus administrators that had no caregiver engagement goal in their CIP and provide Executive Directors a list of their campuses so they can follow up with the principal during their next on-site visit. While this will not count towards our goal for this year, we will still work with the campuses to either develop a goal for the reminder of the year, or document a goal they may already be working towards even though it was not included in the CIP. We will also recommend that these campuses put this item on their next CAC agenda.
- Provide mini-trainings during standing principals meetings throughout the remainder of the school year and give campus leaders the opportunity to refine their caregiver engagement goals in their CIPs in the Plan4Learning platform.
- Provide training to Parent Support staff, School Leadership Executive Directors and identify other campus support staff that could benefit from the training.
- Analyze summative self-assessment in June 2025, establish baseline and develop targets for years 2–5.
- Offer a series of comprehensive training sessions over the summer.
- Schedule touchpoints throughout the 2025–26 school year to provide ongoing support.

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2024/2025 - CPM 2.1

DATA ANALYSIS

So this table shows that while none of our campuses have yet met the requirements to count toward the CPM, it also shows the number of schools that developed caregiver engagement goals and of those, the number that were at masters level.

Group	Fall 2024				Yearly Targets				
	# Developed and completed DCF Goal	# Developed Caregiver Engagement Goal	# Developed DCF Goal at Master Level	# Final 2024–25	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29
All Schools (116)	0	95	9	–					
Band One	0	37	4	–					
Band Two	0	14	1	–					
Band Three	0	22	1	–					
Band Four	0	22	3	–					

*For a campus to qualify as having developed and met a goal in their Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) based on the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships, they must have both developed a goal that achieves "Masters" level alignment with the DCF and have achieved that goal by their formative self-assessment in November 2024.

Campus Progress toward Dual Capacity-building Framework Goal Formative Self-assessment November 2024*

	No Goal		No Progress (0% complete)		Some (1–49% complete)		Considerable (50-99% complete)		Accomplished	
Band	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
All Schools (116)	21	18.1%	6	5.2%	35	30.2%	49	42.2%	5	4.3%
One (43)	6	7%	2	4.7%	13	30.2%	22	51.2%	0	0%
Two (20)	6	30%	0	0%	5	25%	8	40%	1	5%
Three (27)	5	18.5%	2	7.4%	8	29.6%	10	37%	2	7.4%
Four (26)	4	11.5%	2	7.7%	9	34.6%	9	34.6%	2	7.7%

* Table reflects the breakdown of campuses' self-reported formative assessment of progress toward their caregiver engagement goal conducted November 2024. The blue row reflects the self-reported status across all campuses and the rows below show the breakdown by Support and Resource Index band. The blue row reflects formative self-assessment results across all campuses and the rows below show the breakdown by Support and Resource Index band.

District Administration Assessment of campus goal alignment with Dual Capacity-building Framework*

Band	No Goal		Does Not Meet		Approaches		Masters	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
All Schools (116)	21	18.1%	2	1.7%	84	72.4%	9	7.8%
One (43)	6	14%	0	0%	33	76.7%	4	9.3%
Two (20)	6	30%	1	5%	12	60%	1	5%
Three (27)	5	18.5%	1	3.7%	20	74%	1	3.7%
Four (26)	4	15.3%	0	0%	19	73%	3	11.5%

* Table reflects the breakdown of how well campus goals align with the Dual Capacity-building Framework using the DCF rubric according to the district administration's assessment. The blue row reflects the district assessment across all campuses and the rows below show the breakdown by Student Support and Resource Index band.

Key Takeaways

- *The majority of schools (84 of 116, or 72%) developed goals that achieved "Approaches." Common reasons that goals fell short of the "Masters" category include limited detail surrounding strategies as well as strategies primarily focused on providing services or getting families to "show up" with limited mention of how the school/family partnership taps into the resources families bring to the table.*
- *Band 1 schools had the highest percentage of schools whose goals achieved "Approaches" (76.7%) and "Masters" (9.3%)*
- *All campuses had a relatively similar spread in terms of the percentage of schools in each category of alignment. There is no discernable pattern of schools in particular bands scoring significantly better or worse than schools in other bands.*
- *21 campuses did not develop a CIP Caregiver Engagement goal.*
- *The majority of Principal self-assessments included minimal, if any narrative around the evidence of progress.*
- *There is a strong correlation between campuses with a strong, experienced Parent Support Specialist and/or a well-established Families as Partners program and those that have caregiver engagement goals strongly aligned with the DCF.*

