

2018-19 Evaluation of the Student Success Initiative and Accelerated Instruction

Sarah Hinkley, Ph.D.

EA19-173-4

At-a-Glance¹

The Student Success Initiative (SSI) was created by the 76th Texas Legislature in 1999 and modified by the 81st Texas Legislature in 2009. SSI was designed 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 Approaches Grade Level or Above (Approaches+) performance standard. This policy includes students who did not meet Approaches+ but were advanced 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+ on a STAAR End of Course (EOC). STAAR EOC 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 AI programs for high school students and to hold an annual public hearing to review the results of the evaluation.

Purpose and Methods of the Evaluation

The purpose of the 2018-19 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 EOCs 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 2018 (all levels), December 2018 (high school), and April 2019 (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 Principals were provided access to information forms to document the AI provided outside of ASSCs to students who failed one or more grade-five, grade-eight, or high school subtests. Emails providing access were sent to campus principals and office managers after testing data were released. Campus staff members had two to four weeks to complete forms after each administration. The evaluator sent weekly reminders to principals of campuses who 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. 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 both STAAR subtests following the third administration.

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

A total of \$1,196,999.31 in SCE funding was used to pay campus staff members to provide AI during the 2018-19 school year (Table 1). An additional

¹ Portions of this evaluation were adapted from Hinkley (2018).

² ASSCs are for local credit only and designed for students

who did not meet Approaches+ on STAAR subtests or are “at risk” of failing.

\$19,700.00 was spent on curricular resources (\$2,100.00 on grade-eight mathematics and \$17,600.00 on Algebra I).³ During the summer, \$1,927,032.26 was spent on SSI summer school, EOC Test Prep, and related June testing.⁴

Table 1: 2018-19 State Compensatory Education Funding Allocated for Accelerated Instruction

Level	Extra-Duty Pay
Elementary School	\$595,669.14
Elementary/Middle School	\$8,838.00
Middle School	\$273,440.91
Middle/High School	\$11,877.40
High School	\$307,173.86
Total	\$1,196,999.31

Source: District budget department, received August 22, 2019.

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

What were the rates of students who did not meet STAAR Approaches+?

In 2019, the first STAAR administration for grades five and eight occurred in April. Additional administrations for students who did not meet Approaches+ occurred in May 2019 and June 2019. Table 2 displays the rates of students who did not meet Approaches+ by exam and administration.

Table 2: 2018-19 STAAR Reading and Mathematics Failure Rates by Version, Grade, and Administration

Exam	April Tested <i>n</i> (%Fail)	May Tested <i>n</i> (%Fail)	June Tested <i>n</i> (%Fail)
English			
5 th Read	7,892 (27.9)	2,070 (65.5)	933 (88.2)
5 th Math	11,813 (18.2)	1,991 (61.8)	866 (73.1)
8 th Read	9,944 (31.3)	3,041 (69.6)	1,443 (88.1)
8 th Math	7,806 (25.0)	1,900 (66.7)	826 (79.4)
Spanish			
5 th Read	4,113 (14.5)	586 (65.0)	282 (80.9)
5 th Math	213 (63.4)	154 (74.0)	83 (86.7)

Source: STAAR files dated April 29, 2019 (April), June 3, 2019 (May), and July 29, 2019 (June).

Note: STAAR = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness. Fail = did not meet Approaches Grade Level or Above. Math = mathematics. 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 2018, May 2019, and June 2019. The May 2019 administration included the most first-time test takers. Students were required to take

³ No money was spent on resources for the other subjects in 2018-19.

⁴ This amount includes funding related to the one week of summer programming and related testing. Because of districtwide power outages, programming was only held the week of June 17, 2019. Extended Learning Opportunities department staff members indicated that a new algorithm for

STAAR EOCs at each administration until they attained the Approaches+ standard or graduated. Table 3 displays the rates of students who did not meet Approaches+ by exam and administration.

Table 3: 2018-19 STAAR EOC Failure Rates by Exam and Administration

Exam	December Tested <i>n</i> (% Fail)	May Tested <i>n</i> (%Fail)	June Tested <i>n</i> (%Fail)
Algebra I	1,342 (72.5)	11,032 (15.4)	426 (57.7)
Biology	1,138 (63.8)	10,213 (16.6)	462 (73.2)
English I	4,626 (79.1)	13,871 (46.0)	1,886 (85.9)
English II	3,615 (83.7)	12,297 (41.4)	1,248 (79.0)
US Hist	479 (63.7)	9,568 (7.2)	183 (67.8)

Source: STAAR EOC files dated January 14, 2019 (December), May 31, 2019 (May), and July 23, 2019 (June).

