



raise your hand

— T E X A S —

STRONGER SCHOOLS. BRIGHTER FUTURES.

**The Texas Star System:
An Improvement Model
For Public School Accountability**

The Texas Star System: An Improvement Model for Students and Schools

A new public school state accountability system – The Texas Star System – is proposed to focus on **Improvement** by including:

1. **Analyses of Growth** to determine program improvement and individual student improvement.
2. Measures of **Comparable Improvement** in which schools with similar indicators are grouped to examine differences in achievement and growth, and reward success.
3. Clear **Identification of Areas in Need of Improvement**, to be addressed by District and Campus improvement plans following a priority structure.
4. A **Proportional Model** provided in an annual status report, to include a diagnostic profile of achievement across a wide variety of measures and a summary showing the proportion earned for achievement and growth.
5. An assignment of **Stars** earned based on the proportional model evaluation.
6. A system of **Rewards and Interventions** for achievement, growth, and targeted school improvement.
7. A system design that is **Fluid and Flexible** to evolve with changes in the testing program and the addition of new indicators.

The Texas Star System

The following Guiding Principles were used to inform and direct the development of The Texas Star System.

A new public school accountability system should:

- Focus on improvement rather than labeling
- Provide true, meaningful accountability
- Be complex enough to differentiate among schools and districts, but not be so complex as to lose transparency in communicating to stakeholders
- Be fair in addressing the diversity of educational settings and challenges
- Include high expectations for achievement for all students
- Shape local behavior appropriately
- Build in compensating factors so that the lowest performance of one group in one subject does not determine a performance rating
- Provide a new approach to evaluating schools and districts

Components of The Texas Star System

The proposed state accountability system will provide evaluation of performance on a variety of indicators, analyses of change, and targeted school improvement for schools and districts, to include the following components:

1. To account for diverse populations, a **Proportional Model**, expressed annually in a diagnostic profile format, will consider achievement in a wide variety of measures to include factors other than assessment performance. The number of areas evaluated for each school or district will vary depending on the demographics and measures applicable to the school or district. For each indicator falling within an expected range of performance, credit will be earned. A proportion of credit earned to measures evaluated will be calculated. Areas of low performance will be identified but no one measure will cause a school or district to be considered low-performing.

Where appropriate, the state system and federal evaluations under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) will be aligned. For example, the student groups evaluated and the indicators with highest priority for improvement will be aligned with Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as calculated under NCLB. Where there are differences, the state should seek flexibility to align the federal system with the state system.

2. To focus improvement efforts, **Indicator Tiers** will be used. Tier 1 indicators include reading and mathematics performance and measures included in AYP evaluations. Tier 2 indicators include the core curriculum areas other than reading and mathematics. Tier 3 indicators measure college and workforce readiness. Example Tier indicators for each school level are shown in Table 1.

3. To recognize districts and schools that have not met performance targets, **Growth** will be factored into the proportion earned. There are two methodologies to evaluate growth:
 - a. For those measures that do not exist at every grade, a status, or **Program Improvement**, model will be used. For example, three years of results for the percent of students passing the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) Science assessment in grade 5 will be reported and evaluated. These results, by definition, are based on the performance of different students over time, but provide a measure of the success of the program (Science instruction in 5th grade). Based on the trend, an arrow pointing up, flat, or down, will be assigned. For example, an Up Arrow for assessment results would be assigned if growth is five or more percentage points over three points of assessment (comprising two full years), and positive from year to year. If performance is not in the expected range, an Up Arrow allows growth credit to be earned and factored into the proportion. (See Appendix C for further elaboration.)
 - b. For those measures that exist for contiguous grades (*i.e.*, Reading and Mathematics in grades 3 through 8), a **Growth Model** will be used. This type of model allows the evaluation of individual student growth from year to year by matching student performance results across years. If performance is not in the expected range but results of the growth model analysis produce an Up Arrow, growth credit will be earned and factored into the proportion. Currently, the Reading and Mathematics assessments in grades 3 through 8 are not vertically aligned, which hampers the construction of an easily understood growth model. SB 1031, passed in the 80th Regular Session of the Texas Legislature requires that assessment instruments allow for measuring annual improvement in student achievement. (Methodology to be determined.)
4. To aid educators in identifying schools that have demonstrated growth so that best practices may be shared, measures of **Comparable Improvement** will be created. These will group schools with similar indicators in order to examine and illustrate differences in achievement and growth and reward success. It is recommended that the current methodology used to calculate Comparable Improvement be continued for TAKS Reading/ELA and Mathematics. Methodologies for calculating improvement for indicators other than Reading/ELA and Mathematics should be developed and reported as part of Comparable Improvement.
5. To provide a diagnostic profile for each district and school, a **Summary** of the proportion earned for performance and growth will be created and the areas in need of improvement will be identified. Every school and district will have at least one area in need of improvement identified. District and Campus Improvement Plans (CIPs) will address the areas in need of improvement. Table 2 provides the priority in which areas in need of improvement will be addressed in Campus and District Improvement Plans.

