



AUSTIN ISD BOARD MONITORING REPORT

REPORT DATE: May 7, 2026

REPORTING PERIOD: BOY and MOY 2025

GOAL 1 3 rd Grade Literacy	The percentage of 3rd-grade students earning meets grade level or above on the STAAR Reading Assessment in English or Spanish will increase from 47% in June 2024 to 59% by June 2029.
GPM 1.1 2 nd Grade Literacy Intervention	The percentage of 2nd-grade students scoring in the recommended-for-intervention level on the NWEA MAP Reading Achievement Score Proficiency Indicator (below 30th percentile in English/40th percentile in Spanish) will decrease from 30% in June 2024 to 29% by June 2029.

CAMPUS OUTLIERS AND HIGHLIGHTS

The campuses highlighted below exemplify Austin ISD’s reading beliefs in action—showing how engaging, hands-on, data-informed instruction and strong foundational literacy systems lead to measurable gains for students. Many of these schools serve high percentages of historically underserved students and have implemented consistent structures for collaboration, coaching, and targeted intervention. Their work demonstrates that when daily instruction is rigorous and aligned to strong Tier 1 systems, early literacy can accelerate rapidly and disrupt inequitable patterns in student outcomes.

Cook Elementary School - Outlier

Cook Elementary demonstrated exceptional early literacy gains, performing on par with the district average despite serving significantly higher-need student populations. These results reflect a strategic focus on vertical alignment, instructional rigor, and early, targeted intervention. By placing experienced first- and third-grade teachers into second-grade roles, the campus strengthened alignment between foundational skills and upcoming grade-level expectations, ensuring instruction was tightly matched to students’ literacy development. Teachers implemented consistent, bell-to-bell literacy instruction, supported by high-quality collaboration in PLCs to strengthen lesson internalization and instructional coherence. In addition, Cook activated Tier 2 literacy supports by the third week of the semester, using Title I-funded reading interventionists to provide early, targeted support for students with the greatest needs. Together, these structures created a strong, aligned literacy system that accelerated growth and reduced the percentage of students requiring intervention.



Key Takeaways - BOY

- 29% recommended for intervention (vs. 26% district average)
- 26-point reduction in students scoring “recommended for intervention”
- 33-point increase in median percentile score from prior year
- Performed near the district average despite serving higher-need populations

Key Takeaways - MOY

- 26% recommended for intervention (vs. 21% district average)
- 16-point reduction in students scoring “recommended for intervention”
- 18-point increase in median percentile score from prior year
- Performed near the district average despite serving higher-need populations

Wooten Elementary School - Outlier

Wooten Elementary demonstrated strong early literacy outcomes, performing below the district average for students recommended for intervention while serving a high-need student population. These results reflect a highly developed instructional leadership system that supports consistent, high-quality literacy instruction across classrooms. The campus leadership team meets weekly and engages in instructional rounds to monitor implementation and calibrate expectations for effective literacy practices. Teachers receive regular, actionable observation and feedback, strengthening Tier 1 instruction and ensuring alignment to district expectations. Strong PLC structures and robust student data tracking systems support timely instructional adjustments and targeted supports. In addition, Wooten consistently implements high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) and district-aligned intervention resources, reinforcing foundational literacy skills and providing systematic support for students needing additional instruction. Together, these systems reflect a cohesive, leadership-driven approach to early literacy that can inform improvement efforts across other campuses.

Key Takeaways - BOY

- 29% recommended for intervention (vs. 26% district average)
- 2-point reduction from prior year
- Performed near the district average despite serving higher-need populations in a swing space



Key Takeaways - MOY

- 16% recommended for intervention (vs. 21% district average)
- 18-point reduction from prior year
- 25-point increase in median percentile score from prior year
- Performed below the district average despite serving higher-need populations

Campbell Elementary School - Outlier

Campbell Elementary continues to demonstrate strong early literacy outcomes, remaining well below the district average for students recommended for intervention. These results are driven by a highly effective first-grade team, strong PLC structures, and closely aligned Tier 1 and Tier 2 literacy systems. Teachers implemented HMH with fidelity, while Tier 2 interventions using UFLI were delivered consistently to address targeted student needs. A seasoned instructional coach partnered closely with teachers through regular feedback cycles, unit modeling, and advance lesson internalization during PLCs. Small class sizes and a low scholar-to-teacher ratio supported more intensive instruction, while intervention and center groupings were frequently adjusted based on multiple data sources, including MAP, CBAs, summative assessments, and student work. Strategic use of Title I funds to staff veteran interventionists further strengthened Tier 2 literacy supports, contributing to sustained reductions in students needing intervention.