The Root Cause

- ***Limited DCF training:*** *While the district adopted the Dual Capacity-building Framework into policy requiring campuses to include a caregiver engagement goal in their CIPs in 2018, there has been limited training in the years since. This means there has been limited reinforcement with veteran principals, and newer principals may have never received training.*
- ***Mindsets around meaningful caregiver engagement****: A common understanding of caregiver engagement can often focus on the school as the provider of resources and support and the families and students as the receivers. When a campus doesn't have a strong culture of caregiver volunteerism or hasn't historically created spaces for collaboration and partnership, caregiver participation or presence may be viewed as a measure of strong engagement. While participation may be a sign of the relationships campuses have built with families and a good start, it does not necessarily mean that families are seen or treated as partners.*
- ***Inconsistencies in articulation of goals****: Principals have varying levels of training and understanding around developing ambitious yet achievable goals and high-leverage strategies to achieve those goals, particularly in the area of caregiver engagement goals.*
- ***Competing demands for principal time****: Face time with principals is in high demand among departments so meeting and training opportunities are often constrained by time which limits the depth and effectiveness of training.*

Outliers

Oak Springs —which has 96.94% of students classified as economically disadvantaged and emergent bilinguals making up 73.3% of its students — both set a "Masters" level caregiver engagement goal and has made considerable progress toward that goal. With the aim of increasing participation in caregiver engagement events to promote family-school partnerships, Oak Springs first began by organizing a block walk over the summer to get family responses to a needs and interests survey to inform caregiver engagement event throughout the year. They then began offering monthly family workshops at varied times to accommodate families' schedules and disseminate monthly calendars with a full month of activities so families know well in advance what is planned.

"As principal, I have created sponsor-supported innovative initiatives including our "Rent Rewards" attendance initiative and, "Educator Rewards," sponsored by Dream Together 2030, to address the economic hardships of families aiming to increase attendance and student outcomes," said Principal Cynthia Sinegal. "We have been able to increase attendance rates [throughout the fall] and maintain nearly 90% despite the current context."

Snapshot of Oak Springs February 2025 calendar.

Navarro ECHS — which has 85.98% of students classified as economically disadvantaged and emergent bilinguals making up 73.3% of its students —both set a caregiver engagement goal strongly aligned with the DCF and has made considerable progress toward that goal. Navarro is the first Austin ISD High School to adopt the Families as Partners program and they aim to double the number of parent "champions" by May

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2024/2025 - CPM 2.1

2025 from three to six. The campus is using these parent leaders to help guide and educate families about literacy and CCMR goals and opportunities.

"We want parents to engage with us around CCMR not for any accountability purposes, but to inform them of opportunities students have on our campus to accomplish things that will benefit them after high school," said Principal Steven Covin.

When asked what benefits the campus has seen to his campus community and student learning and well-being, Principal Covin shared that 78% of their 2025 cohort is currently on track to meet CCMR from a highly meaningful outcome—meeting ELA and Math TSI, achieving dual credit, earning an industry-based certification, or scoring a 3 or higher on an AP exam. He anticipates this will only improve in their younger cohorts through various initiatives including parental engagement.

Webb Middle School — which has 97.23% of students classified as economically disadvantaged and emergent bilinguals making up 78.6% of its students — both set a caregiver engagement goal strongly aligned with the DCF and has made considerable progress toward that goal. Webb has reportedly tripled participation in coffees with the principal and has started including students on their Campus Advisory Council alongside their parents.

When asked what contributes to their success, Principal Michae Coyle shared that they have a strong Parent Support Specialist, who has developed great relationships with parents. They've also begun offering two opportunities for each meeting, one is at 9 a.m. (Pastries with the Principal) and one at 5 p.m. (Pizza with the Principal). They utilize multiple multilingual communication channels to get the word out including the school newsletter and Thrillshare alerts. In addition to offering engaging parent-driven topics, "We spend less time on just 'telling' and more time listening," said Principal Coyle.