6. To recognize and assist districts and schools, a system of **rewards and interventions** will be part of the system.
- a. To eliminate confusion and redundancy, only one system for rewards and sanctions will be implemented by the state. Identification of districts and schools to be rewarded or sanctioned will be based on the Star System.
 - b. After two consecutive years earning six Stars, districts and schools will be **acknowledged** by the state as a Texas Star District, or a Texas Star School. Districts may not be recognized as a Texas Star District if any of its schools is under sanction for low performance.
 - c. Monetary **rewards** will be awarded to schools for:
 - Three consecutive years of significant growth in Tier I Indicators, or three consecutive years of significant growth in Tier 2 Indicators if all Tier 1 Indicators remain in the Expected Range of performance. (Methodology to be determined.)
 - Performance in the top quartile in Comparable Improvement. In addition to a monetary reward, a stipend will be provided to the schools that share their successful practices with schools in their comparison group in lower quartiles.
 - d. Subject to further consideration as the model is developed, the criteria for identifying schools and districts needing intervention are as follows:
 - **Academic Watch** – Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 40 and 49.9%
 - **Academic Warning** – Either Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40%
 - **Academic Crisis** – Either Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40% and prior year = Academic Warning

Note: if the value for either the Tier 1 Proportion or the Total Proportion is lower than the range defined, the lower value will determine the category. For example, if a school has a Tier 1 Proportion of 42.1% and Total Proportion of 38.9% , the school will be under Academic Warning.







See Table 3 for the proposed schedule of interventions.

- e. Schools and districts not classified as Academic Watch, Academic Warning or Academic Crisis will be identified for **Early Intervention** if they are:
 - Not meeting AYP for two years, and
 - In the bottom 10% of schools or districts based on the proportional model, and
 - In the lower half of their group in Comparable Improvement (for schools)

Activities during Early Intervention will include review by an external evaluator to determine the capacity of the district to improve student performance. The review will ascertain that adequate resources are present in the school, including certified teachers; textbooks, library books, laboratory materials and computers with Internet access; a targeted Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) reflecting the Star System analysis; staff development plans aligned with the CIP; active monitoring of student progress, tutorials, after-school and Saturday classes; and a comparison of the availability of resources in other, higher-performing, schools in the district.

The resources of a school under intervention will be brought up to capacity through the combined efforts of the district, the Regional Educational Service Center, and the state. The state should delineate for districts the flexibility allowed to change principals, staff, and programs. If the school and district meet the capacity evaluation, the district will be allowed one year to bring performance up to standards without further intervention.

Texas Star System Proposed Categories

	100% of Tier I Indicators in the Expected Range and Total Proportion = 90% or higher
	Tier 1 Proportion* and Total Proportion** = 90% or higher
	Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 80 and 89.9%
	Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 70 and 79.9%
	Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 60 and 69.9%
	Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 50 and 59.9%
<i>Academic Watch</i>	Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 40 and 49.9%
<i>Academic Warning</i>	Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40%
<i>Academic Crisis</i>	Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40% and prior year = Academic Warning

Under this proposal, if the value for either the Tier 1 Proportion or the Total Proportion is lower than the range defined for the number of stars, the lower value will determine the number of stars assigned. For example, if a school's Tier 1 Proportion is 82.1% and Total Proportion is 78.9%, three stars will be assigned.

* Total Proportion = percent of all Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 Indicators in Expected Range of Performance or meeting Growth Standards

**Tier 1 Proportion = percent of Tier 1 Indicators in Expected Range of Performance or meeting Growth Standards

NOTE: The parameters proposed in this document are intended as guidelines. The proposed framework allows for flexibility in determining the specifics of setting standards in areas such as Expected Range, Program Growth, Student Growth, assignment of Stars and allocation of indicators to Tiers, as well as allowing for credit to be earned by examining combinations of indicators (for example, *either* college readiness or workforce readiness).