Key Takeaways - BOY

- 25% recommended for intervention (vs. 26% district average)
- 7-point reduction from prior year
- Performed below the district average despite serving higher-need populations

Key Takeaways - MOY

- 7% recommended for intervention (vs. 21% district average)
- 31-point reduction from prior year
- Performed below the district average despite serving higher-need populations

Pillow Elementary School - Outlier



Beginning-of-year literacy data highlight Pillow Elementary as a positive campus outlier, demonstrating strong year-over-year growth in median percentile scores and a meaningful reduction in the percentage of students needing intervention. This growth is rooted in consistent, high-quality implementation of structured literacy practices across K–2. Teachers implemented the HMH structured literacy curriculum with fidelity, supported by PLCs focused on lesson internalization and an expectation that teachers rehearse lessons prior to instruction. An instructional coach regularly pushed into classrooms to model and support structured literacy lessons, while primary teachers engaged in peer observations to refine practice. Experienced teachers provided targeted support to novice teachers, strengthening instructional consistency across the grade level. In addition, Tier 2 interventions were implemented with fidelity to address student needs early. Together, these practices reflect a cohesive, collaborative approach to literacy instruction that can inform and strengthen implementation on other campuses.

Key Takeaways - BOY

- 25% recommended for intervention (vs. 26% district average)
- 11-point reduction from prior year
- 1-point increase in median percentile score
- Performed below the district average despite serving higher-need populations

Key Takeaways - MOY

- 23% recommended for intervention (vs. 21% district average)
- 32-point reduction from prior year
- 46-point increase in median percentile score from prior year
- Performed below the district average despite serving higher-need populations

While not all were below the district average, several Band 1 and 2 campuses demonstrated sustained and significant improvement in early literacy outcomes from BOY to MOY. Winn Montessori continued its strong trajectory, reducing the percentage of students below benchmark by 21 points at MOY while increasing the median percentile by 32 points—reflecting one of the strongest sustained growth patterns across the district. Pleasant Hill Elementary also demonstrated notable progress, decreasing the percentage of students below benchmark by 21 points and increasing the median percentile by 26 points, indicating meaningful acceleration in student achievement.

T.A. Brown Elementary showed continued upward momentum, reducing the percentage of students below benchmark by 22 points at MOY while increasing the median percentile by 13 points, reflecting steady gains building on BOY improvements. Pickle Elementary maintained strong performance, with consistently low percentages of students below benchmark and continued growth in median percentile scores, signaling



sustained Tier 1 effectiveness. Together, these campuses highlight the impact of consistent implementation of strong instructional systems, effective PLC structures, and targeted supports in driving sustained early literacy growth across the year.

2nd Grade Students NWEA MAP Growth Reading Achievement Percentile (2025 NWEA Norms), Fall 2025

The percentage of 2nd-grade students scoring in the recommended-for-intervention level on the Fall 2025 NWEA MAP Reading Achievement Score Proficiency Indicator (below 30th percentile in English and below 40th percentile in Spanish)

District GPM data at the campus-level. Table that shows the all student category and student subgroups for the current data point only. Organized by the [SRI](#) band system. Name data by GPM, current year/progress time period, and campus level.