Progress of Initiatives

The Austin ISD Stronger Together District Initiative will reinforce campus efforts to build partnerships with families in several key ways. The initiative is composed of four scopes:

- **Exceptional Front office experience** —Create an exceptional and consistent family experience across all campuses by providing coordinated training and strengthening Central Office support of front office staff.
- **Meaningful family engagement aligned by vertical team** — Develop defined expectations and provide ongoing training and support around PTAs, CACs, family communications, Principal Coffees, campus tours, volunteers, Dual Capacity-building Framework, Parent Self-Serve, etc.
- **Streamlined communications** — Create streamlined systems of communication that are aligned, accessible and vibrant so families have multiple ways to engage with their campuses in ways that meet their needs.
- **Exceptional Central Office Responsiveness** — Develop standard practices and support systems that define how Central Office departments support campuses.

The aim is to move away from our current state as a system of schools toward our goal of becoming a high-functioning and aligned school system where everyone who works for Austin ISD understands that we exist to serve our students, families and schools exceptionally well. Every campus and department will begin to feel that they are part of a culture of care and excellence and take pride in the high-quality services we provide and the relationships, partnership and experiences we create.

We are still in the planning and kick-off phase in year one of implementing the Austin ISD Stronger Together initiative; however the initiative builds on past work in all the scopes outlined above. The initiative allows us to sharpen our focus and create a shared understanding of our goals and why we have chosen to prioritize the strategies tied to those goals.

Throughout Fall 2024, we have developed several KPIs (outlined in Appendix 4) to track performance in each of the scopes outlined above. This will be an ongoing process as we further develop the five year plan.

The Plan Forward

DCF and Goal-setting training: We are developing training materials for principals and parent support staff covering the following key learning objectives:

- Developing ambitious yet achievable goals and high-leverage strategies to achieve those goals.

- Breaking down the features of a "Masters" level caregiver engagement goal using the Dual Capacity-building Framework Goals Rubric and reviewing exemplar DCF goals.

- Norm around normative and summative self-assessment ratings

We're working with the Campus and District Accountability team and School Leadership team to identify opportunities to provide mini-trainings during standing principals meetings throughout the remainder of the school year. We will also train Parent Support staff during an upcoming monthly Professional Learning Day. We'll then offer a series of more comprehensive training sessions for principals over the summer and schedule touch-points throughout the 2025–26 school year to provide ongoing support.

Parent Support (PS): In Fall 2024, thanks to the generous increase to the City of Austin Parent Support grant, Austin ISD assembled a regional parent support team. This team of three supports all 45 campuses without a Parent Support professional assigned to the school. We have since outreached to those campuses to identify a person or persons on campus who primarily fulfill the parent support functions to increase collaboration and strengthen our support of their caregiver engagement goals.

We are also working with the Northeast Vertical team to consider a pilot for the 2025–26 school year to facilitate greater vertical team collaboration and alignment of caregiver engagement efforts. Our aim is to streamline communications throughout the vertical team, including creating a vertical team calendar of events and engagement opportunities as well as implementing increased cross-training of Parent Support team members to tap into the expertise of more seasoned PSes and better support newer ones. We aim for this pilot to become the model across the district for years 3–5.

Volunteer Coordination: For the 2024–25 school year, Austin ISD brought the function of volunteer coordination — a function previously fulfilled by Austin Partners in Education. While we have made great strides in tracking campus implementation of volunteer coordination and prioritized our onboarding support at band 1 and 2 campuses, at this time, the program is supported by a single central Volunteer coordinator. We are currently considering reorg that would increase the staff support for this function, which will expand our capacity to support campuses in developing a robust volunteer program and opportunities.

Thrillshare and Campus websites: For the 2024–25 school year, Austin ISD transitioned to a new, more user-friendly and streamlined communication system for alerts (email, text, robocalls), newsletters, social media and application-based push notifications. We spent the summer and fall semester training and onboarding campuses and are in the process of developing a KPI that can drive our training and support efforts. We have a handful of campuses using the tool in exemplary fashion and we plan to tap into those campus leaders to model for other campuses how to maximize this tool to enhance caregiver engagement.

