

2024-25

State Compensatory Education: Annual Evaluation

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

Stephanie Elizalde, Ed. D.
Superintendent of Schools




2024-25

State Compensatory Education: Annual Evaluation


Approved Report of the Department of Evaluation and Assessment

EA25-301-2
August 2025

Larry Featherston, Ph.D., Manager



Andwaniak Meharie, Ph.D.
Executive Director, Program Evaluation



Jacob Cortez, M.Ed.
Assistant Superintendent, Evaluation and Assessment

© 2025 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
9400 N. Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75231.

This report is available for download at www.dallasisd.org/Page/888. For more information, please contact
Program Evaluation at evaluation@dallasisd.org.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY FINDINGS	5
PROGRAM BACKGROUND	6
State and District Criteria for At-Risk Students	7
Limitations	8
EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND RESULTS	8
EQ1: What were the demographic characteristics of 2024-25 Dallas ISD At-Risk students?	8
EQ2: What programs and services were funded by the SCE Program?	11
EQ3: What were the academic performance outcomes, graduation rates, and dropout rates of At-Risk and Not At-Risk students?	13
REFERENCES	17
APPENDICES	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: 2024-25 Student Enrollment by Grade	9
Table 2: 2024-25 Student Demographic Characteristics	10
Table 3: 2024-25 Students Reported as At-Risk by At-Risk Indicator	10
Table 4: 2024-25 Number and Percentage of At-Risk Students by Grade and EB Status	11
Table 5: 2024-25 STAAR 3-8 and STAAR EOC Approaches+ Rates and Performance Gaps.....	14

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: 2013-14 Through 2024-25 District Student Population by At-Risk Status	9
Figure 2: 2015-16 Through 2023-24 Graduation Rates by Cohort and At-Risk Status	15
Figure 3: 2015-16 Through 2023-24 Dropout Rates by Cohort and At-Risk Status	16

2024-25

State Compensatory Education: Annual Evaluation

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this report is to comply with the TEC §29.081 evaluation requirement and examine the effectiveness of the State Compensatory Education (SCE) program in eliminating any disparity in 1) Performance on assessment instruments between students at risk of dropping out of school and all other district students, and 2) High school completion rates between students at risk of dropping out of school and all other district students. The scope of this report includes (a) describing the At-Risk student population within Dallas Independent School District (ISD) and trends in At-Risk student identification, (b) examine SCE funding, allocation, and expenditures, and (c) assess the performance gap between At-Risk and Not At-Risk students.

KEY FINDINGS

In 2023-24, the district received an SCE program allotment of \$195,735,855.00 from the state. The minimum direct cost requirement was 55 percent for the 2023-24 school year, or \$107,654,720.00. The district budgeted \$113,524,933.67 in direct costs to support programs/services for At-Risk students, and actual expenditures totaled \$114,086,144.22. Key findings for 2024-25 included the following:



In school year 2024-25, a total of 109,997 Dallas ISD students (79.9%) were identified as At-Risk which is an increase from 2023-24 (74.8%).



Hispanic/Latino and Emergent Bilingual (EB) students are over-represented among At-Risk students compared to their proportions of the overall district student population.



At-Risk students performed lower than Not At-Risk students across all grade-levels and test subjects on the *State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR)*, and *STAAR End of Course (EOC)* tests.



The percentage of At-Risk students who achieved the Approaches+ performance level in 2024-25 increased across two-thirds of grade levels and subjects compared to 2023-24 performance results.



Overall, the Class of 2024 At-Risk students had a four percentage points increase in graduation rate compared to the Class of 2023 At-Risk students. The gap between Not At-Risk and At-Risk students decreased nearly three percentage points from the Class of 2023 to the Class of 2024.



The gap in graduation rates between At-Risk and Not At-Risk students has decreased each of the last four years; 16.9 percentage points for the class of 2021, 11.9 percentage points for the class of 2022, 8.7 percentage points for the class of 2023, and 6.0 percentage points for the class of 2024.



Overall, dropout rates decreased notably for the Class of 2024 At-Risk students and decreased slightly for Not At-Risk students, narrowing the dropout rate gap by 2.9 percentage points.

