

2016-17 Evaluation of the Student Success Initiative and Accelerated Instruction

Sarah Hinkley, Ph.D.

EA17-173-4

At-a-Glance

The Student Success Initiative (SSI) was created by the 76th Texas Legislature in 1999 to ensure that all students in grades five and eight 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 policy includes the third administration, even if the student advances to the next grade through a unanimous Grade Placement Committee (GPC) decision.

AI requirements were expanded to include high school students 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 (SCE) 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 2016-17 SSI and AI evaluation was 1) to evaluate the effectiveness of the AI provided to students who failed grade-five or grade-eight *STAAR* mathematics or reading subtests and high school students who failed *STAAR EOC* exams and 2) to describe the GPC promotion rates of SSI students. The evaluation was based on a review of legislation pertaining to SSI and AI, district funding documents, course files, campus-based information forms, attendance information provided by the Summer School/Extended Year department, *STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC* data,¹ and promotion data.

AI information was collected for the following administrations: May/July 2016 (all levels), December 2016 (high school), and March 2017 (grades five and eight) using course files and information forms. Course files were used to gather information about AI that students were provided through Applications and Study Skills Courses (ASSCs).² Information forms, sent to principals of students who failed one or more grade-five, grade-eight, or high school subtest, were used to collect information about AI provided outside of ASSCs. 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 evaluator sent weekly reminders to principals of campuses that had not yet completed the forms. Campus staff members indicated the hours of AI provided outside of ASSCs during a typical week, when AI was provided, and the campus role of the most common AI provider. Staff members completed multiple entries for students who failed more than one subtest.

Frequency analyses were conducted on ASSC enrollment data, campus information form data, and summer attendance data. A series of paired samples *t* tests and Cohen’s *d* analyses were used to examine differences in scale scores between the March and May and May and June administrations of the grade-five and grade-eight *STAAR* reading and mathematics subtests. These analyses also were conducted for the December to May and May to June *STAAR EOC* subtests. Additionally, frequency analyses of promotion data were conducted to examine the promotion rates of grade-five and grade-eight SSI students who had not passed one or more *STAAR* subtest following the third administration.

What was the source and amount of SSI and accelerated instruction funding?

A total of \$1,704,918.16 in SCE funding was used to pay SSI staff to provide AI during the 2016-17 school year (Table 1). An additional \$20,792.74 was spent on Algebra I curricular resources (other subjects used resources that were already available). During the summer, \$3,537,438.42 was spent on SSI summer school and *EOC* Test Prep. This total included \$2,590,782.98 for SSI for grades five and eight and

¹ Beginning in March 2017, the short answer questions were removed from the English I and II *EOCs* and were replaced with multiple choice questions.

² ASSCs are for local credit only and designed for students who failed *STAAR* subtests or are “at risk” of failing.

STAAR retesting and \$946,655.44 for EOC Test Prep and EOC retesting.

Table 1: State Compensatory Education Funding Allocated for Accelerated Instruction

Level	Extra-Duty Pay
Elementary	\$903,146.31
Middle	\$351,366.90
High	\$450,404.95
Total	\$1,704,918.16

Source: District budget department, pulled 08/29/17.

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

What were the STAAR passing rates?

In 2017, the first STAAR administration for grades five and eight occurred in March. Additional administrations for students who did not pass occurred in May 2017 and June 2017. 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)	June n Tested (% Passed)
English			
5 th Read	7,968 (61.0)	3,030 (29.9)	1,653 (18.1)
5 th Math	11,810 (75.7)	2,825 (23.2)	1,710 (25.8)
8 th Read	9,532 (62.4)	3,514 (35.6)	1,639 (18.1)
8 th Math	7,673 (62.9)	2,738 (36.6)	1,258 (27.2)
Spanish			
5 th Read	4,058 (82.7)	728 (31.0)	406 (19.0)
5 th Math	224 (44.2)	132 (14.4)	98 (25.5)

Source: STAAR files pulled on 5/18/17 (March-revised, received in May), 6/7/17 (May), and 7/10/16 (June).

Note: Math=Mathematics and Read=Reading. Only students who tested on grade level were included in this table and analyses.

For high school students, STAAR EOCs were administered in December 2016, May 2017, and June 2017. The May 2017 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)	June n Tested (% Passed)
Algebra I	2,526 (31.2)	11,538 (78.2)	911 (31.5)
Biology	1,187 (32.4)	10,257 (82.6)	536 (39.9)
English I	4,624 (24.1)	14,129 (49.4)	2,369 (17.4)
English II	3,929 (31.7)	12,091 (51.8)	1,668 (21.7)
U.S. Hist.	440 (38.4)	8,328 (91.8)	197 (42.6)

Source: STAAR EOC files pulled on 1/17/17 (December), 6/8/16 (May), and 8/1/16 (June).