School	Total % BOY	Total % MOY	% A. Indian	% Asian BOY	% Asian MOY	% AA BOY	% AA MOY	% His BOY	% His MOY	% Pac. Islander	% 2 or More BOY	% 2 or More MOY	% White BOY	% White MOY	% EcD BOY	% EcD MOY	% Em Bil BOY	% Em Bil MOY	% Sped BOY	% Sped MOY
Andrews ES	45%	35%	-	*	*	*	*	46%	38%	-	-	-	*	*	37%	38%	46%	39%	*	*
Barrington ES	34%	29%	-	*	*	*	*	36%	31%	-	-	-	*	*	32%	28%	35%	31%	71%	45%
Brown ES	53%	42%	-	40%	*	*	*	51%	40%	-	*	*	*	*	55%	41%	55%	45%	*	38%
Cook ES	29%	26%	-	-	-	*	*	29%	28%	-	-	-	*	*	29%	26%	27%	24%	80%	43%
Dawson ES	48%	35%	*	-	-	*	*	56%	43%	-	-	-	*	*	61%	41%	50%	20%	40%	38%
Galindo ES	44%	39%	*	*	*	*	*	44%	40%	-	-	-	29%	29%	46%	41%	26%	42%	56%	52%
Govalle ES	46%	31%	-	-	-	89%	56%	38%	26%	-	-	-	*	*	50%	31%	44%	28%	75%	39%
Harris ES	50%	31%	-	-	-	-	-	53%	33%	-	-	-	*	*	61%	34%	55%	31%	67%	50%
Hart ES	35%	31%	-	43%	0%	*	*	35%	32%	-	-	-	-	-	36%	33%	37%	24%	73%	53%
Houston ES	41%	29%	-	-	-	80%	*	36%	29%	-	-	-	*	*	47%	27%	30%	28%	43%	19%
Jordan ES	46%	49%	-	-	-	63%	50%	39%	50%	-	*	*	*	*	45%	47%	38%	44%	89%	89%
Langford ES	47%	43%	-	-	-	*	*	49%	45%	-	*	*	-	*	46%	44%	40%	38%	57%	69%
Linder ES	47%	30%	-	*	*	38%	55%	47%	28%	-	*	*	*	*	50%	30%	56%	23%	60%	42%
Norman-Sims ES	49%	43%	-	*	*	53%	53%	44%	35%	-	*	*	*	*	55%	42%	50%	35%	14%	44%



School	Total % BOY	Total % MOY	% A. Indian	% Asian BOY	% Asian MOY	% AA BOY	% AA MOY	% His BOY	% His MOY	% Pac. Islander	% 2 or More BOY	% 2 or More MOY	% White BOY	% White MOY	% EcD BOY	% EcD MOY	% Em Bil BOY	% Em Bil MOY	% Sped BOY	% Sped MOY
Oak Springs ES	80%	77%	-	-	-	91%	67%	75%	92%	-	-	-	*	*	82%	77%	*	*	*	88%
Ortega ES	47%	38%	-	-	-	43%	60%	48%	36%	-	-	-	*	*	50%	35%	50%	44%	56%	50%
Overton ES	52%	38%	*	-	-	17%	29%	54%	37%	-	-	-	*	*	50%	42%	50%	41%	71%	36%
Padron ES	43%	40%	-	-	-	*	*	42%	42%	-	*	*	*	-	37%	42%	44%	44%	64%	47%
Pecan Springs ES	49%	31%	-	-	-	75%	57%	40%	23%	-	*	*	*	*	52%	32%	33%	19%	75%	33%
Perez ES	42%	31%	-	-	-	*	*	43%	31%	-	*	*	*	*	44%	31%	44%	28%	36%	37%
Pickle ES	36%	20%	-	-	-	*	*	39%	22%	-	*	*	*	*	37%	20%	40%	19%	55%	38%
Rodriguez ES	50%	53%	-	-	-	*	*	51%	58%	-	-	-	-	*	48%	55%	56%	56%	43%	63%
Sanchez ES	50%	26%	-	-	-	*	*	51%	25%	-	*	*	-	-	53%	26%	52%	27%	*	*
Walnut Creek ES	31%	40%	-	*	*	*	*	27%	39%	-	-	-	50%	40%	25%	40%	20%	33%	*	43%
Widen ES	45%	24%	-	-	-	*	20%	46%	25%	-	-	-	*	*	62%	26%	45%	19%	63%	33%
Winn Montessori	31%	32%	-	*	*	60%	60%	38%	39%	-	*	*	9%	9%	45%	48%	43%	47%	50%	62%
Wooldridge ES	51%	49%	-	-	-	*	*	52%	49%	-	*	*	-	-	56%	48%	51%	50%	80%	50%
Wooten ES	29%	16%	-	-	-	*	*	24%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	29%	16%	17%	23%	56%	44%
Allison ES	24%	40%	-	*	*	*	*	24%	41%	-	-	-	*	*	27%	44%	11%	35%	*	50%
Blackshear ES	35%	41%	-	*	*	44%	67%	33%	40%	-	*	*	33%	17%	33%	53%	*	*	40%	60%
Campbell ES	25%	7%	-	*	*	9%	9%	40%	0%	-	-	-	*	*	39%	11%	*	*	33%	13%