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The purpose of the State Compensatory Education (SCE) program is to supplement the regular education program with compensatory, intensive, and accelerated instruction for students identified as being at-risk of dropping out of school (At-Risk). The program is designed to reduce or eliminate disparities between At-Risk and all other students in (a) performance on assessment instruments administered under Subchapter B, Chapter 39 of the Texas Education Code ([TEC] 1995, amended 2013) and (b) rates of high school completion. A history of the program since its inception in 1975 can be found in Appendix A.

For SCE funds to be allocated to a campus, services provided to students must be described in the district and campus improvement plan. A district's SCE allotment may be used for costs such as program and student evaluation; instructional materials, equipment, and other supplies required for quality instruction; supplemental staff expenses; salaries for teachers of At-Risk students; and reduced class size and individualized instruction. In 2023-24, the district received an SCE program allotment of \$195,735,855.00 from the state. The minimum direct cost requirement was 55 percent for the 2023-24 school year, or \$107,654,720.00. The district budgeted \$113,524,933.67 in direct costs to support programs/services for At-Risk students, and actual expenditures totaled \$114,086,144.22. Dallas ISD State Compensatory Education program budget funding, allocations, and expenditures are displayed in Appendix C.

Funding allocated for compensatory education is based on the largest six-weeks enrollment of economically-disadvantaged students in the district during the previous school year. However, economic disadvantage is not itself a criterion for At-Risk status for individual students. Districts receiving SCE funds are required to have policies and procedures in place for the identification and reporting of At-Risk students. Students who meet any of the state and district criteria are to be reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) in the fall of each school year. Dallas ISD policies can be found in EHBC (LOCAL) and EHBC (LEGAL). See Appendices D through F for detailed SCE information.

Funds allocated under SCE must be used for programs and services that are supplemental to the regular education program and offer academic support to students who meet At-Risk eligibility criteria established by the state, as defined in TEC §29.081.¹ School districts must provide accelerated instruction

¹ TEC §29.081, available at <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/SOTWDocs/ED/htm/ED.29.htm#29.081>;
TEA *Financial Accountability System Resource Guide*, available at

to each student in any subject in which the student failed to perform satisfactorily on a *State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR)* or *STAAR End of Course (EOC)* assessment required for graduation.

State and District Criteria for At-Risk Students

According to state criteria for the 2024-25 school year, “Student at-risk of dropping out of school” includes each student who is under 26 years of age and who:

1. Was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years;²
2. Is in grades 7-12 and did not maintain an average equivalent to at least 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester;
3. Did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered under TEC Chapter 39, Subchapter B, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a grade level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument;
4. Is in prekindergarten to grade three and did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year;
5. Is pregnant or is a parent;
6. Has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC §37.006 during the preceding or current school year;
7. Has been expelled in accordance with TEC §37.007 during the preceding or current school year;
8. Is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release;
9. Was previously reported through PEIMS to have dropped out of school;³
10. Is an Emergent Bilingual (EB) student, or student of limited English proficiency (LEP), as defined by TEC §29.052;⁴
11. Is in the custody or care of the Department of Family and Protective Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official;
12. Is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S. Code § 11302 and its subsequent amendments;
13. Resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home;

<https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/financial-accountability/financial-accountability-system-resource-guide>

² Student remains At-Risk for the remainder of his/her public-school education. Excludes a student not advancing from prekindergarten or kindergarten into the next grade level only as a result of the request of the student's parents.

³ Student remains At-Risk for the remainder of his/her public-school education.

⁴ The student no longer meets this criterion once the student has been exited from the program.

14. Has been incarcerated or has a parent or guardian who has been incarcerated, within the lifetime of the student, in a penal institution as defined by Section 1.07, Penal Code; or
15. Is participating in a dropout recovery or adult education program.

Limitations

The reader should note the following limitations of data presented in this report. The report does not address the expenditure of indirect cost SCE allocations, which are designed to defray administrative costs associated with the program and may be used for “any lawful purpose.”⁵ Due to limitations in linking SCE funding to programs and services provided to individual students, the overall effectiveness of SCE funding is difficult to evaluate. Additionally, SCE programs and services provided to secondary students are more difficult to evaluate than those provided to elementary students, such as prekindergarten and bilingual programs, which are comprehensively evaluated on an annual basis. In past years, secondary services were monitored for compliance on each campus, rather than intentionally directed at the central level. These data serve as a reminder that SCE programs and services should consider the underlying factors that determine students’ At-Risk status at each grade level. Specific strategies and activities targeting various groups with different needs are necessary for programs and services to be effective. For example, programs and services appropriate for grades PK-3 At-Risk students due to language could be quite different from interventions recommended for grades 9-12 At-Risk students due to *STAAR EOC* or multiple course failures.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

EQ1: What were the demographic characteristics of 2024-25 Dallas ISD At-Risk students?