CACs: At this time, we do not have real-time tracking of campus compliance with requirements around CACs. All principals are asked to turn in their schedules at the beginning of the year along with rosters and we have 100% compliance. We do not yet have a system for tracking whether meetings are taking place and required agenda items are discussed. Per district policy, the Department of Intergovernmental Relations and Board Services does a yearly audit on two elementary schools, one middle school and one high school as a quality

spot check. While we do not yet have a robust plan in place to better track campus efforts and central support of those efforts, this is an area of opportunity.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Campus-Level Data

CPM 2.1 Campus Level Data, Ordered by SRI Band

Campus	SRI Band	CPM 2.1 0 - No Performance Objective 1 - One or more Performance Objectives	CPM 2.1 Aligned to framework 0 - Does Not Meet (Goal does not align with DCF objectives) 1 - Approaches (Goal reflects some understanding of elements of DCF) 2 - Masters (Goal reflects comprehensive understanding of elements of DCF)	CPM2.1 Progress verbiage formative 0% complete - No Progress 1–49% complete - Some Progress 50-99% complete - Considerable Progress 100% complete - Accomplished
Andrews ES	1	0	No Goal	N/A
Barrington ES	1	0	No Goal	N/A
Bedichek MS	1	1	1	Considerable
Brown ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Burnet MS	1	0	No Goal	N/A
Cook ES	1	0	No Goal	N/A
Dawson ES	1	1	1	Some
Dobie MS	1	1	1	Some
Eastside ECHS	1	1	1	Some
Galindo ES	1	1	1	Considerable
General Marshall MS	1	1	1	Considerable
Govalle ES	1	1	1	Some
Grad Prep Academy	1	1	1	Considerable
Harris ES	1	1	1	Some
Hart ES	1	1	2	Some
Houston ES	1	0	No Goal	N/A
International HS	1	1	1	Considerable
Jordan ES	1	1	1	Some
Langford ES	1	1	1	Some

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2024/2025 - CPM 2.1

LBJ ECHS	1	1	1	No Progress
Linder ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Martin MS	1	1	1	Some
Norman-Sims ES	1	1	1	No Progress
Northeast HS	1	1	1	Considerable
Oak Springs ES	1	1	2	Considerable
Ortega ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Overton ES	1	1	1	Some
Padron ES	1	1	2	Considerable
Paredes MS	1	1	1	Considerable
Pecan Springs ES	1	1	1	Some
Perez ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Pickle ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Rodriguez ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Rosedale	1	1	1	Considerable
Sadler Means YWLA	1	1	1	Considerable
Sanchez ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Travis HS	1	0	No Goal	N/A
Walnut Creek ES	1	1	1	Some
Webb MS	1	1	1	Considerable
Widen ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Winn Montessori	1	1	2	Considerable
Wooldridge ES	1	1	1	Considerable
Wooten ES	1	1	1	Some
Akins HS	2	0	No Goal	N/A
Allison ES	2	1	1	Considerable
Alternative Learning Center	2	1	1	Some
Blackshear ES	2	0	No Goal	N/A
Campbell ES	2	1	1	Some
Crockett HS	2	1	1	Some
Garcia YMLA	2	1	1	Considerable
Garza Independence HS	2	0	No Goal	N/A

GPA Navarro	2	0	No Goal	N/A
Graham ES	2	1	2	Considerable
Guerrero-Thompson ES	2	1	1	Considerable
McBee ES	2	1	1	Some
Mendez MS*	2	*No CIP	*No CIP	N/A
Navarro HS	2	1	1	Considerable
Odom ES	2	1	1	Considerable
Palm ES	2	1	1	Considerable
Pillow ES	2	0	No Goal	N/A
Pleasant Hill ES	2	1	1	Accomplished
St Elmo ES	2	1	0	Some
Zavala ES	2	1	1	Considerable
Anderson HS	3	0	No Goal	N/A
Ann Richards YWL	3	1	1	Considerable
Bailey MS	3	0	No Goal	N/A
Blanton ES	3	1	1	Some
Blazier ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Boone ES	3	1	1	No Progress
Casey ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Covington MS	3	1	1	Some
Cowan ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Cunningham ES	3	0	No Goal	N/A
Davis ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Doss ES	3	1	1	Accomplished
Joslin ES	3	1	0	Some
Kealing MS	3	0	No Goal	No Goal
Kocurek ES	3	1	1	Accomplished
Lively MS	3	1	1	Considerable
McCallum HS	3	1	1	Considerable
Menchaca ES	3	0	No Goal	No Goal
Murchison MS	3	1	1	Some
Oak Hill ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Patton ES	3	1	1	No Progress