School	Total % BOY	Total % MOY	% A. Indian	% Asian BOY	% Asian MOY	% AA BOY	% AA MOY	% His BOY	% His MOY	% Pac. Islander	% 2 or More BOY	% 2 or More MOY	% White BOY	% White MOY	% EcD BOY	% EcD MOY	% Em Bil BOY	% Em Bil MOY	% Sped BOY	% Sped MOY
Graham ES	40%	35%	-	-	-	*	*	38%	34%	-	-	*	*	*	52%	41%	44%	41%	80%	76%
Guerrero-Thompson ES	39%	26%	-	*	*	*	*	39%	26%	-	-	-	*	*	41%	25%	42%	22%	50%	70%
McBee ES	33%	26%	-	-	-	*	*	34%	25%	-	-	-	*	*	34%	26%	38%	26%	20%	33%
Odom ES	40%	30%	-	-	-	*	*	42%	33%	-	-	-	*	*	44%	34%	62%	45%	45%	27%
Palm ES	29%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	29%	26%	-	*	*	*	*	47%	29%	42%	40%	40%	35%
Pillow ES	25%	23%	*	*	*	*	*	28%	19%	-	*	*	8%	25%	16%	29%	17%	17%	*	*
Pleasant Hill ES	36%	21%	*	*	*	0%	29%	44%	19%	-	-	-	*	*	29%	20%	53%	19%	40%	20%
St Elmo ES	26%	27%	-	*	*	*	*	30%	31%	-	-	-	20%	10%	38%	34%	33%	32%	38%	50%
Zavala ES	54%	54%	-	-	-	60%	*	56%	53%	-	*	*	*	*	57%	55%	20%	40%	83%	71%
Blanton ES	26%	18%	-	*	*	*	*	39%	31%	-	*	*	12%	6%	54%	38%	40%	35%	50%	40%
Blazier ES	26%	16%	-	20%	20%	41%	16%	22%	17%	-	17%	0%	37%	16%	33%	19%	24%	21%	29%	22%
Boone ES	25%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	33%	26%	-	*	*	22%	19%	35%	33%	17%	17%	30%	15%
Casey ES	20%	13%	-	*	*	50%	20%	20%	16%	-	*	*	11%	0%	33%	23%	25%	13%	20%	15%
Cowan ES	28%	17%	-	*	*	*	*	38%	29%	-	17%	0%	21%	12%	40%	39%	38%	25%	42%	24%
Cunningham ES	15%	17%	-	-	-	*	*	15%	28%	-	*	*	17%	6%	17%	23%	13%	13%	31%	27%
Davis ES	29%	21%	-	10%	11%	50%	17%	45%	44%	*	33%	29%	15%	7%	50%	35%	45%	36%	43%	35%
Doss ES	11%	10%	-	13%	7%	*	*	34%	36%	-	0%	0%	4%	1%	33%	33%	46%	44%	33%	30%
Joslin ES	48%	19%	-	*	*	-	-	53%	33%	-	*	*	54%	8%	71%	31%	60%	44%	77%	31%