Table 1: Indicators by Tier

	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
Tier 1*	TAKS Reading & Math Grades 3 – 5	TAKS Reading & Math Grades 6 - 8	<i>Until Phased Out::</i> TAKS Reading/English Language Arts & Math Grades 9 -11
			Completion Rate
	Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate	Attendance Rate
		<i>When Available:</i> End-of-Course Assessments	<i>When Available:</i> End-of-Course Assessments
Tier 2	TAKS Writing, Grade 4	TAKS Writing, Grade 7	
	TAKS Science, Grade 5	TAKS Science, Grade 8	<i>Until Phased Out :</i> TAKS Science Grades 10-11
		TAKS Social Studies, Grade 8	<i>Until Phased Out::</i> TAKS Social Studies, Grade 10-11
Tier 3			Advanced Courses/Dual Enrollment
			AP/IB Participation and Performance
			SAT/ACT Participation and Performance
			Workforce Readiness Measures (tbd)
	Any Additional Indicators To Be Determined		

*Inclusion of TAKS-Accommodated, TAKS Modified, TAKS-Alternative and TELPAS-Reading will align with state implementation schedule.

Table 2: Priority Levels for Areas in Need of Improvement
For District or Campus Improvement Plans

<i>Result of Evaluation</i>	<i>Interpretation:</i>	<i>Priority Level*</i>
Tier 1 Indicator: No Check Mark	Did not meet expected performance, growth arrow flat (no change) or down (decrease in performance)	1-1
Tier 1 Indicator: Up Arrow	Did not meet expected performance, growth arrow up (increase in performance, but not yet to expected level)	1-2
Tier 2 Indicator: No Check Mark	Did not meet expected performance, growth arrow flat (no change) or down (decrease in performance)	2-1
Tier 2 Indicator: Up Arrow	Did not meet expected performance, growth arrow up (increase in performance, but yet not to expected level)	2-2
Tier 3 Indicator: No Check Mark	Did not meet expected performance, growth arrow flat (no change) or down (decrease in performance)	3-1
Tier 3 Indicator: Up Arrow	Did not meet expected performance, growth arrow up (increase in performance, but not yet to expected level)	3-2
	All indicators meet expected performance but majority of growth arrows are flat or down	4-1

*A 1-1 is read as Tier 1 Priority 1; 1-2 as Tier 1 Priority 2
2-1 is read as Tier 2 Priority 1; 2-2 as Tier 2 Priority 2, *etc.*

Table 3: Interventions

	Early Intervention	Academic Watch	Academic Warning	Academic Crisis	Year 2 – Academic Crisis	Year 3 – Academic Crisis
Description	Not meeting AYP, in the bottom ten percent of schools based on the proportional model and (for schools) in the lower half of their group in Comparable Improvement	Tier 1 Proportion and Total Proportion between 40 and 49.9%	Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40%	Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40% and prior year = Academic Warning	Tier 1 Proportion or Total Proportion less than 40% and prior year = Academic Warning or Academic Crisis	Total Proportion less than 40.0% prior year = Academic Warning or Academic Crisis
Intervention/Sanction	Commissioner shall select and assign a Technical Assistance Team (TAT) to conduct a capacity analysis and assist in implementing improvement plan (IP); Principal shall attend training as determined by the TAT	Commissioner shall assign a Campus Intervention team (CIT); CIT conducts capacity analysis, assists in development of IP and monitors implementation of IP; Principal shall attend training as determined by the CIT	Commissioner shall order planning for Reconstitution and continue CIT Commissioner may appoint monitor, conservator, management team, or board of managers to oversee IP	Campus opens school year as reconstituted campus CIT and IP ongoing Commissioner may appoint monitor, conservator, management team, or board of managers to oversee IP	Commissioner shall review progress and may order closure or pursue alternative management If Commissioner allows campus to continue, CIT and IP ongoing Commissioner may appoint monitor, conservator, management team, or board of managers to oversee IP	Commissioner shall order closure or pursue alternative management
Timeline of Intervention/Sanction	If the school and district meet the capacity evaluation, the district will be given one year to increase Total Proportion without further intervention.	CIT continues until Total Proportion exceeds 50% for two consecutive years.	CIT continues until Total Proportion exceeds 50% for two consecutive years.	CIT continues until Total Proportion exceeds 50% for two consecutive years.	CIT continues until Total Proportion exceeds 50% for two consecutive years.	CIT continues until Total Proportion exceeds 50% for two consecutive years.
Failure to Implement Intervention/Sanction		Failure to implement CIT recommendations or SIP, the commissioner may order reconstitution	Failure to implement SIP, the commissioner may order alternative management or closure	Failure to implement SIP, the commissioner may order alternative management or closure		

