

2017-18 Evaluation of the Student Success Initiative and Accelerated Instruction

Sarah Hinkley, Ph.D.

EA18-173-4

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 failed to meet the passing standard, Approaches Grade Level or Above (Approaches+). 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 meet Approaches Grade Level or Above (Approaches+) 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 failed 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 2017-18 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 Extended Learning Opportunities department, STAAR 3-8 data, STAAR EOC data, and promotion data.

AI information was collected for the following administrations: June 2017 (all levels), December 2017 (high school), and April 2018 (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).¹ Information forms, sent to principals of students who failed one or more grade-five, grade-eight, or high school subtests, 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 April 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.² Additionally, frequency analyses of promotion data were conducted to examine the promotion rates of grade-five and grade-eight SSI students who had not met Approaches+ on one or more STAAR subtests following the third administration.

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

A total of \$1,710,309.01 in SCE funding was used to pay SSI staff to provide AI during the 2017-18 school year (Table 1). An additional \$98,651.00 was spent on curricular resources (\$31,210.00 on grade-five math,

¹ ASSCs are for local credit only and designed for students who Did Not Meet Approaches+ on STAAR subtests or are “at risk” of failing.

² Although all scores are included, some students’ test scores in grade five and eight (April and May administrations) and English I (May administration) may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

\$28,058.00 on grade-eight math, \$24,000.00 on Algebra I, and \$15,383.00 on Biology).³ During the summer, \$3,431,625.10 was spent on SSI summer school and EOC Test Prep. This total included \$2,497,253.13 for SSI for grades five and eight and STAAR retesting and \$934,371.97 for EOC Test Prep and STAAR EOC retesting.

Table 1: 2017-18 State Compensatory Education Funding Allocated for Accelerated Instruction

Level	Extra-Duty Pay
Elementary	\$863,225.67
Middle	\$317,973.06
High	\$529,110.28
Total	\$1,710,309.01

Source: District budget department, pulled 08/20/18.

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

What were the STAAR Approaches+ rates?

In 2018, the first STAAR administration for grades five and eight occurred in April. Additional administrations for students who did not pass occurred in May 2018 and June 2018. Table 2 displays the Approaches+ rates for students by exam and administration.

Table 2: 2017-18 STAAR Reading and Mathematics Results by Version, Grade, and Administration

Exam	April Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)	May Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)	June Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)
English			
5 th Read	8,131 (70.8)	2,249 (19.5)	1,339 (20.8)
5 th Math	12,029 (81.0)	2,180 (34.3)	1,056 (18.2)
8 th Read	9,870 (64.8)	3,376 (27.4)	1,730 (19.1)
8 th Math	7,630 (69.8)	2,195 (33.2)	979 (23.9)
Spanish			
5 th Read	4,064 (83.5)	677 (33.1)	373 (37.3)
5 th Math	180 (53.9)	93 (25.8)	61 (9.8)

Source: STAAR files pulled on 05/04/18 (April), 06/04/18 (May), and 07/17/18 (June).

Note: STAAR=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness. App+=Approaches Grade Level or Above. Math=Mathematics and Read=Reading. Only students who tested on grade level were included in this table and analyses. Although all scores are included, some students' April and May test scores may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

For high school students, STAAR EOCs were administered in December 2017, May 2018, and June 2018. The May 2018 administration included the most first-time test takers. Students were required to take STAAR EOCs at each administration until they attained the Approaches+ standard or graduated. Table 3

displays the Approaches+ rates for students by exam and administration.

Table 3: 2017-18 STAAR EOC Results by Exam and Administration

Exam	December Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)	May Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)	June Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)
Algebra I	1,797 (19.6)	11,270 (82.0)	753 (40.0)
Biology	1,197 (30.7)	10,754 (84.5)	593 (33.9)
English I	4,819 (20.6)	13,574 (49.9)	2,506 (25.3)
English II	4,036 (21.0)	12,910 (56.7)	1,643 (18.7)
U.S. Hist.	450 (40.2)	9,578 (92.7)	243 (38.7)

Source: STAAR EOC files pulled on 01/16/18 (December), 06/14/18 (May), and 07/27/18 (June).

