

Student Success Initiative and Accelerated Instruction 2015-2016

Sarah Hinkley, Ph.D. & Laila Y. Sanguras M.S.

EA16-173-4

At-a-Glance

The Student Success Initiative (SSI) was created by the 76th Texas Legislature in 1999 to ensure that all fifth- and eighth-grade students receive the instruction and support they need to be academically successful in reading and mathematics. According to the initiative, accelerated instruction (AI) must be provided at no cost after each *State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness* (STAAR) administration for “at-risk” students and for those who did not meet passing standards. This includes the third administration, even if the student advances to the next grade.

AI requirements were expanded during the 83rd Texas Legislative session with the passage of House Bill 5 (TEC §28.0217). This bill requires school districts to provide AI in the applicable subject area each time a student fails to perform satisfactorily on a *STAAR End of Course* (EOC) exam. EOC exam subjects include Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History.

House Bill 5 requires that state compensatory education (SEC) funds be used to provide AI for students who did not pass *STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC* before the funds can be used for other purposes. In addition, House Bill 5 amended TEC §29.081 to require each school district to evaluate the effectiveness of the district’s AI programs for high school students and to hold an annual public hearing to consider the results of the evaluation.

Purpose and Methods of the Evaluation

The purpose of the 2015-16 SSI evaluation was to evaluate the effectiveness of the AI provided to students who failed fifth- or eighth-grade *STAAR* mathematics or reading subtests and high school students who failed *STAAR EOC* exams. The evaluation was based on a review of legislation pertaining to SSI and AI, district funding documents, campus-based information forms, course files, attendance information provided by the Summer School/Extended Year department, and *STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC* data.

Information forms, sent to principals of fifth-grade, eighth-grade, and high school students who failed one or more subtests, were used to collect AI information for the following administrations: summer 2015 (all levels), December 2015 (high school), and March 2016 (fifth and eighth grade). Forms were sent to campus principals and office managers by email after testing data were released. Campus staff had two to four weeks to complete each form. The evaluators sent weekly reminders to staff members who had not yet

completed the forms. Campus staff were asked to indicate the amount of AI provided during a typical week, when AI was typically provided, and the campus role of the most common provider of the AI. Staff members made multiple entries for students who failed more than one subtest. Course files were also used to gather information about AI that students were provided through Applications and Study Skills Courses (ASSCs).¹

Frequency analyses were conducted for campus information form data, ASSC enrollment data, and summer attendance data. A series of paired samples *t*-tests and Cohen’s *d* were used to examine differences in scale scores between the March and May administrations of the fifth- and eighth-grade *STAAR* reading and mathematics exams. These analyses were also conducted for the December to May and May to July *STAAR EOC* exams.

The Texas Commissioner of Education canceled the third (June 2016) *STAAR* administration for fifth- and eighth-grade students. In addition, the Grade Placement Committee (GPC)² requirement for these grades was waived for 2016. Also, mandatory SSI summer school attendance was waived for these students; even so, attendance results are reported.

What was the source and amount of SSI funding?

A total of \$1,736,921 in State Compensatory Education (SCE) funding was used to pay SSI staff to provide AI during the 2015-16 school year (see Table 1).³ An additional \$2,441,000 was spent on SSI summer programs.⁴

¹ ASSCs are for local credit only and designed for students who failed a *STAAR* exam or are “at risk” of failing.

² Typically, to advance to the next grade, fifth- and eighth-grade students must pass *STAAR* reading and mathematics or be promoted per Grade Placement Committee (GPC) decision. A GPC includes the student’s principal (or designee), teacher (or designee), and parent(s).

³ Teaching and Learning did not spend additional monies on SSI materials due to the shortened SSI program dates; instead, existing curricular resources were utilized.

⁴ The Summer School/Extended Year department provided summer funding information on 9/24/16. This number includes *EOC* Test Prep, SSI, and *EOC* testing.