Note: STAAR EOC = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course. Fail = did not meet Approaches Grade Level or Above. US 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 2017-18 STAAR Failures

A total of 4,296 students did not meet Approaches+ (failed) on a 2017-18 STAAR subtest and remained in the district for 2018-19. Of these, 2,309 students failed grade-five ($n = 1,148$) or grade-eight ($n = 1,161$) STAAR mathematics. Additionally, 3,598 students in grade five ($n = 1,639$) or grade eight ($n = 1,959$) failed STAAR reading. These totals include 1,611 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.⁵ Even though most students with failing STAAR scores in 2017-18 were promoted to the next grade, AI was required to be provided at the campuses at which the students were enrolled in 2018-19.

In fall 2018, students who failed at least one STAAR subtest in 2017-18 were enrolled in ASSCs at 57 Dallas ISD campuses.⁶ Students attended these classes for approximately 3.75 hours per week.⁷ Only the results of ASSC enrollment relevant to STAAR reading or mathematics are reported here. Results are reported by

teacher allocations reduced costs while still allowing the program to serve a similar number of students.

⁵ Data were extracted from the STAAR file dated September 05, 2018 and the PowerSchool file dated October 08, 2018.

⁶ Some students were enrolled in ASSCs at the high school level after being promoted.

⁷ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

subtest because several courses qualify as providing AI for each subtest (Table 4). Across courses, students who failed STAAR reading and/or mathematics in 2017-18 comprised about 14 percent of the students enrolled in these ASSCs in fall 2018.

Table 4: Fall 2018 Student Enrollment in Exam-Related ASSCs

Failed Exam	Enrolled <i>n</i>	Did Not Meet App+/Enrolled <i>n</i>
Grade 5 Mathematics	4,063	552
Grade 5 Reading	8,242	1,192
Grade 8 Mathematics	5,206	258
Grade 8 Reading	7,113	551

Source: Secondary semester one course file dated November 04, 2018.

Note: ASSCs = Applications and Study Skills courses. Only courses relevant to *State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness* 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 2018-19 school year and the next STAAR administration, campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple subtests, there were 5,907 failure occurrences (grade five = 2,787; grade eight = 3,120).⁸ Some principals reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (8% of failure occurrences). However, 62 percent of these students were enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those failure occurrences for which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after 2017-18, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (26% of occurrences). This was followed by 3-3.99 hours (25%), and 2-2.99 hours (11%). AI most often was provided during school (54% of occurrences) or after school (21%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (78% 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 two percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for four percent of failure occurrences.

The student was not enrolled in an ASSC nor provided AI outside of an ASSC for 231 failure occurrences (grade-five mathematics = 17, grade-five reading = 3, grade-eight mathematics = 91, and grade-eight reading = 120). These instances comprised four

⁸ No information was available from campus staff members for 22 failure occurrences where the student was enrolled in an alternative program or for students at the four campuses with students who failed in 2017-18 because staff did not complete information forms (*n* = 198 occurrences).

⁹ Data were extracted from a file provided by the Office of Institutional Research on June 06, 2019.

percent of grade-five and grade-eight 2017-18 reading and mathematics failure occurrences.

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight April 2019 STAAR Failures

A total of 4,215 students who failed grade-five (*n* = 2,268) or grade-eight (*n* = 1,947) STAAR mathematics, and 5,873 grade-five (*n* = 2,792) or grade-eight (*n* = 3,081) students who failed STAAR reading in April remained in the district in May 2019. These totals include 2,997 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.⁹

In spring 2018, grade eight students who failed at least one STAAR subtest were enrolled in ASSCs at 26 Dallas ISD middle schools. Students attended these classes for approximately 3.75 hours per week.¹⁰ 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 2019 comprised about 28 percent of the students enrolled in these middle school ASSCs in spring 2019.

Table 5: Spring 2019 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	4,246	864
Grade 8 Reading	5,403	1,875

Source: Secondary semester two course file dated January 15, 2019.