School	Total % BOY	Total % MOY	% A. Indian	% Asian BOY	% Asian MOY	% AA BOY	% AA MOY	% His BOY	% His MOY	% Pac. Islander	% 2 or More BOY	% 2 or More MOY	% White BOY	% White MOY	% EcD BOY	% EcD MOY	% Em Bil BOY	% Em Bil MOY	% Sped BOY	% Sped MOY
Kocurek ES	42%	35%	*	*	*	*	*	50%	40%	-	-	-	28%	28%	44%	38%	64%	42%	58%	50%
Menchaca ES	31%	30%	-	*	*	80%	75%	23%	24%	-	0%	20%	33%	27%	31%	32%	27%	26%	36%	50%
Oak Hill ES	18%	19%	-	*	*	20%	20%	29%	31%	-	0%	0%	9%	9%	27%	35%	27%	29%	44%	42%
Patton ES	12%	9%	-	14%	14%	40%	0%	16%	13%	-	14%	0%	5%	8%	33%	23%	20%	27%	23%	15%
Reilly ES	25%	23%	-	14%	14%	-	-	42%	39%	-	0%	0%	6%	6%	35%	46%	40%	48%	67%	56%
Summitt ES	15%	10%	-	9%	6%	14%	33%	28%	16%	-	10%	10%	12%	5%	17%	13%	15%	9%	22%	20%
Sunset Valley ES	14%	9%	-	-	-	*	*	15%	11%	-	*	*	14%	9%	28%	26%	25%	21%	46%	21%
Travis Heights ES	32%	25%	-	33%	33%	57%	29%	50%	40%	-	20%	*	5%	10%	62%	43%	40%	43%	77%	55%
Williams ES	33%	26%	-	-	-	-	*	34%	27%	-	*	*	17%	33%	36%	27%	23%	42%	36%	35%
Baldwin ES	16%	16%	-	22%	0%	*	*	33%	25%	-	0%	14%	10%	16%	40%	40%	20%	20%	20%	27%
Baranoff ES	15%	9%	*	*	*	*	*	16%	8%	-	0%	0%	16%	11%	12%	13%	*	*	27%	12%
Barton Hills ES	9%	5%	-	*	*	*	*	20%	*	-	*	*	6%	3%	60%	*	*	-	10%	0%
Bear Creek ES	11%	8%	*	6%	13%	*	*	9%	4%	-	0%	0%	15%	9%	0%	0%	18%	10%	26%	26%
Becker ES	20%	19%	-	*	*	*	*	27%	22%	-	0%	0%	13%	13%	42%	35%	25%	33%	30%	44%
Brentwood ES	18%	7%	-	*	*	-	-	38%	19%	-	9%	9%	11%	3%	39%	22%	14%	43%	56%	11%
Bryker Woods ES	14%	11%	*	*	*	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	15%	8%	*	*	*	*	*	*
Casis ES	9%	8%	*	*	*	*	*	7%	13%	*	17%	33%	8%	4%	17%	22%	*	*	8%	15%
Clayton ES	6%	2%	*	8%	0%	*	*	9%	5%	-	0%	0%	6%	2%	*	*	*	*	13%	5%



School	Total % BOY	Total % MOY	% A. Indian	% Asian BOY	% Asian MOY	% AA BOY	% AA MOY	% His BOY	% His MOY	% Pac. Islander	% 2 or More BOY	% 2 or More MOY	% White BOY	% White MOY	% EcD BOY	% EcD MOY	% Em Bil BOY	% Em Bil MOY	% Sped BOY	% Sped MOY
Gullett ES	13%	7%	-	*	*	-	-	36%	23%	-	0%	0%	10%	5%	50%	17%	*	*	22%	0%
Highland Park ES	6%	2%	-	*	*	*	*	0%	7%	-	0%	0%	7%	1%	*	*	*	*	18%	4%
Hill ES	10%	8%	-	0%	0%	*	*	17%	15%	-	0%	0%	6%	5%	35%	22%	38%	33%	12%	14%
Kiker ES	9%	8%	-	8%	0%	-	-	17%	13%	-	0%	0%	8%	10%	10%	30%	0%	0%	20%	23%
Lee ES	10%	5%	-	*	*	*	*	13%	13%	-	*	*	9%	3%	17%	20%	*	*	14%	0%
Maplewood ES	8%	3%	-	*	*	*	*	18%	6%	-	0%	0%	3%	0%	27%	17%	*	*	0%	8%
Mathews ES	29%	16%	-	*	*	*	*	35%	21%	-	*	*	27%	14%	43%	31%	*	*	64%	27%
Mills ES	8%	6%	-	0%	7%	*	*	9%	0%	-	0%	0%	10%	7%	*	*	0%	20%	17%	13%
Ridgetop ES	16%	19%	-	*	*	*	*	23%	26%	-	*	*	4%	9%	40%	60%	22%	44%	40%	40%
Zilker ES	8%	5%	-	*	*	*	*	13%	4%	-	14%	14%	2%	2%	15%	6%	40%	20%	0%	0%
Austin ISD	26%	21%	17%	15%	10%	46%	37%	35%	28%	*	9%	8%	12%	8%	41%	33%	38%	32%	40%	32%

*Data masked due to test count <5, - No tests for that demographic group