Note: adapted from Texas Education Agency document http://www.tea.state.tx.us/pmi/accmon/2008/resources/TAT_AU_Intervention_Matrix.pdf

Table 4: Comparison of the Texas Star System to the Current Statewide Texas Public School System

The Texas Star System	Current Accountability System
<p>A focus on Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads directly to Campus and District Improvement Plans, following a priority structure • Rewards both Program Growth and Student Growth, built into the proportional model • Rewards Comparable Improvement • Shapes local behavior appropriately 	<p>A focus on labeling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires dependence on local expertise to analyze strengths and weaknesses in various reports in order to develop District and Campus Improvement Plans • Does not adequately acknowledge improvement
<p>A proportional model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides greater precision and differentiation among schools and districts • Is fairer, by accommodating diversity without triggering a lower categorization • Provides flexibility to evaluate additional indicators without making the system more punitive • Includes rigor and high expectations for achievement by evaluating student group performance for each subject at each grade 	<p>A four-category “hurdle” model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assigns a lower rating when one group fails to meet one standard • Creates a bias against larger more diverse schools and districts such that lower ratings are more often assigned relative to smaller homogeneous schools and districts • Creates more hurdles as indicators are added to the system • Masks variations in grade-level performance by summing results by subject
<p>A simpler approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides visual cues in report to easily see if performance is in or out of an Expected Range • Provides a summary page of performance including targeted areas in need of improvement • Communicates results clearly to stakeholders 	<p>A system so complex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manual to explain it runs to 194 pages • It focuses on the mechanics of categorization rather than guidance on identifying areas in need of improvement • It is difficult to explain to stakeholders
<p>Includes analysis of disaggregated group performance</p>	<p>Includes analysis of disaggregated group performance</p>
<p>Includes Comparable Improvement analysis</p>	<p>Includes Comparable Improvement analyses</p>
<p>Includes an integrated system of rewards and Interventions for achievement, growth, and targeted school improvement</p>	<p>Includes a fragmented approach to rewards and interventions</p>

Appendix A

Additional Recommendations: State System

Legislative:

1. To reduce the number of state evaluation systems currently in place (the state accountability system, performance-based monitoring, compliance), combine all references to accountability into one section in state statute and simplify the language.
2. To reduce conflicting accountability evaluations, eliminate the Public Education Grant (PEG) program.
3. To reduce the reporting burden on districts and schools, eliminate the School Report Card requirement, an unfunded mandate that consists of a subset of the information currently included in Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports.

Texas Education Agency:

4. To include a broader scope of students, develop workforce readiness indicators to be evaluated in conjunction with college readiness indicators.
5. To reward districts for encouraging participation in college readiness endeavors, consider weighting and combining components of some indicators. An example is college admissions tests, where increased participation typically causes a decline in overall performance.
6. To help schools and districts improve instruction, align the grant programs and initiatives within the state agency to address the areas most in need of improvement as identified by the state accountability system and streamline the grant process to provide aid and support in a timely manner.
7. To reward schools and districts for retaining students at risk of dropping out and assisting them in passing their General Education Development (GED) tests, include GED completers in the calculation of Completion Rate for state accountability purposes.
8. To provide more meaningful accountability for alternative education (AE) schools, use growth measures as the primary focus. A system to evaluate accomplishment of student growth targets specified in individualized plans created for students served in AE schools should be considered.
9. To provide a summary of achievement under higher standards, provide Commended Performance results on a separate report to districts and schools, issued at the same time as the Texas Star System report.
10. Encourage local school boards to create customized accountability systems that evaluate achievement of and progress toward goals of importance to their communities and to report annually on the success of their schools and the district on their chosen indicators.

Appendix B

Additional Recommendations: Federal System

While No Child Left Behind is in effect, federal law requires that public school districts and schools in Texas be assigned a status derived from the calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The State of Texas should continue to comply with this federal requirement.