Note: ASSCs = Applications and Study Skills courses. Some students were enrolled in more than one course. Only courses relevant to *State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness* 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 2019 STAAR administrations, campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple subtests, there were 10,088 failure occurrences (grade five = 5,060; grade eight = 5,028).¹¹

For those failure occurrences for which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after testing in April 2019, campus staff members most often reported providing 4-4.99 hours of AI per week (20% of occurrences). This was followed by 5-5.99 hours (16%), and 3-3.99 hours (13%). AI most often was provided during school (94%

¹⁰ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

¹¹ No information was available for 1,013 students at the campuses who failed in April 2019 where staff members did not complete information forms.

of occurrences). A teacher with content expertise most often provided AI (92% of occurrences). Campus staff members indicated that the students were no longer enrolled at their schools for few students (less than 0.1%). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided for 1.4 percent of failure occurrences.

The student was not enrolled in an ASSC nor provided AI outside of an ASSC for 84 failure occurrences (grade-five mathematics = 6, grade-five reading = 9, grade-eight mathematics = 20, and grade-eight reading = 49). These instances comprised 0.8 percent of grade-five and grade-eight April 2019 reading and mathematics failure occurrences.

Grade-Five and Grade-Eight May 2019 STAAR Failures

A total of 2,604 students failed grade-five ($n = 1,340$) or grade-eight ($n = 1,264$) STAAR mathematics and 3,841 students failed grade-five ($n = 1,732$) or grade-eight ($n = 2,109$) STAAR reading in May 2019 and remained enrolled in the district as of May 28, 2019. These totals include 1,696 students who failed both STAAR mathematics and reading.¹² Fifty-five percent ($n = 736$) of students who failed grade-five STAAR mathematics and 49 percent ($n = 621$) of students who failed grade-eight STAAR mathematics in May attended SSI summer school in June 2019. Fifty percent ($n = 872$) of students who failed grade-five STAAR reading and fifty percent ($n = 1,062$) of students who failed grade-eight STAAR reading in May attended SSI summer school in June 2019.¹³ SSI summer school was conducted for four days (Monday through Thursday, June 17, 2019 through June 20, 2019) for four hours per day.¹⁴

What services were provided to students who failed STAAR EOC?

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

June 2018 STAAR EOC Failures

A total of 8,518 students enrolled in 2018-19 did not achieve Approaches+ (failed) on at least one STAAR EOC as of the June 2018 administration. Some students failed more than one exam.¹⁵

ASSCs were offered at 20 Dallas ISD high schools with students who failed STAAR EOCs. Students attended

these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹⁶ 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 2018 comprised 14 percent of the students enrolled in these high school ASSCs in fall 2018.

Table 6: Fall 2018 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Exam

Exam	Enrolled n	Did Not Meet App+/Enrolled n
Algebra I	1,265	65
Biology	58	9
English I	2,922	564
English II	2,922	387
U.S. History	28	5

Source: Secondary semester one course file dated November 04, 2018.

Note: ASSCs = Applications and Study Skills Courses. Only courses relevant to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course 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 2018-19 school year and the December 2018 administration, high school campus principals completed information forms. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 14,814 failure occurrences.¹⁷ Five campuses reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (7% of failure occurrences). However, five percent of these students were enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they had yet to pass.

For those failure occurrences for which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after testing in June 2018, campus staff members most often reported providing 1-1.99 hours of AI per week (29% of occurrences). This was followed by 2-2.99 hours (22%), and 3-3.99 hours (16%). AI most often was provided after school (34% of occurrences), or during school (30%), or on Saturday (13%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (73% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided in 10 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.

¹² Data were extracted from the STAAR file dated June 3, 2019 and the PowerSchool file dated May 28, 2019.

¹³ Data files provided by the Extended Learning Opportunities department on August 12, 2019.

¹⁴ As reported by the Extended Learning department on July 12, 2019. The program was only held for a week in 2019 because of power outages.

¹⁵ Data were extracted from the STAAR EOC file dated October 10, 2018 and included students from all

administrations that had yet to pass a STAAR EOC. Students must continue to test until they pass or graduate. The PowerSchool data file was dated October 10, 2018.

¹⁶ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

¹⁷ No information was available for 89 failure occurrences for students enrolled in alternative programs or for 321 students at campuses where staff did not complete information forms.

The student was not enrolled in an ASSC nor provided AI outside of an ASSC for 1,482 failure occurrences. These instances comprised 10 percent of the STAAR EOC failure occurrences.