Note: U.S. Hist.= United States History.

What services were provided to SSI students who failed grade-five or grade-eight STAAR?

In grade five, AI was provided through individual or small group instruction. In grade eight, AI was provided through individual instruction, small group instruction, or ASSCs.

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight May 2016 STAAR Failures

A total of 6,168 students failed a May 2016 STAAR subtest and remained in the district for 2016-17. Of these, 4,345 students failed grade-five ($n=2,058$) or grade-eight ($n=2,287$) STAAR mathematics. Additionally, 4,628 students in grade five ($n=2,595$) or grade eight ($n=2,033$) failed STAAR reading. These totals include 2,805 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.³ Even though most students with failing STAAR scores were promoted to the next grade in 2016-17, AI was required to be provided at the campuses at which the students were currently enrolled.

In fall 2016, students who failed STAAR in May 2016 were enrolled in ASSCs at 41 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately 3.75 hours per week.⁴ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR reading or mathematics failures are reported here. Results are reported by failed subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 4). Across courses, students who failed STAAR reading and/or mathematics in May 2016 comprised about 14 percent of the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in fall 2016.

³ Data were pulled from the STAAR file (8/12/16) and the Chancery file (9/21/17).

⁴ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

Table 4: Fall 2016 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failed Test and Grade

Failed Test and Grade	<i>n</i> Enrolled	<i>n</i> Failed/ Enrolled
Mathematics Grade 5	2,304	330
Reading Grade 5	10,105	1,889
Mathematics Grade 8	4,132	503
Reading Grade 8	8,281	694

Source: Secondary semester one course file, pulled 11/15/16.

Note: Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR reading and mathematics failures are reported in this table.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between the beginning of the 2016-17 school year and the next STAAR administration, campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple subtests, there were 8,973 failure occurrences (grade five=4,653; grade eight=4,320).⁵ Some principals reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (8% of failure occurrences). However, 48 percent of these students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after failure in May 2016, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (27% of occurrences). This was followed by 3-3.99 hours (20%), 2-2.99 hours (13%), and 4-4.99 hours (12%). AI most often was provided during school (61% of occurrences) or after school (18%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (87% of occurrences). Campus staff members marked “unknown” for six percent of occurrences, and they indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for two percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for five percent of failure occurrences.

There were 643 failure occurrences (grade-five mathematics=113, grade-five reading=38, grade-eight mathematics=155, and grade-eight reading=337) in which the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These occurrences comprised seven percent of grade-five and grade-eight May 2016 reading or mathematics failures.

⁵ No information was available from campus staff for 15 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program or for students at the two campuses with students who failed in May 2016 because staff did not complete information forms (*n*=299 occurrences).

⁶ Data were pulled from the STAAR file (4/19/17) and the Chancery file (4/17/17).

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight March 2017 STAAR Failures

A total of 5,775 students who failed grade-five (*n*=2,975) or grade-eight (*n*=2,800) STAAR mathematics, and 7,365 grade-five (*n*=3,815) or grade-eight (*n*=3,550) students who failed STAAR reading in March remained in the district in April 2017. These totals include 4,112 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.⁶

In spring 2017, students who failed were enrolled in ASSCs at 28 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately 3.75 hours per week.⁷ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR reading or mathematics failures are reported here. Results are reported by failed subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 5). Across courses, students who failed STAAR reading and/or mathematics in March 2017 comprised about 40 percent of the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in spring 2017.

Table 5: Spring 2017 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failed Test and Grade

Failed Test and Grade	<i>n</i> Enrolled	<i>n</i> Failed/ Enrolled
Mathematics Grade 8	2,078	813
Reading Grade 8	5,779	2,361

Source: Secondary semester two course file, pulled 4/28/17.

Note: Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR reading and mathematics failures are reported in this table.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between the March and May 2017 STAAR administrations, campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple subtests, there were 13,140 failure occurrences (grade five=6,790; grade eight=6,350).⁸ Some principals reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (1.2% of failure occurrences). However, none of these students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after failure in March 2017, campus staff members most often reported providing 7-7.99 hours of AI per week (17% of occurrences). This was followed

⁷ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

⁸ No information was available for two campuses with students who failed in March because staff did not complete information forms (*n*=72 occurrences).

by 11 or more hours (15%), 3-3.99 hours (12%), 5-5.99 hours (12%), and 4-4.99 hours (11%). AI most often was provided during school (93% of occurrences). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (91% of occurrences). Campus staff members marked “unknown” for less than one percent of occurrences, and they indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for one percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for less than one percent of failure occurrences.