Note: STAAR EOC=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course. App+=Approaches Grade Level or Above. U.S. Hist.=United States History. Although all scores are included, some students' May English I test scores may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

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 2016-17 STAAR Failures

A total of 4,628 students did not pass a 2016-17 STAAR subtest and remained in the district for 2017-18. Of these, 2,876 students failed grade-five ($n=1,582$) or grade-eight ($n=1,294$) STAAR mathematics. Additionally, 3,721 students in grade five ($n=1,938$) or grade eight ($n=1,783$) failed STAAR reading. These totals include 1,969 students who failed either STAAR mathematics or reading.⁴ Even though most students with failing STAAR scores were promoted to the next grade in 2017-18, AI was required to be provided at the campuses at which the students were currently enrolled.

In fall 2017, students who did not pass at least one STAAR subtest in 2016-17 were enrolled in ASSCs at 37 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately 3.75 hours per week.⁵ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR reading or mathematics are reported here. Results are reported by subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 4). Across courses, students who did not pass STAAR reading and/or mathematics in 2016-17 comprised about 10 percent of

³ The other subjects did not spend any money on resources in 2017-18.

⁴ Data were pulled from the STAAR file (07/10/17) and the Chancery file (10/16/17).

⁵ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in fall 2017.

Table 4: Fall 2017 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Grade and Exam

Grade and Exam	Enrolled <i>n</i>	Did Not Meet App+/Enrolled <i>n</i>
Grade 5 Mathematics	4,107	747
Grade 5 Reading	10,024	1,620
Grade 8 Mathematics	3,997	34
Grade 8 Reading	6,381	51

Source: Secondary semester one course file, pulled 11/14/17.

Note: ASSCs=Applications and Study Skills courses. Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR reading and mathematics subtests are reported in this table. Did Not Meet App+=Did Not Meet Approaches Grade Level or Above.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between the beginning of the 2017-18 school year and the next STAAR administration, campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple subtests, there were 6,597 failure occurrences (grade five=3,520; grade eight=3,077).⁶ Some principals reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (3% of failure occurrences). However, 38 percent of these students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those failure occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after 2016-17, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (28% of occurrences). This was followed by 2-2.99 hours (18%), and 3-3.99 hours (14%). AI most often was provided during school (50% of occurrences) or after school (28%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (83% of occurrences). Campus staff members marked "unknown" for two percent of occurrences, and they indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for three percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for six percent of failure occurrences.

There were 492 failure occurrences (grade-five mathematics=15, grade-five reading=32, grade-eight mathematics=180, and grade-eight reading=265) in which the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These comprised seven percent of grade-five and grade-eight 2016-17 reading or mathematics failure occurrences.

⁶ No information was available from campus staff for 24 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program or for students at the four campuses with students who did not pass in 2016-17 because staff did not complete information forms (*n*=307 occurrences).

⁷ Data were pulled from the STAAR file (05/04/18) and the Chancery file (04/30/18).

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight April 2018 STAAR Failures

A total of 4,646 students who failed grade-five (*n*=2,353) or grade-eight (*n*=2,293) STAAR mathematics, and 6,491 grade-five (*n*=3,031) or grade-eight (*n*=3,460) students who failed STAAR reading in April remained in the district in May 2018. These totals include 3,291 students who failed either STAAR mathematics or reading.⁷

In spring 2018, students who failed at least one STAAR subtest were enrolled in ASSCs at 33 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately 3.75 hours per week.⁸ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR reading or mathematics are reported here. Results are reported by subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 5). Across courses, students who failed STAAR reading and/or mathematics in April 2018 comprised about 33 percent of the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in spring 2018.

Table 5: Spring 2018 Middle School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Grade and Exam

Grade and Exam	Enrolled <i>n</i>	Did Not Meet App+/Enrolled <i>n</i>
Grade 8 Mathematics	4,078	1,021
Grade 8 Reading	6,342	2,394

Source: Secondary semester two course file, pulled 05/01/18.

Note: ASSCs=Applications and Study Skills Courses. Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR reading and mathematics subtests are reported in this table. Did Not Meet App+=Did Not Meet Approaches Grade Level or Above.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between the April and May 2018 STAAR administrations, campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple subtests, there were 11,137 failure occurrences (grade five=5,384; grade eight=5,753).⁹ Some principals reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (3% of failure occurrences). Seventy-one percent of these students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those failure occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after testing in April 2018, campus staff members most often reported providing 5-5.99 hours of AI per week (15% of occurrences). This was followed by 4-4.99 hours (13%), 2-2.99 hours (11%), and 11 or more hours (10%). AI most often was

⁸ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

⁹ No information was available for 59 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program or for students at the two campuses with students who failed in April 2018 because staff did not complete information forms (*n*=246 occurrences).

provided during school (88% of occurrences). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (89% of occurrences). Campus staff members marked “unknown” or indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for very few students (0.2% combined). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for 0.2 percent of failure occurrences.