Table 1: SCE Funding Allocated for AI

Level	Extra-Duty Pay
Elementary	1,009,182
Middle	330,499
High	397,240
<i>Total</i>	1,736,921

Source. District budget department, received 9/19/16.

Note. Extra duty pay reflects only SCE funding and includes in-school and out-of-school tutoring.

What were the STAAR passing rates?

In 2016, the first STAAR administration for grades five and eight occurred in March. An additional administration for students who did not pass occurred in May; the June administration was canceled. Table 2 displays the passing rates for students by subject area and administration.

Table 2: STAAR Reading and Mathematics Results by Version, Grade, and Administration

Exam	March n Tested (% Passed)	May n Tested (% Passed)
English		
5 th Reading	7,729 (63)	2,848 (24)
5 th Mathematics	11,726 (69)	3,542 (36)
8 th Reading	10,151 (67)	3,203 (32)
8 th Mathematics	10,099 (58)	3,846 (34)
Spanish		
5 th Reading	4,151 (70)	1,281 (33)
5 th Mathematics	173 (29)	134 (19)

Source. STAAR files pulled on 4/21/16 (March) and 7/11/16 (May).

For high school students, STAAR EOCs were administered in December 2015, May 2016, and July 2016. The May 2016 administration included the most first-time test takers. Students were required to take STAAR EOCs at each administration until they passed or graduated. Table 3 displays the passing rates for students by subject area and administration.

Table 3: STAAR EOC Results by Subject Area and Administration

Exam	December n Tested (% Passed)	May n Tested (% Passed)	July n Tested (% Passed)
Algebra I	2,610 (23)	12,115 (72)	1,238 (22)
Biology	1,091 (32)	10,175 (82)	636 (34)
English I	4,592 (37)	13,276 (50)	2,353 (15)
English II	3,718 (34)	11,633 (52)	1,817 (21)
U.S. Hist.	564 (38)	9,473 (92)	250 (40)

Source. STAAR EOC files pulled on 7/12/16 (December), 7/12/16 (May), and 8/16/16 (July).

Note. Hist.=History.

What services were provided to SSI students who failed fifth- or eighth-grade STAAR?

In fifth grade, AI can be provided through individual or small group instruction. In eighth grade, AI can be provided through individual instruction, small group instruction, or ASSCs.

Fifth- and Eighth-Grade June 2015 STAAR Failures

In June 2015, 3,128 students failed fifth- or eighth-grade STAAR reading.⁵ Of these, 2,971 students (fifth grade=1,415; eighth grade=1,556) were enrolled in Dallas ISD for 2015-16. Even though most of those students were promoted to the next grade in 2015-16 (94%), AI was still required to be provided at the students' current campuses.⁶ Campus principals were sent information forms listing each student who failed a June 2015 exam to document the AI provided before the March 2016 administration. AI data were provided for 2,906 students who failed a fifth- or eighth-grade exam from 120⁷ campuses. For those occurrences in which AI was provided after failure in June 2015, campus staff members reported most often providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (22%); this was followed by 2-2.99 hours (20%), 3-3.99 hours (18%), 4-4.99 hours (17%), and less than one hour per week (11%). AI was most often provided during (83%) or after school (14%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (89%). Campus staff members reported that AI was not provided to 297 students (10% of failures) and marked "unknown" for another 186 students (6%).

In fall 2015, ASSCs were offered at 26 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately four hours per week.⁸ Some students who failed STAAR reading in June 2015 were enrolled in middle school ASSCs. Of these students, some were enrolled in ASSCs other than English language arts or general courses. Thus, some enrollment was not related to STAAR reading failure and is likely due to the students being considered "at risk" of failing other subjects. Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR reading failures are reported here. Students enrolled in eighth-grade courses are included in the table; they were likely retained after 2014-15 (see Table 4). The total enrollment in these classes was 1,547; this number includes 30 students who were enrolled in multiple sections.

⁵ STAAR mathematics requirements were suspended for the 2014-15 school year. Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 9/1/15.