There were 85 failure occurrences (grade-five mathematics=17, grade-five reading=21, grade-eight mathematics=29, and grade-eight reading=18) in which the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These occurrences comprised less than one percent of grade-five and grade-eight March 2017 reading or mathematics failures.

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight May 2017 STAAR Failures

A total of 3,982 students failed grade-five ($n=2,267$) or grade-eight ($n=1,715$) STAAR mathematics and 4,846 grade-five ($n=2,600$) or grade-eight ($n=2,246$) students failed STAAR reading in May 2017 and remained enrolled in June 2017. These totals include 2,568 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.⁹ Seventy-one percent ($n=1,608$) of students who failed grade-five STAAR mathematics and sixty-six percent ($n=1,136$) of students who failed grade-eight STAAR mathematics in May attended SSI summer school in June 2017.¹⁰ Seventy-one percent ($n=1,836$) of students who failed grade-five STAAR reading and sixty-three percent ($n=1,415$) of students who failed grade-eight STAAR reading in May attended SSI summer school in June 2017. SSI summer school was conducted for nine days (Monday through Thursday, June 5, through June 19, 2017) for four hours per day.¹¹

What services were provided to students who failed STAAR EOC?

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

July 2016 STAAR EOC Failures

A total of 8,902 students were enrolled in the district for 2016-17 who failed (had yet to pass) at least one

STAAR EOC after the July 2016 administration; some students had yet to pass more than one exam.¹²

ASSCs were offered at 31 Dallas ISD high schools with students who failed STAAR EOCs. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹³ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to the STAAR EOCs students failed are reported here. Results are reported by failed subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 6). Across courses, students who failed STAAR EOCs in July 2016 comprised 12 percent of the students enrolled in these high school ASSCs in fall 2016.

Table 6: Fall 2016 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failed Test and Grade

Failed Test and Grade	n Enrolled	n Failed/ Enrolled
Algebra I	2,298	66
Biology	114	5
English I	3,758	690
English II	3,025	348
U.S. History	45	0

Source: Secondary semester one course file, pulled 11/15/16.

Note: Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR EOC failures are reported in this table.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between the beginning of the 2016-17 school year and the December 2016 administration, 35 high school campus principals completed information forms. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 15,908 failure occurrences.¹⁴ Eight campuses reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (6% of failure occurrences). However, eight percent of these students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after failure in July 2016, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (36% of occurrences). This was followed by 4-4.99 hours (16%), 3-3.99 hours (15%), and 2-2.99 hours (15%). AI most often was provided during school (51% of occurrences), on Saturday (21%), or after school (17%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (88% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided in five

⁹ Data were pulled from the STAAR file (6/7/17) and the Chancery file (6/5/17).

¹⁰ Data were pulled from files provided on 8/17/17 by the Summer School/Extended Year department.

¹¹ <http://dallasisd.org/cms/lib/TX01001475/Centricity/domain/148/december%2015%202016/Staffing%20for%202017%20Summer%20SSI%20Summer%20Readiness%20Programs%20and%20EOC%20Test%20Prep.pdf>

¹² Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 8/16/16 and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass an EOC exam. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate.

¹³ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

¹⁴ No information was available for 54 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program.

percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members marked “unknown” for less than one percent of failure occurrences, and they indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for two percent of failure occurrences.

There were 1,146 failure occurrences where the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These occurrences comprised seven percent of the *STAAR EOC* failures.

December 2016 *STAAR EOC* Failures

A total of 6,692 students enrolled in the district in February 2017 had yet to pass at least one *STAAR EOC* after the December 2016 administration; some students had yet to pass more than one exam.¹⁵

ASSCs were offered at 29 Dallas ISD high schools with students who failed. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹⁶ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to *STAAR EOCs* students failed are reported here. Results are reported by failed subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 7). Across courses, students who failed *STAAR EOCs* in December 2016 comprised ten percent of the students enrolled in these high school ASSCs in spring 2017.

Table 7: Spring 2017 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Failed Test and Grade

Failed Test and Grade	<i>n</i> Enrolled	<i>n</i> Failed/ Enrolled
Algebra I	2,223	27
Biology	103	0
English I	3,014	525
English II	2,648	234
U.S. History	42	0

Source: Secondary semester two course file, pulled 3/10/17.