There were 18 failure occurrences (grade-five mathematics=5, grade-five reading=4, grade-eight mathematics=5, and grade-eight reading=4) in which the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These comprised 0.2 percent of grade-five and grade-eight April 2018 reading or mathematics failure occurrences.

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight May 2018 STAAR Failures

A total of 2,944 students failed grade-five ($n=1,491$) or grade-eight ($n=1,453$) STAAR mathematics and 4,695 grade-five ($n=2,254$) or grade-eight ($n=2,441$) students failed STAAR reading in May 2018 and remained enrolled in June 2018. These totals include 1,978 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.¹⁰ Sixty-one percent ($n=910$) of students who failed grade-five STAAR mathematics and 70 percent ($n=1,014$) of students who failed grade-eight STAAR mathematics in May attended SSI summer school in June 2018. Sixty-six percent ($n=1,498$) of students who failed grade-five STAAR reading and 71 percent ($n=1,733$) of students who failed grade-eight STAAR reading in May attended SSI summer school in June 2018.¹¹ SSI summer school was conducted for nine days (Monday through Thursday, June 11, through June 25, 2018) for four hours per day.¹²

What services were provided to students who failed STAAR EOC?

High school AI was provided through individual instruction, small-group instruction, or ASSCs.

June 2017 STAAR EOC Failures

A total of 9,193 students enrolled in 2017-18 did not achieve Approaches+ (had yet to pass) at least one STAAR EOC as of the June 2017 administration; some students had yet to pass more than one exam.¹³

ASSCs were offered at 24 Dallas ISD high schools with students who failed STAAR EOCs. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹⁴ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to the STAAR EOCs are reported here. Results are reported by subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 6). Across courses, students who failed STAAR EOCs in June 2017 comprised 16 percent of the students enrolled in these high school ASSCs in fall 2017.

Table 6: Fall 2017 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Exam

Exam	Enrolled n	Did Not Meet App+/ Enrolled n
Algebra I	1,082	29
Biology	147	4
English I	3,120	667
English II	3,120	482
U.S. History	7	5

Source: Secondary semester one course file, pulled 11/14/17.

Note: ASSCs=Applications and Study Skills Courses. Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR EOC failures are reported in this table. Did Not Meet App+=Did Not Meet Approaches Grade Level or Above.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between the beginning of the 2017-18 school year and the December 2017 administration, high school campus principals completed information forms. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 15,639 failure occurrences.¹⁵ Two campuses reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (3% of failure occurrences). However, 19 percent of these students were actually enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those failure occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after testing in June 2017, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (42% of occurrences). This was followed by 3-3.99 hours (19%), and 2-2.99 hours (17%). AI most often was provided during school (46% of occurrences), or after school (34%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (86% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided in four 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 one percent of failure occurrences.

¹⁰ Data were pulled from the STAAR file (06/04/18) and the Chancery file (06/04/18).

¹¹ Data were pulled from files provided on 07/30/18 by the Extended Learning Opportunities department.

¹² <https://tinyurl.com/2018SummerWAIP>

¹³ Data were pulled from the STAAR file on 10/17/17 and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass an EOC exam. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate. Chancery data was pulled 10/16/17.

¹⁴ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

¹⁵ No information was available for 68 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program or for students at the two campuses with students who did not pass in 2016-17 because staff did not complete information forms ($n=664$ occurrences).

There were 983 failure occurrences where the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These comprised six percent of the STAAR EOC failure occurrences.

December 2017 STAAR EOC Failures

A total of 6,885 students enrolled in the district in February 2018 had yet to pass at least one STAAR EOC as of the December 2017 administration; some students had yet to pass more than one exam.¹⁶

ASSCs were offered at 23 Dallas ISD high schools with students who failed. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹⁷ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR EOCs are reported here. Results are reported by subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 7). Across courses, students who failed STAAR EOCs in December 2017 comprised 12 percent of the students enrolled in these high school ASSCs in spring 2018.

Table 7: Spring 2018 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs Exam

Exam	Enrolled <i>n</i>	Did Not Meet App+/Enrolled <i>n</i>
Algebra I	1,039	16
Biology	118	0
English I	2,543	419
English II	2,543	309
U.S. History	10	9

Source: Secondary semester two course file, pulled 03/05/18.

Note: ASSCs=Applications and Study Skills Courses. Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to STAAR EOC failures are reported in this table. Did Not Meet App+=Did Not Meet Approaches Grade Level or Above.