⁶ The promotion percentage for 2015-16 was pulled from the 2014-15 SSI report (Lorenz, 2015).

⁷ Three campuses with students who failed in June 2015 did not complete information forms (n=60 students).

⁸ Calculations were made based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

Table 4: Fall 2015 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Subject and Grade

ASSC Subject and Grade	<i>n</i> Enrolled	<i>n</i> Failed/ Enrolled
General Middle School ASSC	1,362	85
English Language Arts Grade 6	67	13
English Language Arts Grade 8	118	1

Source. Secondary semester one course file, pulled 12/15/15.

Note. Some students were enrolled in more than one ASSC.

Students who failed STAAR reading in June 2015 made up less than a tenth (7%) of the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in fall 2015 (see Table 5).

Table 5: Fall 2015 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failure/At-Risk Status

Status	<i>n</i> (% of Enrolled Students)
Failed STAAR Reading	99 (7%)
At-Risk	1,204 (79%)
Did not fail STAAR Reading, Not At-Risk	214 (14%)

Source. Secondary semester one course file, pulled 12/15/15 and the STAAR file pulled 9/1/15.

An additional 264 students who failed in June 2015 were promoted and enrolled in high school ASSCs. There were 37 fifth-grade students and 192 eighth-grade students who failed STAAR reading in June, were not provided AI, and were not enrolled in a fall ASSC. These students made up seven percent of fifth- and eighth-grade students who failed in June.

Fifth- and Eighth-Grade March 2016 STAAR Failures

In March 2016, 7,607 students failed fifth- ($n=3,707$) or eighth-grade ($n=3,900$) STAAR mathematics. Additionally, 7,416 fifth- ($n=4,153$) or eighth-grade ($n=3,263$) students failed STAAR reading. These totals include 5,088 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.⁹ To determine what AI students were provided between the time the campuses were notified of the failures and the May STAAR administration, 183 elementary and middle school campus principals were sent information forms.¹⁰ Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 14,879 failure occurrences (fifth grade=7,716; eighth grade=7,163). For those occurrences in which AI was provided after the March 2016 administration, campus staff members reported most often providing 4-4.99 hours (16% of

⁹ Data were pulled on from the STAAR file on 4/21/16.

¹⁰ Two campuses with students who failed in March did not complete information forms ($n=144$ occurrences).

occurrences) or 5-5.99 hours (16%) of AI per week; this was followed by 11 or more hours (15%), 10-10.99 hours (12%), and 7-7.99 hours (12%). AI was most often provided during school (97% of occurrences). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (87% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for 52 failure occurrences (0.3% of failure occurrences). Campus staff members marked “unknown” for 46 occurrences (0.3% of failure occurrences) and indicated the students were no longer enrolled at that school for 111 occurrences (0.7%).

In spring 2016, ASSCs were offered at 26 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately four hours per week.¹¹ Some students who failed STAAR reading or mathematics in March 2016 were enrolled in middle school ASSCs for the spring semester. Of these students, some were enrolled in ASSCs other than English language arts, mathematics, or general courses. Thus, some enrollment was not related to STAAR failure and is likely due to the students being considered “at risk” of failing other subjects. Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR failures are reported here. Students enrolled in eighth-grade courses are included in the table; they were likely retained after 2014-15 (see Table 6). The total enrollment in these classes was 3,567; this number includes 58 students who were enrolled in multiple sections.

Table 6: Spring 2016 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Subject and Grade

ASSC Subject and Grade	<i>n</i> Enrolled	<i>n</i> Failed/ Enrolled
General Middle School ASSC	1,396	313
English Language Arts	10	5
English Language Arts Grade 8	127	85
Mathematics Grade 8	2,034	1,007

Source. Secondary semester two course file, pulled 1/21/16.

Note. Some students were enrolled in more than one ASSC.

Students who failed at least one STAAR subtest made up less than half (40%) of the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in spring 2016 (see Table 7).