December 2018 STAAR EOC Failures

A total of 7,372 students enrolled in the district in February 2019 failed at least one STAAR EOC as of the December 2018 administration; some students failed more than one exam.¹⁸

ASSCs were offered at 20 Dallas ISD high schools with students who failed. Students attended these classes for an average of 3.75 hours per week.¹⁹ 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 2018 comprised 10 percent of the students enrolled in these high school ASSCs in spring 2019.

Table 7: Spring 2019 High School Student Enrollment in ASSCs by Exam

Exam	Enrolled <i>n</i>	Did Not Meet App+/ Enrolled <i>n</i>
Algebra I	1,214	35
Biology	57	0
English I	2,637	544
English II	2,637	89
U.S. History	5	2

Source: Secondary semester two course file, dated January 14, 2019.

Note: ASSCs = Applications and Study Skills Courses. Only courses relevant to State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course 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 2019 administration, 34 high school campus principals were sent information forms. Because some students failed multiple exams, there were 13,018 failure occurrences.²⁰ Two campuses reported occurrences in which only ASSCs were used to provide AI (six failure occurrences). Of these, no students were enrolled in ASSCs relevant to the subtests they failed.

For those failure occurrences for which AI was provided outside of ASSCs after testing in December 2018, campus staff members most often reported providing 2-2.99 hours of AI per week (45% of occurrences). This was followed by 1-1.99 hours (24%), and 3-3.99 hours

(11%). AI most often was provided after school (40% of occurrences), on Saturday (29%), or during school (23%). A teacher with content expertise most often provided the AI (88% of occurrences). Campus staff members reported that no AI was provided in 6 percent of failure occurrences. Campus staff members marked “unknown” or indicated that the students were no longer enrolled for less than one percent of failure occurrences combined.

The student was not enrolled in an ASSC nor provided AI outside of an ASSC for 696 failure occurrences. These instances comprised six percent of the STAAR EOC failure occurrences.

May 2019 STAAR EOC Failures

Table 8 contains the EOC Test Prep enrollment rates of students who failed a STAAR EOC after testing in December or May and remained enrolled in May 2019. Between 9 and 15 percent of students who failed an exam were enrolled in the relevant EOC Test Prep course. This program was offered Monday through Thursday, June 17, 2019 through June 20, 2019 for two hours per day.²¹

Table 8: Summer 2019 STAAR EOC Test Prep Student Enrollment by Exam

Exam	Yet to Pass in 2018-19 <i>n</i>	Enrolled in EOC Test Prep	
		<i>n</i>	%
Algebra I	1,895	200	10.6
Biology	1,853	222	12.0
English I	6,872	753	11.0
English II	5,417	494	9.1
U.S. History	779	120	15.4

Source: STAAR EOC thru May file, dated August 16, 2019, PowerSchool file dated May 28, 2019, and EOC Test Prep attendance data received August 12, 2019.

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 to May 2019 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

In April of 2019, 7,598 grade-five students took the STAAR reading in English and 4,008 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 2,080 (27%) and 558 (14%) failed, respectively.²² Additionally, 11,482 grade-five

¹⁸ Data were extracted from a file provided by the Office of Institutional Research on March 08, 2019 and included students from all administrations that had yet to pass a STAAR EOC. Students must test until they pass or graduate.

¹⁹ Calculations were based on bell schedules posted on school websites (Hinkley, 2017 & Hinkley & Sanguras, 2016).

²⁰ No information was available for 1,366 failure occurrences where staff did not complete information forms.

²¹ As reported by the Extended Learning department on July 12, 2019. The program was only held for a week in 2019 because of power outages.

²² Data were extracted from the April STAAR file dated April 29, 2019.

students took the mathematics portion in English and 145 completed it in Spanish; of these students, 2,008 (18%) and 71 (49%) failed, respectively.

In grade eight, STAAR is only offered in English. For reading, 9,569 took the exam and 2,880 (30%) failed. For mathematics, 7,449 grade-eight students took the exam and 1,755 (24%) failed.