Note: Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to *STAAR EOC* failures are reported in this table.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between failing December *EOCs* and the May 2017 administration, 33 high school campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 11,447 failure occurrences.¹⁷ Two campuses reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide

AI (0.1% of failure occurrences). Of these, 62 percent of students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after failure in December 2016, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (36% of occurrences). This was followed by 3-3.99 hours (33%), and 2-2.99 hours (17%). AI most often was provided during school (49% of occurrences), after school (27%), or on Saturday (10%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (90% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided in five percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members marked “unknown” for one percent of failure occurrences, and they indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for less than one percent of failure occurrences.

There were 497 failure occurrences where the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These occurrences comprised five percent of the *STAAR EOC* failures.

May 2017 *STAAR EOC* Failures

Table 8 contains the *EOC* Test Prep attendance rates of students who had yet to pass a *STAAR EOC* after testing in May 2017 and remained enrolled in the district in June. At most, 20 percent of students who failed an exam attended the relevant *EOC* Test Prep course. This program was offered Monday through Thursday, June 5, through June 15, 2017 for four hours per day.¹⁸

Table 8: *STAAR EOC* Test Prep Student Enrollment by Failed Test

Exam	<i>n</i> Yet to Pass	Attended <i>EOC</i> Test Prep	
		<i>n</i>	%
Algebra I	3,171	626	20
Biology	2,170	411	19
English I	7,559	1,435	19
English II	5,629	767	14
U.S. History	704	105	15

Source: *STAAR* Yet to Pass file, pulled 7/12/17, Chancery file pulled 6/5/17, and *EOC* Test Prep attendance data pulled 8/17/17.

Note: Some students were enrolled in more than one course.

¹⁵ Data were pulled from the *STAAR* and Chancery files on 2/7/17 and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass an *EOC* exam. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate.

¹⁶ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites.

¹⁷ No information was available for 58 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program or

for the students at the two campuses because staff did not complete information forms (*n*=1,074 occurrences).

¹⁸ <http://dallasisd.org/cms/lib/TX01001475/Centricity/domain/148/december%202016/Staffing%20for%202017%20Summer%20SSI%20Summer%20Readiness%20Programs%20and%20EOC%20Test%20Prep.pdf>

What were the effects of services on the grade-five and grade-eight STAAR scores of SSI students?

March 2017 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

In March of 2017,¹⁹ 7,968 grade-five students took the STAAR reading in English and 4,058 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 3,105 (39%) and 704 (17%) failed, respectively. Additionally, 11,810 grade-five students took the mathematics portion in English and 224 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 2,868 (24%) and 125 (56%) failed, respectively.

In grade eight, STAAR is only offered in English. For reading, 9,532 took the exam and 3,587 (38%) failed. For mathematics, 7,673 grade-eight students took the exam and 2,844 (37%) failed.

May 2017 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

Of the students who failed a STAAR reading exam in March and retested in May, 32 percent passed the exam. For mathematics, 29 percent of students who failed in March and retested in May passed the exam.

Table 9 shows differences between March and May scores as well as tests for statistically and practically significant change for students who received AI between administrations.²⁰ Results of *t* test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains²¹ on all exams when students received AI.

Table 9: March to May 2017 Grade-Five and Grade-Eight STAAR Results for Students who Received Accelerated Instruction

STAAR	Mean Scale Score Change	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	<i>n</i> tested (% passed)
5 th R	41.5	27.1 (82.7)	0.49	2,920 (29.3)
5 th S R	22.6	6.9 (87.1)	0.29	710 (30.6)
5 th M	22.7	17.9 (66.2)	0.35	2,711 (22.5)
5 th S M	17.7	2.7 (72.5)	0.27	122 (15.6)
8 th R	34.8	20.2 (100.8)	0.36	3,439 (35.0)
8 th M	42.3	33.8 (64.0)	0.67	2,608 (37.2)

Source: March (revised in May) and May STAAR files pulled on 5/18/17 and 6/7/16, respectively.

Note: R=Reading; M=Mathematics; S=Spanish version; **Bold**=*p*<.01; *italics*=*d*>.20.

June 2017 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

Of the students who failed STAAR reading in May and retested in June, 18 percent passed the exam. For mathematics, 27 percent of students who failed in May and retested in June passed the exam. Students who failed in May and attended SSI summer school passed at a higher rate than students who did not attend SSI summer school (see Table 10).