¹¹ Calculations were made based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

Table 7: Spring 2016 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failure/At-Risk Status

Status	n (% of Enrolled Students)
Failed STAAR Subtest	1,410 (40%)
At-Risk	1,647 (47%)
Did not fail STAAR Subtest, Not At-Risk	452 (13%)

Source. Secondary semester two course file, pulled 1/21/16 and the STAAR file pulled 4/21/16.

There were 10 fifth-grade students and 14 eighth-grade students who failed at least one STAAR subtest, were not provided AI, and were not enrolled in an ASSC. These students made up 0.3 percent of fifth- and eighth-grade students who failed.

Fifth- and Eighth-Grade May 2016 STAAR Failures

In May 2016, 4,923 students failed fifth- ($n=2,395$) or eighth-grade ($n=2,528$) STAAR mathematics. Additionally, 5,213 fifth- ($n=3,031$) or eighth-grade ($n=2,182$) students failed STAAR reading. These totals include 3,106 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.¹² Of the 3,760 fifth-grade students who failed STAAR reading and/or mathematics in May, 3,015 (80%) attended SSI summer school in June.¹³ Of the 3,270 eighth graders who failed a May exam, 2,326 (71%) attended SSI summer school. SSI summer school was conducted for nine days (Monday through Thursday, June 6, through June 20, 2016) for four hours per day. As mentioned above, mandatory attendance was waived.

What services were provided to SSI students who failed STAAR EOC?

In high school, AI can be provided through individual instruction, small group instruction, or ASSCs.

July 2015 STAAR EOC Failures

In July 2015, 3,003 students failed at least one STAAR EOC; almost half (47%) failed more than one exam.¹⁴ To determine what AI students were provided before the December 2015 administration, 32 high school campus principals were sent information forms to document the AI students were provided. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 4,426 failure occurrences. For those occurrences in which AI was provided after failure in July 2015, campus staff members reported most often providing 4-4.99 hours of AI per week (29% of occurrences); this was followed by 1-1.99 hours (18%), 2-2.99 hours (15%), less than one hour (11%), and 3-3.99 hours (10%). AI was most

often provided during school (79% of occurrences) or after school (10%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (86% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided in 422 occurrences (10% of failure occurrences). For another 176 occurrences (4%), campus staff members marked “unknown.”

ASSCs were offered at 17 of the 32 Dallas ISD high schools with SSI students. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹⁵ There were 1,937 students enrolled in high school ASSCs in fall 2015. Some students ($n=285$) were enrolled in more than one section; thus, the total enrollment was 2,222 (see Table 8).

Table 8: Fall 2015 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Subject

ASSC Enrollment	n
General High School ASSC	55
English Language Arts	345
Mathematics	1,667
Science	127
Social Studies	28

Source. Secondary semester one course file, pulled 12/15/15.

Note. Some students were enrolled in more than one ASSC.

Students who failed at least one STAAR EOC made up less than a tenth (7%) of the students enrolled in high school ASSCs in fall 2015 (see Table 9).

Table 9: Fall 2015 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failure/At-Risk Status

Status	n (% of enrolled students)
Failed STAAR EOC	140 (7%)
At-Risk	1,374 (71%)
Did not fail STAAR EOC, Not At-Risk	423 (22%)

Source. Secondary semester one course file, pulled 12/15/15 and the STAAR file, pulled 9/1/15.

There were 231 students who failed at least one STAAR EOC, were not provided AI, and were not enrolled in an ASSC. These students made up eight percent of the students who failed one or more STAAR EOCs.

December 2015 STAAR EOC Failures

In December 2015, 6,506 students had yet to pass at least one STAAR EOC; many (67%) had yet to pass more than one exam.¹⁶ To determine what AI students were provided between the December 2015 and May 2016 administrations, 32 high school campus

¹² Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 7/11/16.

¹³ Data were pulled from files provided on 7/21/16 by the Summer School/Extended Year department.