Of the students who failed a STAAR reading exam in April and retested in May, 33 percent attained Approaches+ on the exam. For mathematics, 37 percent of students who failed in April and retested in May attained Approaches+ on 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.²³ Results of *t* test and Cohen's *d* analyses revealed statistically and practically significant mean scale score gains on all exams when students received AI.²⁴

Table 9: April to May 2019 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	33.2	18.2 (79.0)	0.42	1,881 (34.8)
5 th S R	37.0	7.8 (105.3)	0.46	494 (33.0)
5 th M	46.1	25.7 (74.7)	0.61	1,741 (38.4)
5 th S M	49.9	6.4 (64.0)	0.69	67 (37.3)
8 th R	35.9	23.5 (76.6)	0.47	2,520 (31.2)
8 th M	50.0	28.0 (66.8)	0.79	1,404 (35.7)

Source: STAAR files dated April 29, 2019 (April) and June 3, 2019 (May).

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+ = Approaches Grade Level or Above.

May to June 2019 STAAR Reading and Mathematics

Of the students who failed STAAR reading in May and retested in June, 12 percent attained Approaches+ on the exam. For mathematics, 23 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 with the exception of grade-five Spanish mathematics and grade-eight reading (Table 10).

Table 10 also shows differences between mean scale scores on the May and June administrations. Because

²³ Less than one percent of students who tested at both time points for a given test did not receive any AI; thus, comparisons between those who did and did not receive AI were not reported.

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 mathematics exams in English regardless of Summer SSI attendance and for students who attended Summer SSI and took the grade-five Spanish mathematics exam. Results were statistically, but not practically, significant for students who attended Summer SSI and took the grade-eight mathematics exam and for students who did not attend Summer SSI and took the grade-eight reading exam. Students who took the grade-five English reading exam and did not attend Summer SSI showed a statistically, and practically, significant decrease. No other results were statistically significant.

Table 10: May to June 2019 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	2.7	0.8 (84.0)	0.04	612 (14.7)
5 th S R	15.7	2.3 (92.8)	0.21	188 (20.2)
5 th M	33.3	12.8 (64.6)	0.53	617 (27.7)
5 th S M	26.8	3.2 (63.7)	0.46	58 (12.1)
8 th R	5.4	2.6 (64.5)	0.09	946 (10.8)
8 th M	8.1	2.8 (67.1)	0.14	547 (22.3)
Did Not Attend Summer SSI				
5 th R	-13.3	-3.6 (65.0)	-0.20	310 (6.1)
5 th S R	12.7	1.4 (86.0)	0.15	88 (15.9)
5 th M	32.9	7.5 (68.1)	0.53	239 (24.7)
5 th S M	10.9	0.7 (71.8)	0.14	24 (16.7)
8 th R	9.9	3.2 (66.5)	0.15	460 (13.3)
8 th M	6.0	1.2 (78.9)	0.09	241 (15.4)

Source: STAAR files dated June 03, 2019 (May) and July 23, 2019 (June), and Summer SSI attendance data received August 12, 2019.

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* = $d \geq .20$. App+ = Approaches Grade Level or Above.

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

December 2018 to May 2019 STAAR EOC

The December EOC administration was the first administration of the school year.²⁵ However, it included mostly students who were retesting. In December 2018,

²⁴ $p < .01$; Cohen's *d* is a measure of effect size and is indicative of practical significance; small = .20, medium = .50, and large = .80 (Cohen, 1988).

²⁵ December administration STAAR EOC data were dated January 14, 2019.

1,342 students took the Algebra I exam and 973 (73%) failed. For Biology, 1,138 students tested and 726 (64%) failed. For English I, 4,626 students tested and 3,658 (79%) failed. For English II, 3,615 students tested and 3,026 (84%) failed. For U.S. History, 479 students tested and 305 (64%) failed.

Table 11 shows differences between December 2018 and May 2019 Approaches+ rates as well as tests for statistically and practically significant change for students who received AI between administrations.²⁶ 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 2018 to May 2019 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	169.3	12.8 (309.2)	0.69	550 (30.4)
Biology	164.5	11.5 (271.1)	0.79	359 (32.3)
English I	112.4	21.3 (258.7)	0.42	2,397 (22.2)
English II	113.5	20.1 (255.9)	0.41	2,047 (22.2)
US Hist	226.6	8.4 (351.1)	0.87	169 (45.6)

Source: STAAR EOC files dated January 14, 2019 (December) and May 31, 2019 (May).

Note: STAAR EOC = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course. MSSC = mean scale score change. US Hist = United States history. **Bold** = $p < .01$. *Italics* = $d > .20$. App+ = Approaches Grade Level or Above.