It is recommended that The Texas Education Agency make the following modifications to the current calculation of AYP:

1. Evaluate grade 11 rather than grade 10. Because the Exit-level assessment requirement for high school graduation is administered beginning at grade 11, students are more motivated to do well on the assessment given at grade 11 relative to that at grade 10.
2. Evaluate Reading in grade 11 rather than the English Language Arts measure currently being used, which combines Reading and Writing.
3. Allow and provide a list of acceptable formulas for the calculation of confidence intervals. Confidence intervals provide a "window" or a "range" around a given percent. If the goal is to measure student proficiency with certainty, then constructing a confidence interval around the observed scores should be used. Doing so would allow districts, teachers, and politicians to infer how well the observed scores represent the true proficiency of the entire population of students. Providing a list of acceptable formulas for calculating confidence intervals would increase the uniformity of the NCLB accountability system.
4. Include the third administration of assessments administered under the Student Success Initiative in the calculation of AYP.

It is recommended that the Texas Education Agency request the following change in definition to the US Department of Education:

5. Define Full Academic Year as "spring testing to spring testing." Currently students considered to be enrolled for a Full Academic Year (*i.e.*, those included in the calculation of AYP) are those who are enrolled in the school or district by the fall "snapshot" date (the last Friday in October) and are tested in the same school or district in the spring. Using "spring testing to spring testing" as the operational definition provides a more meaningful measure of the influence a school or district has on student learning over the course of a full year.

Appendix C
The Texas Star System
Example Achievement Profiles and Glossary

The following Elementary School Achievement Profile and High School Achievement Profile are provided as examples of the application of the Texas Star System. They are intended as illustrations, and do not reflect actual data from any individual schools.

The parameters provided are intended as guidelines. The proposed framework allows for flexibility in determining the specifics of setting standards in areas such as Expected Range, Program Growth, Student Growth, assignment of Stars and allocation of indicators to Tiers, as well as allowing for credit to be earned by examining combinations of indicators (for example, *either* college readiness or workforce readiness).

The following Glossary is provided as a guide to the Achievement Profile.

GLOSSARY:

Tier I Indicators include reading and mathematics performance and measures included in AYP evaluations. **Tier 2 Indicators** include the core curriculum areas other than reading and mathematics. **Tier 3 Indicators** measure college and workforce readiness. Indicators are identified as Tier I, Tier 2 or Tier 3 to provide priorities for campus and district improvement (see Tables 1 and 2).

Expected Range provides the range of performance that will earn credit for achievement (indicated by a check mark in the Achievement column). Performance results are placed in the appropriate column: **Out of Range** or **Within Range**. The Expected Range will vary depending on the indicator being evaluated.

Program Growth evaluates change over three points of measurement (two full years). These results, by definition, are based on the performance of different students over three years and provide a measure of the success of the program. Based on the trend, an arrow pointing up, flat, or down, will be assigned. For every Up Arrow, credit will be earned (indicated by a check mark in the Growth column). The direction of an arrow is factored into the priorities for campus and district improvement.

For example, the following parameters might be used for program growth in the TAKS subject areas:

Up Arrow -- assigned if growth is five or more percentage points over three years and is positive from year to year.

Flat Arrow – assigned if growth is less than five or more percentage points over three years or is not positive from year to year.

Down Arrow – assigned if there is a decline of five or more percentage points over three years, with decline from year to year.

Program Growth standards will differ depending on the indicator being evaluated and will be based on a reasonable growth expectation for the indicator. For information purposes, Growth arrows are calculated and reported to show the trend of performance for each indicator, whether performance is in the Expected Range or Out of Range.

Student Growth provides a measure of student improvement for those measures that exist for contiguous grades (*i.e.*, TAKS Reading and Mathematics in grades 3 through 8). A growth model to evaluate student cohort data will be created. This type of model allows the evaluation of individual student growth from year to year by matching student performance results across years. Based on the results of the growth model analysis, credit will be earned for performance not in the Expected Range. It is recommended that Growth credit be earned by meeting *either* the Program Growth or Student Growth standard.

Achievement shows the outcome of the evaluations for achievement. Credit, indicated by a check mark in the Achievement column, is earned for performance in the Expected Range.

Growth shows the outcome of the evaluations for growth. Credit, indicated by a check mark in the Growth column, may be earned for Program Growth (an Up Arrow) or for Student Growth (an Up Arrow).

X: An X next to a student group indicates that it is being evaluated.

SUMMARY provides the results of the evaluation and the areas in need of improvement to be addressed in campus and district improvement plans.

Tier I Achievement shows the credit assigned for performance in the Expected Range for Tier I Indicators.

Tier I Growth shows the credit assigned when performance is not in the Expected Range but is showing either Program Growth or Student Growth.