¹⁴ Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 9/1/15.

¹⁵ Calculations were made based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

¹⁶ Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 2/19/16 and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass an EOC exam. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate.

principals were sent information forms pertaining to this timeframe.¹⁷ Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 10,882 failure occurrences. For those occurrences in which AI was provided after the December 2015 administration, campus staff members reported most often providing 4-4.99 hours of AI per week (31% of occurrences); this was followed by 1-1.99 hours (25%), 2-2.99 hours (16%), and 3-3.99 (16%). AI was most often provided during school (48% of occurrences), followed by after school (35%), and on Saturdays (11%). A content area teacher most often provided the AI (94%). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for 605 occurrences (6%). Campus staff marked “unknown” for another 203 occurrences (2%).

ASSCs were offered at 17 of the 32 Dallas ISD high schools with SSI students. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.71 hours per week.¹⁸ There were 1,843 students enrolled in high school ASSCs during the spring 2016 semester. Some students ($n=247$) were enrolled in more than one section for a total enrollment of 2,090 (see Table 10).

Table 10: Spring 2016 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Subject

ASSC Subject Area	<i>n</i>
English Language Arts	296
Mathematics	1,625
Science	143
Social Studies	26

Source. Secondary semester two course file, pulled 1/21/16.

Note. Some students were enrolled in more than one ASSC.

Students who failed at least one STAAR EOC made up 12 percent of the students enrolled in high school ASSCs in spring 2016 (see Table 11).

Table 11: Spring 2016 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failure/At-Risk Status

Status	<i>n</i> (% of enrolled students)
Yet to Pass STAAR EOC	210 (12%)
At-Risk	1,222 (66%)
Did not fail STAAR EOC, Not At-Risk	411 (22%)

Source. Secondary semester two course file, pulled 1/21/16 and the STAAR Yet to Pass file pulled 2/19/16.

There were 200 students who had yet to pass at least one STAAR EOC, were not provided AI, and were not enrolled in an ASSC. These students made up three percent of STAAR EOC students who had yet to pass.

¹⁷ Four high schools with students who failed in December did not complete information forms. No data were available for the 1,210 occurrences at these schools.

¹⁸ Calculations were made based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

May 2016 STAAR EOC Failures

In May 2016, 10,973 students had yet to pass at least one STAAR EOC;¹⁹ of these students, 1,939 (18%) attended EOC Test Prep.²⁰ This program was offered for 12 days (Monday through Thursday, June 6, through June 23, 2016) for four hours per day.²¹ Students who failed in May made up 94 percent of enrollees (total=2,066).

What were the effects of services on the fifth- and eighth-grade STAAR scores of SSI students?

March 2016 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

In March of 2016, 7,729 fifth-grade students took the STAAR reading in English and 4,151 completed it in Spanish; of these, 2,895 (37%) and 1,258 (30%) failed, respectively. Additionally, 11,726 fifth-grade students took the mathematics portion in English and 173 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 3,586 (31%) and 122 (71%) failed, respectively.

In eighth grade, STAAR is only offered in English. For reading, 10,151 took the exam and 3,312 (33%) failed. For mathematics, 10,099 eighth-grade students took the exam and 4,199 (42%) failed.

May 2016 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

Of the students who failed a STAAR reading exam in March and retested in May, 29 percent passed. For mathematics, 35 percent of students who failed in March and retested in May passed. Students who failed in March and were provided AI (including those who were enrolled in ASSCs) passed at a higher rate than students who were not provided AI (see Table 12).

Table 12 also shows differences between students' mean scale scores on the March and May administrations. Due to unequal sample sizes, comparisons between groups (Provided Accelerated Instruction, Not Provided Accelerated Instruction) should be viewed with caution. However, results of *t*-test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains²² on all exams with the exception of students who were not provided AI and took the fifth-grade reading exam in Spanish and the eighth-grade mathematics and reading exams.