Table 10 also shows differences between mean scale scores on the May and June administrations. Because of unequal sample sizes, comparisons between groups (Attended Summer SSI and Did Not Attended Summer SSI) 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 most exams.

Results were not statistically significant for students who did not attend Summer SSI and tested in Spanish on the grade-five reading and mathematics exams. There were not practically or statistically significant changes in results for students who took the grade-five reading exam in English (regardless of Summer SSI enrollment) or for students who did not attend Summer SSI and took the grade-eight reading exam.

Table 10: May to June 2017 Grade-Five and Grade-Eight STAAR Results by Summer SSI Attendance Status

STAAR	Mean Scale Score Change	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	<i>n</i> tested (% passed)
Attended Summer SSI				
5 th R	4.2	2.1 (72.7)	0.06	1,391 (19.5)
5 th S R	38.0	8.9 (80.5)	0.55	360 (19.7)
5 th M	27.4	15.6 (66.9)	0.42	1,457 (27.2)
5 th S M	45.7	4.6 (89.0)	0.54	82 (29.3)
8 th R	14.5	7.7 (67.2)	0.22	1,291 (19.6)
8 th M	33.6	17.5 (61.4)	0.59	1,026 (28.8)
Did Not Attend Summer SSI				
5 th R	-6.2	-1.3 (76.1)	-0.09	251 (10.4)
5 th S R	19.4	2.2 (60.5)	0.32	45 (11.1)
5 th M	15.1	3.5 (66.9)	0.24	236 (18.2)
5 th S M	32.7	1.6 (83.0)	0.57	16 (6.3)
8 th R	6.2	1.7 (63.6)	0.10	301 (12.0)
8 th M	24.8	5.6 (60.0)	0.43	182 (20.3)

Source: May and June administration STAAR files pulled on 6/14/17 and 7/10/17, respectively, and Summer SSI attendance data pulled 8/17/17.

Note: R=Reading; M=Mathematics; S=Spanish version; **Bold**=*p*<.01; *italics*=*d*>.20.

¹⁹ Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 5/18/17 (March-revised, received in May).

²⁰ Less than two percent of students for a given test did not receive any AI; thus, comparisons between those who did and did not receive AI were not reported.

²¹ *p*<.01; Cohen's *d* is a measure of effect size and is indicative of practical significance; small=.20, medium=.50, and large=.80 (Cohen, 1988).

What were the effects of services on the student STAAR EOC scores?

December 2016 STAAR EOC

The December EOC administration was the first administration of the school year.²² However, it included mostly students who were retesting. In December 2016, 2,526 students took the Algebra I exam and 1,737 (69%) failed. For Biology, 1,187 students tested and 802 (68%) failed. For English I, 4,624 students tested and 3,509 (76%) failed. For English II, 3,929 students tested and 2,686 (68%) failed. For U.S. History, 440 students tested and 271 (62%) failed.

May 2017 STAAR EOC

Table 11 presents the May 2017 STAAR EOC passing rates for students who failed in December who received AI.²³ Table 11 also shows differences between mean scale scores on the December to May administrations. Results of *t* test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on the Algebra I, Biology, English I, and U.S. History exams. There were statistically, but not practically, significant mean scale score gains on the English II exam.

Table 11: December 2016 to May 2017 STAAR EOC Results for Students who Received Accelerated Instruction

STAAR EOC	Mean Scale Score Change	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	<i>n</i> tested (% passed)
Algebra I	169.2	22.7 (250.4)	0.79	1,126 (38.7)
Biology	112.3	8.8 (295.5)	0.51	537 (33.7)
English I	109.4	23.1 (244.9)	0.41	2,675 (16.7)
English II	14.9	2.8 (249.4)	0.06	2,140 (16.3)
U.S. His.	194.8	7.0 (348.5)	0.69	156 (40.4)

Source: December and May administration STAAR files pulled on 1/17/17 and 6/8/17, respectively.

Note: U.S. His.= United States History; **Bold**= $p < .01$; *italics*= $d > .20$.

June 2017 STAAR EOC

Table 12 presents the June 2017 STAAR EOC passing rates for students who failed in May and retested.

Table 12: STAAR EOC Passing Rates by Failed Test

STAAR EOC	Failed in May and Retested	Retested and Passed in June	
		<i>n</i>	%
Algebra I	786	242	30.8
Biology	494	192	38.9
English I	2,260	389	17.2
English II	1,595	344	21.6
U.S. History	177	72	40.7

Source: May and June administration STAAR files pulled on 6/8/17 and 8/1/17, respectively.