Key findings from this section:




In school year 2024-25, a total of 109,997 Dallas ISD students (79.9%) were identified as At-Risk which is an increase from 2023-24 (74.8%).



Hispanic/Latino and Emergent Bilingual (EB) students are over-represented among At-Risk students compared to their proportions of the overall district student population.

In 2024-25, a total of 109,997 Dallas ISD students were identified as At-Risk, representing 79.9 percent of the district’s grades Early Childhood (EC) - 12 enrollment ($N = 137,673$). From 2015-16 through 2018-19, there was a gradual decline in the percentage of At-Risk students. However, this decline was followed by rising percentages of At-Risk students over the next three-year period, from 2019-20 through 2021-22. In 2023-24, there was a stark increase in the percentage of at-risk students from the previous school year which persisted into 2024-25 (Figure 1).

⁵ For additional information regarding indirect cost, view <https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/laws-and-rules/texas-administrative-code/19-tac-chapter-109>. See Appendix C for detailed SCE budget allocations, funding, and expenditures.

Figure 1: 2013-14 Through 2024-25 District Student Population by At-Risk Status

Source: TEA 2014 to 2020 TAPR reports. District At-Risk indicator data files, 08/19/21, 06/07/22, 06/20/23, 06/26/24, and 07/21/25.

Similar proportions of At-Risk students were in grades 1 through 12, with approximately 78-83 percent of students in each of these grade levels designated At-Risk (Table 1).

Table 1: 2024-25 Student Enrollment by Grade

Grade	District	At-Risk	
	N	n	%
EC	652	262	40.2%
PK	10,507	7,256	69.1%
KN	9,718	8,034	82.7%
1	10,204	8,347	81.8%
2	10,282	8,252	80.3%
3	10,488	8,531	81.3%
4	10,116	7,985	78.9%
5	9,817	7,638	77.8%
6	9,065	7,392	81.5%
7	8,941	7,237	80.9%
8	8,941	7,457	83.4%
9	10,955	8,897	81.2%
10	10,043	8,113	80.8%
11	8,463	6,841	80.8%
12	9,481	7,755	81.8%
Total	137,673	109,997	79.9%

Source: District student data file, 05/12/25. District At-Risk indicator data file, 07/21/25

Note: Data from district student data file may differ from TAPR report data. EC = Early Childhood. PK = Prekindergarten. KN = Kindergarten.

Hispanic/Latino students and EB students were over-represented among the At-Risk student group, compared to their proportions of the overall district student population (Table 2).

Table 2: 2024-25 Student Demographic Characteristics

	District (N = 137,673)		At-Risk (N = 109,997)	
	n	%	n	%
Gender				
Male	70,016	50.9	56,280	51.2
Female	67,657	49.1	53,717	48.8
Ethnicity				
Hispanic/Latino	99,412	72.2	86,531	78.7
African American	25,452	18.5	17,514	15.9
White	7,745	5.6	2,948	2.7
Other	5,064	3.7	3,004	2.7
Emergent Bilingual				
Non-EB	67,007	48.7	39,331	35.8
EB	70,666	51.3	70,666	64.2

Source: District student data file, 05/12/25. District At-Risk indicator data file, 07/21/25

Note: Data from district student data file may differ from TAPR report data.