¹⁹ Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 7/12/16 and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass an EOC exam. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate.

²⁰ Data were pulled from files provided on 7/21/16 by the Summer School/Extended Year department.

²¹ <http://www.dallasisd.org/cms/lib/TX01001475/Centricity/Domain/11462/High%20Summer%20School%20Info.pdf>

²² $p<.001$; Cohen's *d* is a measure of effect size and is indicative of practical significance; small=.20, medium=.50, and large=.80 (Cohen, 1988).

Table 12: March to May 2016 STAAR 5 and 8 Results by Accelerated Instruction Status

STAAR	Mean Scale Score Change	t (SD)	d	n tested (% passed)
Provided Accelerated Instruction				
5 th R	26.4	19.3 (70.8)	0.35	2,679 (23.4)
5 th S R	40.2	17.8 (79.1)	0.51	1,224 (32.8)
5 th M	36.9	35.3 (60.8)	0.56	3,377 (35.5)
5 th S M	23.8	4.6 (55.7)	0.38	117 (18.8)
8 th R	39.4	32.5 (66.8)	0.56	3,048 (31.8)
8 th M	40.5	39.4 (62.3)	0.65	3,667 (34.9)
Not Provided Accelerated Instruction				
5 th R	25.6	3.7 (66.5)	0.35	91 (19.8)
5 th S R	45.1	3.1 (66.7)	0.65	21 (23.8)
5 th M	26.9	3.9 (61.8)	0.41	81 (28.4)
5 th S M	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8 th R	4.4	0.2 (85.6)	0.06	15 (13.3)
8 th M	-19.6	-0.6 (150.4)	-0.13	22 (18.2)

Source. March and May STAAR files pulled on 4/21/16 and 7/11/16, respectively.

Note. R=Reading; M=Mathematics; S=Spanish version; n/a=less than five students were tested; **Bold**= $p<.001$; *italics*= $d>.20$. In these analyses, "Provided Accelerated Instruction" includes students who were provided AI and those enrolled in ASSCs. Students marked "unknown" for AI were included in the "Not Provided Accelerated Instruction" category.

What were the effects of services on the STAAR EOC scores of SSI students?

December 2015 EOC

The December EOC administration was the first administration of the school year.²³ However, it included mostly students who were retesting. In December 2015, 2,610 students took the Algebra I exam and 1,998 (77%) failed. For Biology, 1,091 students tested and 742 (68%) failed. For English I, 4,592 students tested and 2,896 (63%) failed. For English II, 3,718 students tested and 2,442 (66%) failed. For U.S. History, 564 students tested and 347 (62%) failed.

May 2016 EOC

Table 13 presents the May 2016 STAAR EOC passing rates for students who failed in December by AI status.²⁴ More students who were provided AI passed than students who were not provided AI.

Table 13 also shows differences between students' mean scale scores on the December to May administrations. Due to unequal sample sizes, comparisons between groups (Provided Accelerated Instruction, Not Provided Accelerated Instruction)

²³ December administration STAAR EOC data were pulled 7/12/16.

²⁴ May administration STAAR EOC data were pulled on 7/12/16.

should be viewed with caution. However, results of *t*-test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on the Algebra I, Biology, and U.S. History exams, regardless of AI status. Analyses also revealed statistically significant scale score decreases on the English II exam; these results were also practically significant for students who were not provided AI. There was no significant change for students who took the English I exam regardless of whether or not AI was provided.