To determine what AI students were provided outside of ASSCs between December EOCs and the May 2018 administration, 31 high school campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 11,738 failure occurrences.¹⁸ Four campuses reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (0.1% of failure occurrences). Of these, no students were enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those failure occurrences in which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after testing in December 2017, campus staff members most often reported providing 3-3.99 hours of AI per week (30% of occurrences). This was followed by 2-2.99 hours (26%), and 1-1.99 hours

(17%). AI most often was provided during school (33% of occurrences), after school (32%), or on Saturday (22%). 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 one percent of failure occurrences.

There were 581 failure occurrences where the student was not enrolled in an ASSC or provided AI outside of an ASSC. These comprised five percent of the STAAR EOC failure occurrences.

May 2018 STAAR EOC Failures

Table 8 contains the EOC Test Prep enrollment rates of students who had yet to pass a STAAR EOC as of May 2018 and remained enrolled in the district in June. Between 61 and 73 percent of students who failed an exam were enrolled in the relevant EOC Test Prep course.¹⁹ This program was offered Monday through Thursday, June 11, through June 21, 2018 for four hours per day.²⁰

Table 8: Summer 2018 STAAR EOC Test Prep Student Enrollment by Exam

Exam	Yet to Pass <i>n</i>	Enrolled in EOC Test Prep	
		<i>n</i>	%
Algebra I	2,665	1,623	61
Biology	2,153	1,394	65
English I	6,702	4,871	73
English II	5,403	3,937	73
U.S. History	761	521	68

Source: STAAR Yet to Pass file, pulled 06/18/18, Chancery file pulled 06/04/18, and EOC Test Prep attendance data pulled 07/30/18.

Note: STAAR EOC=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course. Some students were enrolled in more than one course.

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

April 2018 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

In April of 2018,²¹ 8,131 grade-five students took the STAAR reading in English and 4,064 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 2,372 (29%) and 672 (17%) failed, respectively. Additionally, 12,029 grade-five

¹⁶ Data were pulled from the STAAR and Chancery files on 01/17/18 and 01/16/18, respectively and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass an EOC exam. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate.

¹⁷ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

¹⁸ No information was available for 36 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program.

¹⁹ There were minimal attendance data for EOC Test Prep. Students were included in the analyses if they were enrolled in a course and did not have absences that totaled the length of the course or more.

²⁰ <https://tinyurl.com/2018SummerWAIP>

²¹ Data were pulled from the April STAAR file received on 05/09/18.

students took the mathematics portion in English and 180 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 2,280 (19%) and 83 (46%) failed, respectively.

In grade eight, STAAR is only offered in English. For reading, 9,870 took the exam and 3,479 (35%) failed. For mathematics, 7,630 grade-eight students took the exam and 2,307 (30%) failed.

May 2018 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

Of the students who failed a STAAR reading exam in April and retested in May, 25 percent attained Approaches+ on the exam. For mathematics, 34 percent of students who failed in April and retested in May attained Approaches+ the exam.

Table 9 shows differences between April and May scores as well as tests for statistically and practically significant change for students who received AI between administrations.²² Results of *t* test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains²³ on all exams when students received AI with the exception of grade five English reading. However, the decrease in grade five English reading scores was not statistically significant.

Table 9: April to May 2018 Grade-Five and Grade-Eight STAAR Results for Students who Received Accelerated Instruction

STAAR	MSSC	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)
5 th R	-4.1	-2.5 (77.4)	0.05	2,169 (19.2)
5 th S R	34.5	11.2 (78.6)	0.50	653 (31.9)
5 th M	40.5	26.7 (69.5)	0.62	2,104 (33.9)
5 th S M	46.2	6.8 (63.2)	0.67	87 (27.6)
8 th R	31.5	26.2 (67.2)	0.47	3,134 (26.7)
8 th M	24.5	17.1 (63.9)	0.40	1,975 (33.6)

Source: April and May STAAR files pulled on 05/09/18 and 06/04/18, respectively.

Note: STAAR=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness; MSSC=Mean Scale Score Change; R=Reading; M=Mathematics; S=Spanish version; **Bold**=*p*<.01; *italics*=*d*>.20. App+=scores were Approaches Grade Level or Above. Although all scores are included, some students' April and May test scores may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

June 2018 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

Of the students who failed STAAR reading in May and retested in June, 22 percent attained Approaches+ on the exam. For mathematics, 21 percent of students who failed in May and retested in June attained Approaches+ on the exam. Students who failed in May and attended SSI summer school attained

Approaches+ at a higher rate than students who did not attend (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 Attend 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 some exams.