Reilly ES	3	1	1	Some
Summitt ES	3	1	1	Some
Sunset Valley ES	3	1	2	Some
Travis Heights ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Uphaus ECC	3	1	1	Some
Williams ES	3	1	1	Considerable
Austin HS	4	0	No Goal	No Goal
Baldwin ES	4	1	1	Considerable
Baranoff ES	4	1	1	Some
Barton Hills ES	4	1	1	Some
Bear Creek ES	4	0	No Goal	No Goal
Becker ES	4	1	1	Considerable
Bowie HS	4	1	1	Considerable
Brentwood ES	4	1	1	Considerable
Bryker Woods ES	4	1	1	Considerable
Casis ES	4	1	1	No Progress
Clayton ES	4	1	1	Some
Gorzycki MS	4	0	No Goal	No Goal
Gullett ES	4	1	2	Some
Highland Park ES	4	1	2	Some
Hill ES	4	1	1	Considerable
Kiker ES	4	1	2	Some
Lamar MS	4	1	1	Some
LASA HS	4	1	1	Considerable
Lee ES	4	1	1	Considerable
Maplewood ES	4	1	1	Accomplished
Mathews ES	4	1	1	No Progress
Mills ES	4	1	1	Considerable
O Henry MS	4	0	No Goal	No Goal
Ridgetop ES	4	1	1	Some
Small MS	4	1	1	Some
Zilker ES	4	1	1	Accomplished

Table reflects whether or not campus developed a caregiver engagement goal, how well campus goals align with the Dual Capacity-building Framework as assessed by district administration using the DCF rubric and the campuses' self-reported formative assessment of progress toward their caregiver engagement goal conducted November 2024 . Data is organized by Support Resource Index (SRI) bands.

Appendix 2: Defining the Progress Measure

Constraint: The superintendent shall not allow families to be without meaningful partnerships with their home campus and district.

CPM 2.1: The number of campuses that develop and meet a goal in their Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) based on the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships will increase from BASELINE in June 2025 to Y by June 2029.

CPM 2.1 is a strong indicator of whether or not families are able to form meaningful partnerships with their home campus and district. When campus leaders are able to articulate goals to strengthen school-family partnerships and develop and implement strategies to achieve those goals, it is an indicator of a strong culture of collaboration with caregivers. When caregiver engagement goals demonstrate a desire and effort to tap into the wealth of resources families can bring to a school and their child's learning, it is clear that the school is creating the conditions for families to meaningfully engage in their child's education. When these conditions are in place, research and our own data show a correlation to student achievement, well-being and connection.

For a campus to qualify as having developed and met a goal in their Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) based on the Dual Capacity Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships, they must have both developed a goal that achieves "Masters" level alignment with the DCF *and* have achieved that goal. Campuses that achieved "Approaches" level alignment with the DCF commonly frame their strategies around increasing participation, which is a good goal to have, but it can fall short of inviting families to partner with the district and share their own gifts and talents toward the benefit of the school. In many instances, that level of engagement may in fact be occurring; however it was not necessarily captured in how the campus leader articulated the goal. We anticipate with training, many of the goals will tip into the "Masters" level with relative ease. For this reason, among others, we are comfortable setting ambitious targets and believe we will see a significant jump in year two in particular.

Dual Capacity-building Framework Goals Rubric

The Dual Capacity-building Framework Goals Rubric was developed using the six standards of engagement in the DCF. Goals rated as 1 - "Approaches" demonstrate some understanding of the DCF but may lack detail or are primarily focused on caregiver participation counts with limited or no focus on the quality or character of the engagement.