Table 13: December 2015 to May 2016 STAAR EOC Results by Accelerated Instruction Status

STAAR EOC	Mean Scale Score Change	t (SD)	d	n tested (% passed)
Provided Accelerated Instruction				
Algebra I	163.2	19.6 (293.9)	0.73	1,242 (35.4)
Biology	145.2	10.0 (307.0)	0.59	442 (36.2)
English I	-3.2	-0.6 (252.8)	-0.01	1,980 (17.3)
English II	-41.7	-6.5 (261.6)	-0.16	1,654 (15.2)
U.S. Hist.	229.9	11.2 (276.2)	0.98	181 (57.5)
Not Provided Accelerated Instruction				
Algebra I	168.4	9.8 (259.1)	0.78	226 (34.1)
Biology	127.2	4.2 (230.9)	0.72	59 (35.6)
English I	-2.9	-0.2 (243.4)	-0.01	319 (14.1)
English II	-84.1	-5.8 (242.0)	-0.32	283 (11.7)
U.S. Hist.	262.6	4.4 (371.6)	0.88	38 (47.4)

Source. December and May administration STAAR files pulled on 7/12/16.

Note. Hist.=History; **Bold**= $p<.001$; *italics*= $d>.20$. In these analyses, "Provided Accelerated Instruction" includes students who were provided AI and those enrolled in ASSCs. Students marked "unknown" for AI were included in the "Not Provided Accelerated Instruction" category.

July 2016 EOC

Table 14 presents the July 2016 STAAR EOC²⁵ passing rates for students who failed in May and did or did not attend summer EOC Test Prep. A greater percentage of students who attended passed the exams than students who did not attend.

Table 14 also shows differences between students' mean scale scores on the May to July administrations. Due to unequal sample sizes, comparisons between groups (Provided Accelerated Instruction, Not Provided Accelerated Instruction) should be viewed with caution. However, results of *t*-test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on the Algebra I, Biology, English II, and U.S. History exams for students who attended EOC Test Prep.

Results also revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on English II for students who did not attend EOC Test Prep and practically significant gains on Biology and U.S.

²⁵ The data were pulled on 8/16/16.

History. There were no significant changes in scores for students who took the English I exam regardless of EOC Test Prep enrollment status.

Table 14: May to July 2016 STAAR EOC Results by Accelerated Instruction Status

STAAR EOC	Mean Scale Score Change	t (SD)	d	n tested (% passed)
Provided EOC Test Prep				
Algebra I	71.04	6.28 (252.39)	0.35	497 (25.4)
Biology	82.99	6.18 (230.24)	0.44	294 (37.4)
English I	6.37	0.82 (241.25)	0.02	968 (18.0)
English II	111.65	11.01 (259.56)	0.38	655 (22.7)
U.S. Hist.	178.33	7.33 (211.98)	0.83	76 (46.1)
Not Provided EOC Test Prep				
Algebra I	16.96	1.81 (231.49)	0.10	612 (15.7)
Biology	44.61	3.17 (236.46)	0.23	283 (26.1)
English I	-18.14	-2.49 (259.51)	-0.07	1,272 (12.7)
English II	68.21	8.44 (262.68)	0.24	1,057 (20.8)
U.S. Hist.	68.18	2.92 (271.57)	0.29	135 (30.4)

Source. May and July administration STAAR files pulled on 7/12/16 and 8/16/16, respectively.

Note. Hist.=History; **Bold**= $p < .001$; *italics*= $d > .20$.

Summary and Recommendations

Most students who failed STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC were provided some accelerated instruction after each administration.²⁶ Students who failed and retested after receiving AI passed at a higher rate than those who were not provided AI.

Encourage secondary campuses to offer ASSCs and to enroll more students who failed STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC. Students who were provided AI or were enrolled in ASSCs after failing an exam typically passed at higher rates than those who were not. Seven to 40 percent of middle school students enrolled and seven to 12 percent of high school students enrolled in ASSCs failed STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOCs. Utilizing ASSCs may ensure students receive more subject-specific instruction for a greater amount of time.

Ensure campuses are aware that SSI documentation is required. No data were available for the 1,414 students at campuses for which information forms were not returned. Administrators should be aware of this requirement to increase compliance and to ensure the district has complete data for analyses.

References

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lorenz, A. (2015). Student Success Initiative: 2014-15. Dallas, TX: Dallas Independent School District.

²⁶ This may include time spent in ASSCs or EOC Test Prep.