The most common At-Risk indicators for Dallas ISD students in 2024-25 were EB designation, STAAR/EOC failure, and unsatisfactory performance on readiness assessment (PK-3) (Table 3).⁶

Table 3: 2024-25 Students Reported as At-Risk by At-Risk Indicator

Description	n	Percent of At-Risk Students	Percent of All Students
Emergent Bilingual	70,666	64.2%	51.3%
Prior failure on state assessment (STAAR 3-8, STAAR EOC)	37,142	33.8%	27.0%
Unsatisfactory performance on readiness assessment (PK-3)	30,750	28.0%	22.3%
Retained in one or more grades	11,460	10.4%	8.3%
Two or more course failures in preceding/current school year (7-12)	6,841	6.2%	5.0%
Homeless	3,462	3.1%	2.5%
Has been incarcerated or has a parent/guardian who has been incarcerated	3,287	3.0%	2.4%
In custody of Texas Department of Family and Protective Services	530	0.5%	0.4%
Placement in Alternative Education Program	138	0.1%	0.1%
Previously reported as a dropout	102	0.1%	0.1%
Pregnant or parenting	95	0.1%	0.1%
Resides in residential placement facility	25	0.0%	0.0%
Has been expelled in proceeding or current school year	*	*	*
Is currently on parole, probation, or deferred prosecution	-	-	-
Participation in dropout recovery or adult education program	-	-	-

Source: District At-Risk indicator data file, 07/21/25

Note: The total number of students enrolled was 137,673 and the number with At-Risk indicators was 109,997.

The district student data system did not identify any students as (a) currently on parole, probation, or deferred prosecution or (b) participation in a dropout recovery or adult education program.⁷ The proportion of At-Risk students due to EB status varied from grade to grade (Table 4).

⁶ Note that data included duplicated counts, as students may meet more than one of the At-Risk criteria.

⁷ Current district interpretation of state requirements for students on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release require identification, provision, and documentation of appropriate services at the campus level (see Appendix E). The district is continuing efforts to improve documentation for identifying students as At-Risk according to all state criteria.

Table 4: 2024-25 Number and Percentage of At-Risk Students by Grade and EB Status

Grade	Non-EB		EB	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
EC	36	13.7%	226	86.3%
PK	2,240	30.9%	5,016	69.1%
KN	3,189	39.7%	4,845	60.3%
1	3,232	38.7%	5,115	61.3%
2	3,035	36.8%	5,217	63.2%
3	3,148	36.9%	5,383	63.1%
4	2,677	33.5%	5,308	66.5%
5	2,452	32.1%	5,186	67.9%
6	2,528	34.2%	4,864	65.8%
7	2,404	33.2%	4,833	66.8%
8	2,518	33.8%	4,939	66.2%
9	3,232	36.3%	5,665	63.7%
10	2,908	35.8%	5,205	64.2%
11	2,658	38.9%	4,183	61.1%
12	3,074	39.6%	4,681	60.4%
Total	39,331	35.8%	70,666	64.2%

Source: District student data file, 05/12/25. District At-Risk indicator data file, 07/21/25

Note: Data from district student data file may differ from TAPR report data.

EQ2: What programs and services were funded by the SCE Program?

2023-24 SCE Funding

In 2023-24, the district received an SCE program allotment of \$195,735,855.00 from the state. The minimum direct cost requirement was 55 percent for the 2023-24 school year, or \$107,654,720.00. The district budgeted \$113,524,933.67 in direct costs to support programs/services for At-Risk students, and actual expenditures totaled \$114,086,144.22. Dallas ISD State Compensatory Education program budget funding, allocations, and expenditures are displayed in Appendix C.

District Improvement Plan

The 2024-25 DIP was reviewed for required SCE components. The plan contained Board-approved student achievement goals; a detailed needs assessment based on Board goals; Goal Performance Measures (GPMs) to be used to assess progress towards goals; Key Actions aligned with the needs assessment and tied to GPMs; and timelines for attainment of specific achievement outcomes. Highly detailed district and campus budgets were presented for approval along with the DIP, with funding tied to Board goals. As in the past few years, the district plan contained broad statements regarding goals, strategies, and activities targeting specific At-Risk criteria, while detailed plans were developed at the campus level.

Campus Improvement Plans

CIPs were reviewed for seven comprehensive high schools, seven middle schools, and fourteen elementary schools. All 28 schools conducted a needs assessment as required, in alignment with the district needs assessment, and set achievement targets aligned with both their needs assessment and district goals. All needs assessments included analysis of *STAAR 3-8* or *STAAR EOC* student performance as

applicable. Most campus plans did include specific data regarding At-Risk students or At-Risk student groups. The percentage of At-Risk students at the sampled schools ranged from 71 to 92 percent.