Tier I Proportion shows the credit earned for either achievement or growth for the Tier I indicators, divided by the total number of areas evaluated. The number of areas evaluated will vary by campus and district based on the indicators applicable and the student groups evaluated.

Total Proportion shows the credit earned for either achievement or growth for all indicators (Tier 1, 2, or 3), divided by the total number of areas evaluated. The number of areas evaluated will vary by campus and district based on the indicators applicable and the student groups evaluated.

Areas In Need Of Improvement lists the areas to be addressed in district and campus improvement plans (CIPs). Measures that did not fall in the Expected Range must be addressed in the CIP based on priority levels determined by the indicator type (Tier 1, 2, or 3) and the trend in performance. (See Table 2)

Stars earned shows the number of stars assigned to a school or district based on evaluation of both the Tier I Proportion and the Total Proportion earned under the Texas Star System (see page 7).

TIER 1 INDICATORS:

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to100% Within Range	Program Growth	Student Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS READING							
Grade 3							
X All Students	00		91%	89-93-91%		---	✓
X African-American	00		86%	93-90-86%		---	✓
X Hispanic	00		88%	94-90-88%		---	✓
X White	00		99%	81-86-99%		---	✓
Special Education	00		n/a			---	n/a
X Economic Disad,	00		86%	93-90-86%		---	✓
Grade 4							
X All Students	00		90%	86-88-90%		tbd	✓
X African-American	00	78%		70-73-78%		tbd	✓
X Hispanic	00		99%	88-93-99%		tbd	✓
X White	00		99%	98-97-99%		tbd	✓
Special Education	00		n/a			n/a	n/a
X Economic Disad.	00		80%	91-86-80%		tbd	✓
Grade 5							
X All Students	00		88%	76-86-88%		tbd	✓
X African-American	00		82%	69-73-82%		tbd	✓
X Hispanic	00		86%	69-78-86%		tbd	✓
X White	00		99%	99-99-99%		tbd	✓
Special Education	00		n/a			n/a	n/a
X Economic Disad.	00	70%		80-76-70%		tbd	
Grade 6							
X All Students	00		95%	97-96-95%		tbd	✓
X African-American	00		80%	99-85-80%		tbd	✓
X Hispanic	00		99%	91-95-99%		tbd	✓
X White	00		99%	99-99-99%		tbd	✓
Special Education	00		n/a			n/a	n/a
X Economic Disad.	00		99%	99-97-99%		tbd	✓

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Student Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS MATHEMATICS							
Grade 3							
X All Students	00		88%	70-83-88%		---	
X African-American	00		86%	57-80-86%		---	
X Hispanic	00		82%	80-79-82%		---	
X White	00		99%	71-99-99%		---	
Special Education	00		n/a			---	n/a
X Economic Disadv.	00		86%	64-80-86%		---	
Grade 4							
X All Students	00		87%	89-88-87%		tbd	
X African-American	00		83%	77-80-83%		tbd	
X Hispanic	00		92%	85-90-92%		tbd	
X White	00		83%	86-85-83%		tbd	
Special Education	00		n/a			n/a	n/a
X Economic Disadv.	00		88%	82-85-88%		tbd	
Grade 5							
X All Students	00	74%		78-76-74%		tbd	
X African-American	00	72%		77-75-72%		tbd	
X Hispanic	00		86%	80-84-86%		tbd	
X White	00		99%	98-96-99%		tbd	
Special Education	00		n/a			n/a	n/a
X Economic Disadv.	00	60%		78-73-60%		tbd	
Grade 6							
X All Students	00		97%	83-90-97%		tbd	
X African-American	00		99%	79-85-99%		tbd	
X Hispanic	00		99%	82-94-99%		tbd	
X White	00		89%	99-95-89%		tbd	
Special Education	00		n/a			n/a	n/a
X Economic Disadv.	00		99%	78-80-99%		tbd	

	Expected Range: Out of Range	96% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Student Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
ATTENDANCE RATE						
X All Students		97%	97-97-97%	--	✓	
X African-American		97%	98-97-97%	--	✓	
X Hispanic		97%	97-97-97%	--	✓	
X White		97%	97-96-97%	--	✓	
X Special Education		97%	96-96-96%	--	✓	
X Economic Disadvantaged		97%	97-96-97%	--	✓	

TIER 2 INDICATORS:

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Student Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS WRITING							
Grade 4							
X All Students	00		94%	97-93-94%	--	✓	
X African-American	00		92%	92-90-92%	--	✓	
X Hispanic	00		92%	99-89-92%	--	✓	
X White	00		99%	99-99-99%	--	✓	
Special Education	00		n/a		--	n/a	
X Economic Disadv.	00		80%	91-92-80%	--	✓	

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Student Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS SCIENCE							
Grade 5							
X All Students	00	79%		70-75-79%	--		✓
X African-American	00	75%		68-72-75%	--		✓
X Hispanic	00		89%	88-88-89%	--	✓	
X White	00		99%	95-99-99%	--	✓	
Special Education	00		n/a		--	n/a	
X Economic Disadv.	00	78%		70-76-78%	--		✓

**THE TEXAS STAR SYSTEM
EXAMPLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
ACHIEVEMENT PROFILE SUMMARY**

TIER I:		TOTAL (All Tiers):	
Tier I Achievement:	41	Total Achievement:	48
Tier I Growth:	<u>1</u>	Total Growth:	<u>4</u>
Tier I Credit Earned:	42	Total Credit Earned:	52
Number of Tier I Indicators Evaluated:	46	Total Indicators Evaluated:	56
Tier I Proportion:	42 out of 46 = 91.3%	Total Proportion:	52 out of 56 = 92.8%

Areas in Need of Improvement:

Priority:

Tier 1:

Reading:	Economic Disadvantaged (Grade 5)	1-1
	African-American (Grade 4)	1-2
Mathematics:	All, African-American, Economic Disadvantaged (Grade 5)	1-1

Tier 2:

Science:	All, African-American, Economic Disadvantaged (Grade 5)	2-2
----------	---	-----



This Elementary School earned five stars under the proposed categories.

TIER 1 INDICATORS:

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS READING GRADE 9						
X All Students	000		82%	80-81-82%		
X African-American	000		80%	70-78-80%		
X Hispanic	000		82%	75-80-82%		
White	000		n/a			n/a
X Special Education	000		80%	78-79-80%		
X Econ Disadvantaged	000		82%	77-80-82%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a			n/a
TAKS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 10						
X All Students	000		86%	80-84-86%		
X African-American	000		83%	78-80-83%		
X Hispanic	000		86%	80-84-86%		
White	000		n/a			n/a
X Special Education	000	70%		60-65-70%		
X Econ Disadvantaged	000		80%	70-75-80%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a			n/a
TAKS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 11 (EXIT)						
X All Students	000		84%	77-81-84%		
X African-American	000		82%	70-78-82%		
X Hispanic	000		84%	77-80-84%		
White	000		n/a			n/a
X Special Education	000	73%		70-71-73%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		81%	74-78-81%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a			n/a

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS MATHEMATICS						
GRADE 9						
X All Students	000		81%	78-80-81%		
X African-American	000	78%		70-76-78%		
X Hispanic	000		82%	72-78-82%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000	75%		75-74-75%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		82%	77-79-82%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
GRADE 10						
X All Students	000		81%	70-78-81%		
X African-American	000		80%	79-80-80%		
X Hispanic	000		82%	77-80-82%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000	78%		78-79-78%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		81%	65-77-81%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
GRADE 11 (EXIT)						
X All Students	000		81%	70-75-81%		
X African-American	000		80%	68-74-80%		
X Hispanic	000		84%	75-80-84%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
Special Education	000		n/a		n/a	
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		83%	70-78-83%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
COMPLETION RATE						
		Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth		
X All Students			82%	75-78-82%		
X African-American			80%	74-77-80%		
X Hispanic			80%	75-78-80%		
White			n/a		n/a	
X Special Education			83%	78-81-83%		
X Economic Disadvantaged			81%	77-79-81%		
Limited English Proficient			n/a		n/a	
ATTENDANCE RATE:						
		Expected Range: Out of Range	95% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth		
X All Students			95%	90-94-95%		
X African-American			95%	88-93-95%		
X Hispanic			95%	95-95-95%		
White			n/a		n/a	
X Special Education			95%	95-95-95%		
X Economic Disadvantaged			95%	95-95-95%		

END-OF-COURSE TESTS (Anticipated to begin in spring 2011)

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
ALGEBRA I						
X All Students	000		82%	78-80-82%		
X African-American	000		83%	78-80-83%		
X Hispanic	000		80%	68-72-80%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000		80%	80-81-80%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		81%	70-76-81%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
GEOMETRY						
X All Students	000		83%	77-80-83%		
X African-American	000		81%	78-80-81%		
X Hispanic	000		86%	80-84-86%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000		81%	79-80-81%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		82%	75-79-82%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
BIOLOGY						
X All Students	000	73%		66-70-73%		
X African-American	000	66%		60-61-66%		
X Hispanic	000	76%		70-74-76%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000	70%		65-68-70%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000	71%		64-69-71%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	