Score	Communicating	Parenting	Student Learning	Volunteering	School Decision-Making	Collaborating Family, School, and Community Partnerships
0 - Does Not Meet (Goal does not align with DCF objectives)	Strategies include one-directional communication with no reference to various methods, languages or other accessibility considerations	No strategies to help all families establish home environments to support children as learners.	Strategies around partnership programs do not assist learning efforts in school, at home and throughout the community in ways that link school to real life.	Volunteer program strategies do not include efforts to recruit, provide professional development and organize parent, family, and community resources to support educational programs both within and outside the schools.	School Decision-Making partnership strategies do not include efforts to support and provide professional development to parents, families and community members as partners with schools in making decisions that affect students and education.	Family, School, and Community Partnership collaboration strategies do not include efforts to strengthen schools, parents, families, and student learning through community resources and supportive services.
1 - Approaches (Goal reflects some understanding of elements of DCF)	Strategies include one-directional communication and some reference to various methods, languages or other accessibility considerations	Some strategies to help all families establish home environments to support children as learners.	Strategies around partnership programs include some efforts to assist learning efforts in school, at home and throughout the community in ways that link school to real life.	Volunteer program strategies include some efforts to recruit, provide professional development and organize parent, family, and community resources to support educational programs both within and outside the schools.	School Decision-Making partnership strategies include some efforts to support and provide professional development to parents, families and community members as partners with schools in making decisions that affect students and education.	Family, School, and Community Partnership collaboration strategies include some efforts to strengthen schools, parents, families, and student learning through community resources and supportive services.
2 - Masters (Goal reflects comprehensive understanding of elements of DCF)	Two-way communication with acknowledgment of need for various methods, languages and other accessibility considerations	Comprehensive strategies to help all families establish home environments to support children as learners.	Strategies around partnership programs include comprehensive efforts to assist learning efforts in school, at home and throughout the community in ways that link school to real life.	Volunteer program strategies include comprehensive efforts to recruit, provide professional development and organize parent, family, and community resources to support educational programs both within	School Decision-Making partnership strategies include comprehensive efforts to support and provide professional development to parents, families and community members as partners with	Family, School, and Community Partnership collaboration strategies include comprehensive efforts to strengthen schools, parents, families, and student learning through community resources and

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2024/2025 - CPM 2.1

				and outside the schools.	schools in making decisions that affect students and education.	supportive services.

Appendix 3: Root Cause and Theory of Change

The primary data source used to develop the root cause analysis was the information extracted from the Plan4Learning CIP software. As stated in the key findings, *Common reasons that goals fell short of the "Masters" category include limited detail surrounding strategies as well as strategies primarily focused on providing services or getting families to "show up" with limited mention of how the school/family partnership taps into the resources families bring to the table.* This serves as an indication of two things: 1) Inadequate training around DCF and Caregiver Engagement Goal development and 2) Varying degrees of internalization of the value in investing in partnership-based (as opposed to participation-based)caregiver engagement.

Historically, there have been varying levels of depth in the training and support around CIP development. This is not for lack of will or desire, but rather a function of the competing demands on principal time. By positioning the caregiver engagement goal as both a scorecard goal and a part of one of the five District Initiatives (Stronger Together) we can align our focus and resources around the efforts most closely tied to achieving our caregiver engagement goals (see "The Plan Forward section above).

Appendix 4: Supporting Implementation Data / Research

To measure the effectiveness of our support of campus caregiver engagement goals, Austin ISD tracks several key performance indicators disaggregated by SRI Band including but not limited to:

- **Communicating**:
  - Campuses maximizing use of Thrillshare app, alerts, push notifications and social media. We are currently working with the software developer to help us extract data to develop a KPI around this.
  - Updated campus websites
- **Parenting, Student Learning & Collaborating Family, School and Community Partnerships**:
  - Parent Support families served & workshops. Due to a vacancy, fall data is not yet available in a digestible form; however, we anticipate the dashboard will be updated later this spring.
  - Functioning PTAs (tracked by ACPTA)
- **School Decision-Making:**
  - Robust CACs - no KPI developed at this time
- **Volunteering**:
  - Campus-level support for use of Voly volunteer platform

For each KPI linked above, central staff prioritize outreach and support to band one and two campuses to understand challenges and provide needed guidance and/or training. The KPIs align with the six standards for engagement based on the Dual Capacity Framework (in **bolded text** above and outlined in more detail in the executive summary).

Appendix 5: Glossary

- **CAC** - Campus Advisory Council

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2024/2025 - CPM 2.1

- **CIP** - [Campus Improvement Plan](#)
- **DCF** - [Dual Capacity Framework](#)
- **KPI** - Key Performance Indicator
- **Plan4Learning** - Online software campus leaders use to develop Campus Improvement Plan goals and track progress
- **SRI** - [Support and Resource Index](#)