In accordance with the district's student outcome goals and goal progress measures, key actions directly addressed *STAAR 3-8* and *STAAR EOC* performance in all plans, focusing on content areas in greatest need of improvement. While many plans did not directly state that certain strategies specifically targeted At-Risk students, it is understood that strategies aimed at improving achievement schoolwide are by definition aimed primarily at At-Risk students, in part due to their numbers in the student population.

Strategies generally fell into one of five areas: differentiated and high-quality instruction, data-driven decision making, professional development and teacher support, student engagement and support, and parent and community engagement. *Differentiated and high-quality instruction* included focusing on tailoring teaching methods and materials to meet diverse student needs, often through evidence-based curricula and individualized interventions; and ensuring rigorous Tier 1 instruction and alignment to state standards. *Data-driven decision making* included continuously analyzing student performance data to understand learning gaps and inform instructional adjustments; encouraging students to set personal academic goals and monitor their own progress using data trackers and portfolios; and implementing structured Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with "Look Forward" (planning) and "Look Back" (data analysis and reteach planning) protocols to ensure aligned instruction and address student misconceptions. *Professional development and teacher support* included providing professional development focused on content knowledge, instructional strategies, and interventions; implementing coaching models and providing feedback to teachers; and recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers. *Student engagement and support* included offering extracurricular and co-curricular activities to increase engagement and provide enrichment; implementing social-emotional learning strategies to create a positive school climate and support student well-being; and providing technology for 1:1 instruction and to support learning. *Parent and community engagement* included increasing communication with parents regarding student progress, school initiatives, and safety procedures; and providing opportunities for parent involvement, such as workshops and meetings.

EQ3: What were the academic performance outcomes, graduation rates, and dropout rates of At-Risk and Not At-Risk students?

Key findings from this section:



At-Risk students performed lower than Not At-Risk students across all grade-levels and test subjects on the *STAAR* and *STAAR EOC* tests.



The percentage of At-Risk students who achieved the Approaches+ performance level in 2024-25 increased across two-thirds of grade levels and subjects compared to 2023-24 performance results.



Overall, the Class of 2024 At-Risk students had a four percentage points increase in graduation rate compared to the Class of 2023 At-Risk students. The gap between Not At-Risk and At-Risk students decreased nearly three percentage points from the Class of 2023 to the Class of 2024.



The gap in graduation rates between At-Risk and Not At-Risk students has decreased each of the last four years; 16.9 percentage points for the class of 2021, 11.9 percentage points for the class of 2022, 8.7 percentage points for the class of 2023, and 6.0 percentage points for the class of 2024.



Overall, dropout rates decreased notably for the Class of 2024 At-Risk students and decreased slightly for Not At-Risk students, narrowing the dropout rate gap by 2.9 percentage points.

Student summative academic performance, graduation and dropout data were obtained from district *STAAR* data files and TEA's 2024-25 district-level Completion, Graduation, and Dropout data for Dallas ISD. Graduation and dropout data include all students in the Accountability Subset for each year reported.

STAAR

In 2025, the percentage of At-Risk students at Approaches+ on *STAAR 3-8* and *STAAR EOC* varied by grade level and subject (Table 6). Overall, the percentage of At-Risk students at Approaches+ was lower than the corresponding percentage of Not At-Risk students on all *STAAR 3-8* and *STAAR EOC* tests, revealing performance gaps between the two groups. The largest performance gaps between At-Risk and Not At-Risk students were on grade 8 Social Studies (32.8 percentage points), and English I *EOC* (37.0 percentage points), and English II *EOC* (35.1 percentage points).

Comparing 2024-25 *STAAR 3-8* and *STAAR EOC* performance with 2023-24 *STAAR 3-8* and *STAAR EOC* performance, data show increases in the percentage of At-Risk students achieving the Approaches+ performance level, across two-thirds of grade levels and subjects. The largest increases were on *STAAR 3-8* Mathematics grade 7 (24.3 percentage points) and Reading grade 3 (9.9 percentage points). Small decreases (ranging from -0.1 to -3.5 percentage points) in the percentage of At-Risk students

achieving the Approaches+ performance level were found on the other assessed subjects except for Algebra I EOC which had a -9.7 percentage points decrease.