There were statistically and practically significant increases in results for students who took the grade-five reading exams regardless of language or Summer SSI attendance and for students who attended Summer SSI and took the grade-eight mathematics exam. Results were statistically, but not practically, significant for students who attended Summer SSI and took the grade-five English mathematics and grade-eight reading. No other results were statistically significant.

Table 10: May to June 2018 Grade-Five and Grade-Eight STAAR Results by Summer SSI Attendance Status

STAAR	MSSC	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)
Attended Summer SSI				
5 th R	45.9	20.2 (73.6)	0.67	1,055 (21.7)
5 th S R	56.8	11.2 (83.9)	0.78	276 (39.1)
5 th M	11.0	4.5 (68.2)	0.18	775 (19.4)
5 th S M	9.5	0.9 (64.7)	0.18	37 (8.1)
8 th R	10.7	6.4 (63.9)	0.17	1,435 (19.3)
8 th M	26.4	10.9 (69.8)	0.44	824 (25.4)
Did Not Attend Summer SSI				
5 th R	45.7	10.5 (71.0)	0.63	267 (17.2)
5 th S R	49.7	5.1 (93.2)	0.66	91 (30.8)
5 th M	2.4	0.6 (67.1)	0.04	272 (14.7)
5 th S M	-19.4	-1.3 (62.8)	0.30	17 (0.0)
8 th R	9.1	2.0 (72.5)	0.13	249 (18.1)
8 th M	13.4	2.1 (63.8)	0.25	104 (16.3)

Source: May and June administration STAAR files pulled on 06/04/18 and 07/17/18, respectively, and Summer SSI attendance data pulled 07/30/18.

Note: STAAR=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness; MSSC=Mean Scale Score Change; R=Reading; M=Mathematics; S=Spanish version; **Bold**=*p*<.01; *italics*=*d*>.20. App+=scores were Approaches Grade Level or Above. Although all scores are included, some students' May test scores may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

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

December 2017 STAAR EOC

The December EOC administration was the first administration of the school year.²⁴ However, it included mostly students who were retesting. In December 2017,

²² Less than seven 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.

²³ *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).

²⁴ December administration STAAR EOC data were pulled 01/16/18.

1,797 students took the Algebra I exam and 1,445 (80%) failed. For Biology, 1,197 students tested and 829 (69%) failed. For English I, 4,819 students tested and 3,826 (79%) failed. For English II, 4,036 students tested and 3,187 (79%) failed. For U.S. History, 450 students tested and 269 (60%) failed.

May 2018 STAAR EOC

Table 11 shows differences between December 2017 and May 2018 Approaches+ rates as well as tests for statistically and practically significant change for students who received AI between administrations.²⁵ Results of *t* test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on all exams for students who received AI.

Table 11: December 2017 to May 2018 STAAR EOC Results for Students who Received Accelerated Instruction

STAAR EOC	MSSC	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)
Algebra I	138.0	12.5 (314.2)	0.58	814 (31.4)
Biology	134.5	8.1 (354.1)	0.50	450 (30.2)
English I	60.9	9.8 (313.8)	0.21	2,533 (17.0)
English II	106.9	17.1 (301.9)	0.37	2,341 (22.4)
U.S. His.	277.4	8.8 (385.4)	0.91	148 (50.0)

Source: December and May administration STAAR files pulled on 01/16/18 and 06/14/18, respectively.

Note: STAAR EOC=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course; MSSC=Mean Scale Score Change; U.S. His.=United States History; **Bold**=*p*<.01; *italics*=*d*>.20. App+=scores were Approaches Grade Level or Above. Although all scores are included, some students' May English I test scores may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

June 2018 STAAR EOC

Table 12 presents the June 2018 STAAR EOC passing rates for students who failed in May and retested.

Table 12: May to June 2018 STAAR EOC Approaches Grade Level or Above Rates by Exam

STAAR EOC	Did Not Meet App+ in May and Retested	Retested and Attained App+ in June	
		<i>n</i>	%
Algebra I	652	245	37.6
Biology	504	153	30.4
English I	2,394	602	25.1
English II	1,552	285	18.4
U.S. History	207	70	33.8

Source: May and June administration STAAR files pulled on 06/14/18 and 07/27/18, respectively and Summer SSI attendance data pulled 07/30/18.

Note: STAAR EOC=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course. Did Not Meet App+=Did Not Meet Approaches Grade Level or Above (App+).