[PLACE MARKERS FOR ADDITIONAL END OF COURSE EXAMS]

TIER 2 INDICATORS :

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	80% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
TAKS SCIENCE						
GRADE 10						
X All Students	000	69%		50-57-69%		
X African-American	000	62%		60-62-62%		
X Hispanic	000	71%		47-55-71%		
White	000	n/a			n/a	
X Special Education	000	63%		60-62-63%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000	68%		58-60-68%		
Limited English Proficient	000	n/a			n/a	
GRADE 11 (EXIT)						
X All Students	000	71%		60-65-71%		
X African-American	000	72%		61-67-72%		
X Hispanic	000	71%		60-66-71%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000	70%		60-65-70%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000	72%		61-67-72%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
TAKS SOCIAL STUDIES						
GRADE 10						
X All Students	000		82%	75-78-82%		
X African-American	000		80%	70-72-80%		
X Hispanic	000		86%	80-83-86%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
X Special Education	000	78%		75-77-78%		
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		81%	72-76-81%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	
GRADE 11 (EXIT)						
X All Students	000		93%	80-88-93%		
X Hispanic	000		95%	80-85-95%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	
Special Education	000		n/a		n/a	
X Economic Disadvantaged	000		90%	80-88-90%		
Limited English Proficient	000		n/a		n/a	

TIER 3 INDICATORS :

COLLEGE / WORK FORCE READINESS INDICATORS

ADVANCED COURSES/DUAL ENROLLMENT

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	40% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
X All Students	000		48%	43-47-48%		
X African-American	000		41%	38-40-41%		
X Hispanic	000		49%	46-47-49%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	

AP/IB TESTED

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	30% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
X All Students	000	25%		22-23-25%		
X African-American	000	21%		21-21-21%		
X Hispanic	000	25%		21-23-25%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	

AP/IB EXAMINEES >= Meets State-established Criterion

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	50% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
X All Students	000	20%		18-20-20%		
X African-American	000	18%		18-18-18%		
X Hispanic	000	25%		24-24-25%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	

SAT/ACT TESTED

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	70% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
X All Students	000		80%	75-78-80%		
X African-American	000		80%	75-78-80%		
X Hispanic	000		80%	75-78-80%		
White	000		n/a		n/a	

SAT/ACT >= Met the State-Established Criterion

	# of Students	Expected Range: Out of Range	40% to 100% Within Range	Program Growth	Achievement:	Growth:
X All Students	000	34%		35-34-34%		
X African-American	000	30%		30-30-30%		
X Hispanic	000	36%		36-35-36%		
White	000	n/a			n/a	

[PLACE MARKERS FOR WORK FORCE READINESS INDICATORS]

**THE TEXAS STAR SYSTEM
EXAMPLE HIGH SCHOOL
ACHIEVEMENT PROFILE SUMMARY**

TIER I:		TOTAL (All Tiers):	
Tier I Achievement:	44	Total Achievement:	57
Tier I Growth:	<u>7</u>	Total Growth:	<u>15</u>
Tier I Credit Earned:	51	Total Credit Earned:	72
Number of Tier I Indicators Evaluated:	54	Total Indicators Evaluated:	87
Tier I Proportion:	51 out of 54 = 94.4%	Total Proportion:	72 out of 87 = 82.7%

Areas in Need of Improvement:

Priority:

Tier 1:

TAKS English Language Arts:	Special Education (Grade 11)	1-1
	Special Education (Grade 10)	1-2
TAKS Mathematics:	Special Education (Grade 9, Grade 10)	1-1
	African-American (Grade 9)	1-2
Biology End-of-Course:	All Groups	1-2

Tier 2:

TAKS Science:	African-American, Special Education (Grade 10)	2-1
	All, Hispanic, Economic Disadvantaged (Grade 10)	2-2
	All Groups (Grade 11)	2-2
TAKS Social Studies	Special Education (Grade 10)	2-1

Tier 3:

AP/IB Tested	All Groups	3-1
AP/IB Examinees > Criterion	All Groups	3-1
SAT/ACT Examinees > Criterion	All Groups	3-1



This High School earned four stars under the proposed categories.