When comparing performance gaps between At-Risk and Not At-Risk students in 2024-25 and 2023-24, data show gaps between the two groups closing on 18 of the 20 STAAR 3-8 and STAAR EOC tests. The largest reductions in performance gaps were found on the STAAR 3-8 Mathematics grade 8 (-21.3 percentage points), STAAR 3-8 Mathematics grade 3 (-16.9), STAAR 3-8 Reading grade 3 (-16.8), and STAAR 3-8 Mathematics grade 7 (-16.1). The widest gaps were in English I EOC and English II EOC (37.0 percentage points and 35.1 percentage points, respectively). Appendix H contains the 24.25 to 2023-24 comparison data for STAAR 3-8 and STAAR EOC assessments, by grade level and subject.

Table 5: 2024-25 STAAR 3-8 and STAAR EOC Approaches+ Rates and Performance Gaps

Subject	Grade	At-Risk		Not At-Risk		Diff.
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	%
Reading	3	5,564	65.6	1,682	88.2	-22.6
	4	5,423	68.3	1,939	92.7	-24.4
	5	5,491	72.3	1,959	91.5	-19.2
	6	4,718	64.3	1,415	87.0	-22.7
	7	4,597	64.2	1,433	86.6	-22.4
	8	5,407	73.3	1,268	87.9	-14.6
English I EOC		6,643	53.9	1,645	90.9	-37.0
English II EOC		6,329	59.6	1,743	94.7	-35.1
Mathematics	3	5,286	62.3	1,612	84.0	-21.7
	4	4,837	60.9	1,819	86.9	-26.0
	5	5,100	67.1	1,879	87.3	-20.2
	6	4,755	64.9	1,409	86.2	-21.3
	7	4,037	56.5	1,345	81.4	-24.9
	8	1,892	54.4	266	59.8	-5.4
Algebra I EOC		7,776	74.8	1,470	92.7	-17.9
Science	5	3,980	52.4	1,700	79.2	-26.8
	8	4,697	62.4	1,410	85.5	-23.1
Biology EOC		7,952	84.9	1,670	96.9	-12.0
Social Studies	8	3,430	46.8	1,144	79.6	-32.8
US History EOC		7,285	92.5	1,670	98.6	-6.1

Source: District STAAR 07/22/25 and STAAR EOC 07/22/25 data files.

Note: Diff. = Difference between student groups.

High School Graduation and Completion Rates

Four-year graduation rates, the percentage of students who graduate on-time in four years, are used for federal and state accountability⁸.


$$\text{Graduation Rate} = \frac{\text{graduates}}{\text{graduates} + \text{continuers} + \text{TX certificate of high school equivalency recipients} + \text{dropouts}}$$

Data for the Class of 2024 revealed At-Risk students continued to have a positive trend with a 4.0 percentage points increase in graduation rates (78.3% to 82.3%), while Not At-Risk students had their first positive gain in seven years with a 1.3 percentage point increase (87% to 88.3%; Figure 2). The gap in graduation rates between At-Risk and Not At-Risk students has decreased each of the last three years;

⁸ See TEA Technical Document available at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/acctres/dropcomp_index.html#documentation. For example, the four-year graduation rate for Class of 2024 is the percentage of students who began ninth grade for the first time in 2020-21 and graduated by August 31, 2024.

11.9 percentage points for the class of 2022, 8.7 percentage points for the class of 2023, and 6.0 percentage points for the class of 2024.

Figure 2: 2015-16 Through 2023-24 Graduation Rates by Cohort and At-Risk Status




Source: TEA Completion, Graduation, and Dropout data.

Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, traditional student data tracking may have been disrupted and data for the Class of 2020 should be viewed with caution.

For the Class of 2024, there was a significant decrease in the size of the gap between dropout rates for At-Risk versus Not At-Risk students, from a 6.1 percentage point difference in 2023 to 3.2 in 2024 (Figure 3). Dropout rates for At-Risk students decreased to 13.4, down from 16.8 percent in 2023, while Not At-Risk students had a slight decrease.

Figure 3: 2015-16 Through 2023-24 Dropout Rates by Cohort and At-Risk Status



Source: TEA Completion, Graduation, and Dropout data.

Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, traditional student data tracking may have been disrupted and data for the Class of 2020 should be viewed with caution.