Table 13 presents the June 2017 STAAR EOC 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 EOC Test Prep passed the exams than students who did not attend, with the exception of U. S. History.

Table 13 also shows differences between mean scale scores on the May to June administrations. Due to unequal sample sizes, comparisons between groups (Attended EOC Test Prep, Did Not Attend EOC Test Prep) 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 Biology, English II, and U.S. History exams regardless of EOC Test Prep attendance. There were statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on Algebra I for students who attended EOC Test Prep.

Results also revealed statistically, but not practically, significant mean scale score gains on English I for students who attended EOC Test Prep. There were no significant changes in scores for students who did not attend EOC Test Prep and took the Algebra I or English I exams.

²² December administration STAAR EOC data were pulled 1/17/17.

²³ May administration STAAR EOC data were pulled on 6/8/17. Less than nine percent of students for a given test did

not receive AI; thus, comparisons between those who did and did not receive AI were not reported.

Table 13: May to June 2016 STAAR EOC Results by EOC Test Prep Attendance Status

STAAR EOC	Mean Scale Score Change	t (SD)	d	n tested (% passed)
Attended EOC Test Prep				
Alg. I	109.2	10.3 (239.0)	0.57	503 (38.0)
Bio.	117.5	8.8 (234.0)	0.64	310 (43.2)
Eng. I	42.7	6.5 (232.0)	0.17	1,256 (20.5)
Eng. II	96.2	9.8 (256.6)	0.35	679 (22.7)
U.S. His.	119.5	4.4 (257.9)	0.59	90 (37.8)
Did Not Attend EOC Test Prep				
Alg. I	8.3	0.7 (191.3)	0.05	283 (18.0)
Bio.	69.0	3.9 (238.4)	0.37	184 (31.5)
Eng. I	-7.1	-1.0 (218.5)	-0.03	1,004 (13.1)
Eng. II	77.5	9.0 (261.6)	0.28	916 (20.7)
U.S. His.	165.6	4.5 (344.8)	0.60	87 (43.7)

Source: STAAR files pulled on 6/8/17 (May) and 8/1/17 (June), respectively, and EOC Test Prep attendance data pulled 8/17/17.

Note: Alg.=Algebra; Bio.=Biology; Eng.=English; U.S. His.=United States History; **Bold**= $p < .01$; *italics*= $d > .20$.

What was the context of the Grade Placement Committee (GPC), and what were the promotion rates of 2016-17 grade-five and grade-eight students?

The final advancement decision of a student who failed to demonstrate proficiency on an assessment required for grade advancement lies with the Grade Placement Committee (GPC). The committee consists of three members: 1) the principal or principal's designee, 2) the student's parent or guardian, and 3) the student's teacher.

In the 2016-17 school year, 3,341 grade-five students and 5,110 grade-eight students failed to pass STAAR reading and/or mathematics.²⁴ The promotion rates of these students were determined using a 2017-18 Chancery data file.²⁵ Of the grade-five students who failed to pass STAAR and remained in the district for 2017-18 ($n=2,753$), 111 (4%) were retained and 2,642 (96%) were promoted to grade six for 2017-18. Of the grade-eight students who failed to pass STAAR and remained in the district for 2017-18 ($n=4,520$), 88 (2%) were retained and 4,432 (98%) were promoted to grade nine.²⁶

Summary and Recommendations

Most students who failed STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC were provided some type of AI after each administration. Students who failed and retested after

receiving AI generally 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. Fourteen to 40 percent of middle school students enrolled and ten to 12 percent of high school students enrolled in ASSCs failed STAAR 3-8/STAAR EOC. 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 1,445 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.

For more information, please contact Program Evaluation at evaluation@dallasisd.org.

© 2017 Dallas Independent School District (Dallas ISD)

Mail a written request for permission to use or reproduce any part of this document to:

Dallas ISD
Department of Evaluation and Assessment
H. B. Bell School Support Service Center
2909 N. Buckner Blvd.
Box 10
Dallas, TX 75228

²⁴ The 5/18/17 Chancery file was used to determine grade level in 2016-17. This file was merged with STAAR files pulled on 5/18/17 (March administration), 6/14/17 (May administration), and 7/10/17 (June administration) to determine students who had yet to pass.

²⁵ Pulled 9/18/17.

²⁶ These calculations include the 790 students who had no test data. These students were classified as not having passed STAAR. When these students were excluded from analyses, the percentage rates of retained and promoted students remained unchanged.