May to June 2019 STAAR EOC

Table 12 presents the June 2019 STAAR EOC rates of Approaches+ for students who failed in May and retested in June.

Table 12: May to June 2019 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	387	161	41.6
Biology	433	116	26.8
English I	1,812	247	13.6
English II	1,176	238	20.2
U.S. History	157	44	28.0

Source: STAAR EOC files dated May 31, 2019 (May) and July 23, 2019 (June), and Summer SSI attendance data received August 12, 2019.

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.

Table 13 presents the June 2019 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 achieved Approaches+ 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 Algebra I, Biology, and U.S. History exams regardless of EOC Test Prep attendance. English I scores also revealed statistically significant mean scale score gains regardless of EOC Test Prep attendance; however, these gains were not practically significant. English II mean scale score gains were only statistically significant for students who attended EOC Test Prep; these gains were not practically significant.

Table 13: May to June 2019 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				
Algebra I	197.1	9.4 (274.9)	0.86	170 (49.4)
Biology	77.8	4.1 (259.0)	0.38	190 (27.4)
Eng I	45.5	4.7 (244.8)	0.18	639 (16.4)
Eng II	46.8	3.9 (251.6)	0.17	435 (23.4)
US Hist	98.4	3.0 (267.3)	0.47	68 (33.8)
Did Not Attend EOC Test Prep				
Algebra I	132.8	6.4 (306.3)	0.56	217 (35.5)
Biology	82.5	5.7 (227.2)	0.45	243 (26.3)
Eng I	28.3	3.8 (252.3)	0.11	1,173 (12.1)
Eng II	-2.2	-0.2 (279.0)	-0.01	741 (18.4)
US Hist	79.9	2.84 (265.9)	0.48	89 (23.6)

Source: STAAR EOC files dated May 31, 2019 (May) and July 23, 2019 (June), and EOC Test Prep attendance data received August 12, 2019.

Note: STAAR EOC = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness End of Course. MSSC = mean scale score change. Eng = English. US Hist = United States history. **Bold** = $p < .01$. *Italics* = $d > .20$. App+ = Approaches Grade Level or Above.

What was the context of the Grade Placement Committee (GPC), and what were the promotion rates of 2018-19 grade-five and grade-eight students?

The final advancement decision for a student who did not meet the Approaches+ standard 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 2018-19 school year, 2,278 grade-five students and 2,433 grade-eight students did not meet

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

²⁶ May administration STAAR EOC data were dated May 31, 2019. Less than twelve percent of students who tested at both time points for a given test did not receive AI;

Approaches+ on STAAR reading and/or mathematics.²⁷ The promotion rates of these students were determined using a 2019-20 PowerSchool data file.²⁸ Of the grade-five students who failed to meet Approaches+ on STAAR and remained in the district for 2019-20 ($n = 1,815$), 75 (4%) were retained in grade five, 1,738 (96%) were promoted to grade six, and two (0.1%) were promoted to grade seven for 2019-20. Of the grade-eight students who failed to meet Approaches+ on STAAR and remained in the district for 2019-20 ($n = 2,062$), 57 (3%) were retained in grade eight, 2,003 (97%) were promoted to grade nine, and two (0.1%) were promoted to grade ten.²⁹

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.

- **Increase efforts to provide AI for students throughout the year and during the summer.** Students who were provided AI or were enrolled in ASSCs after an exam attained Approaches+ at higher rates than those who were not. Most students received AI during the school year. However, only 51% of students who failed in grades five and eight attended Summer SSI and 11% of students who failed EOCs attended EOC Test Prep. Utilizing summer programming may ensure students receive more subject-specific instruction for remediation.
- **Ensure accurate documentation of services provided to students.** During the school year, no data were available for the 3,099 students at campuses for which data were not completed. The summer attendance data was cleaner than in the past; however, there were still discrepancies (the same student enrolled in multiple locations, etc.) that may have 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. (2018). 2017-18 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.

© 2019 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

²⁷ The May 28, 2019 PowerSchool file was used to determine grade level in 2018-19. This file was merged with the STAAR file containing the April, May, and June administration data dated September 11, 2019.

²⁸ PowerSchool file dated September 16, 2019.

²⁹ These calculations only include students with a scored test who did not meet the Approaches+ standard. Other scoring codes do not note if a student was required to meet the Approaches+ standard to promote, had another means of demonstrating performance, or was exempt from meeting the standard.