Table 13 presents the June 2018 STAAR EOC Approaches+ rates for students who failed in May and

did or did not attend summer EOC Test Prep. A greater percentage of students who were enrolled in EOC Test Prep passed the exams than students who were not enrolled.

Table 13 also shows differences between mean scale scores on the May to June administrations. Because of 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 English I exam regardless of EOC Test Prep attendance. With the exception of English II, the scores of all students who were enrolled in EOC Test Prep had statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains. No significant changes in scores were evident for students who did not attend EOC Test Prep and took any exam except English I.

Table 13: May to June 2018 STAAR EOC Results by EOC Test Prep Attendance Status

STAAR EOC	MSSC	<i>t</i> (SD)	<i>d</i>	Tested <i>n</i> (% App+)
Attended EOC Test Prep				
Alg. I	144.2	13.8 (250.0)	0.69	570 (38.4)
Bio.	94.9	8.6 (235.3)	0.51	459 (30.5)
Eng. I	131.1	25.3 (242.6)	0.49	2,183 (25.7)
Eng. II	8.8	1.2 (260.0)	0.03	1,335 (18.8)
U.S. His.	94.5	4.7 (259.3)	0.43	167 (35.9)
Did Not Attend EOC Test Prep				
Alg. I	68.1	1.9 (327.9)	0.25	82 (31.7)
Bio.	81.0	2.3 (235.0)	0.46	45 (28.9)
Eng. I	107.6	6.9 (226.5)	0.40	211 (19.4)
Eng. II	-4.0	-0.2 (326.6)	0.01	217 (15.7)
U.S. His.	88.9	1.7 (330.8)	0.31	40 (25.0)

Source: STAAR files pulled on 06/14/18 (May) and 07/27/18 (June), respectively, and EOC Test Prep attendance data pulled 07/30/18.

Note: STAAR EOC=State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course; MSSC=Mean Scale Score Change; Alg.=Algebra; Bio.=Biology; Eng.=English; U.S. His.=United States History; **Bold**=*p*<.01; *italics*=*d*>.20. App+=scores were Approaches Grade Level or Above. Although all scores are included, some students' May English I test scores may have been adversely affected by online testing issues.

What was the context of the Grade Placement Committee (GPC), and what were the promotion rates of 2017-18 grade-five and grade-eight students?

The final advancement decision of a student who did not 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.

²⁵ May administration STAAR EOC data were pulled on 06/14/18. Less than sixteen 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.

In the 2017-18 school year, 2,783 grade-five students and 5,249 grade-eight students did not meet Approaches+ on STAAR reading and/or mathematics.²⁶ The promotion rates of these students were determined using a 2018-19 PowerSchool data file.²⁷ Of the grade-five students who failed to pass STAAR and remained in the district for 2018-19 ($n=2,281$), 118 (5%) were retained and 2,163 (95%) were promoted to grade six for 2018-19. Of the grade-eight students who failed to pass STAAR and remained in the district for 2018-19 ($n=4,702$), 60 (1%) were retained and 4,642 (99%) were promoted to grade nine.²⁸

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 attained Approaches+ 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 an exam attained Approaches+ at higher rates than those who were not. Ten to 33 percent of middle school students and 12 to 17 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 accurate documentation of services provided to students.** During the school year, no data were available for the 1,217 students at campuses for which information forms were not returned. The summer attendance data included many discrepancies that precluded accurate analyses. Administrators should document the services students receive to increase compliance and to ensure the district has accurate data for analyses.

References

- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Hinkley, S. (2017). 2016-17 Evaluation of the Student Success Initiative and Accelerated Instruction. Dallas, TX. Dallas Independent School District.

Hinkley, S. & Sanguras, L. (2016). Student Success Initiative and Accelerated Instruction 2015-16. Dallas, TX. Dallas Independent School District.

An electronic version of this report can be found at www.dallasisd.org/Page/888. For more information, please contact Program Evaluation at evaluation@dallasisd.org.

© 2018 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

²⁶ The 05/07/18 Chancery file was used to determine grade level in 2017-18. This file was merged with STAAR files pulled on 05/09/18 (April administration), 06/04/18 (May administration), and 07/17/18 (June administration) to determine students who had yet to pass.

²⁷ Pulled 09/17/18.

²⁸ These calculations include the 425 students without test data. These students were classified as not having passed STAAR. When these students were excluded from analyses, the percentage of retained and promoted grade-eight students remained unchanged. For grade-five students, six percent were retained and 94 percent were promoted.