REFERENCES

- Association of Compensatory Educators of Texas (2012). *State Compensatory Education (SCE) Program*. ACET Spring Conference, April 2012. Austin, TX.
- Dallas Independent School District (2023). *District Improvement Plan, 2023-24*, Dallas, TX.
- Dallas Independent School District (2013). *The Dropout Early Warning System*. Dallas, TX: Office of Institutional Research, Dallas ISD.
- Sands, K. (2023). *2022-23 State Compensatory Education: Annual Evaluation*. Dallas, TX. Dallas Independent School District.
- Texas Education Agency (2021). *Financial Accountability System Resource Guide: Compensatory Education*. Module 9, Update 17. Austin, TX.
- Texas Education Agency (2023). *Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS): 2023-24 Data Collection Schedule*. Austin, TX.
- Texas Education Agency (2023a). *Completion, Graduation, and Dropouts*. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/reports-and-data/school-performance/accountability-research/completion-graduation-and-dropouts>.
- Texas Education Agency (2023b). *Texas Academic Performance Report (TAPR): 2012-13 through 2023-24*. Retrieved from <https://tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/index.html>.

APPENDICES

LIST OF APPENDICES

A Acronyms and Abbreviations.....20

B Program History of State Compensatory Education.....21

C 2024-25 Methodology and Data Sources.....23

D 2023-24 SCE Allocations, Budget, and Expenditures.....24

E Dallas ISD District Policies Covering State Compensatory Education.....30

F 2024-25 At-Risk Criteria.....29

G SCE Program Intent Codes and Descriptions.....31

H Expanded STAAR data: Two-year Comparisons.....32

Appendix A

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AEP	Alternative Education Program
AI	Accelerated Instruction
Approaches+	Approaches Grade Level or Above
CIP	Campus Improvement Plan
DAEP	Disciplinary Alternative Education Program
DIP	District Improvement Plan
EB	Emergent Bilingual (formerly Limited English Proficiency [LEP])
EC	Early Childhood
EOC	<i>End-of-Course</i>
EOY	End-of-Year
GPM	Goal Performance Measure
HB	House Bill
ISD	Independent School District
KN	Kindergarten
PEIMS	Public Education Information Management System
PIC	Program Intent Code
PK	Prekindergarten
SB	Senate Bill
SCE	State Compensatory Education
STAAR	<i>State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness</i>
TAPR	Texas Academic Performance Report
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TEC	Texas Education Code
Title I, Part A SCE	Title I, Part A Schoolwide Activities Related to SCE

Appendix B

Appendix B: Program History of State Compensatory Education

Year	Bill / Legislature	Main Point
1975	House Bill (HB) 1126	State Compensatory Education (SCE) began. The SCE program as required by HB 1126 paralleled federal program requirements in that funds were defined as supplemental to other state and local monies and mandated to be spent on identified students.
1995	Senate Bill (SB) 1	Repealed all previously adopted SCE rules.
2001	SB 702	Amended Texas Education Code (TEC) Section 29.081 which governs SCE. Changed the state criteria and required the use of student performance results on assessments and tests administered under TEC Chapter 39 Subchapter B to design supplemental programs or services for students at-risk of dropping out of school. School districts were required to design and provide compensatory intensive or accelerated instructional services and remedial and support programs for students at-risk of dropping out of school and include the description in the district and campus improvement plans. SB 702 also required evaluation and documentation of the effectiveness of the SCE program in reducing disparities in performance or disparities in the high school completion rates between at-risk students and all other district students. It required the Commissioner of Education to adopt accountability measures for assessing student progress or lack of in determining district accreditation ratings.
2003	HB 3459	Lowered the required threshold percentage for low-income students on a campus to 40 percent (or greater). This expanded the use of the SCE allotment to supplement schoolwide components of federal <i>No Child Left Behind</i> projects. Additional legislation has allowed SCE expenditures for mentoring services and programs to treat students who have dyslexia.
2009	The 81 st Legislature	Made two changes to the SCE program with respect to: (1) student identification and (2) the percent of the indirect cost. First, excluding "a student who did not advance from prekindergarten to the next grade level only as a result of the request of the parents." Second, Texas Administrative Code (TAC) amended 19 TAC Chapter 105, <u>Foundation School Program</u> , Subchapter B, <u>Use of State Funds</u> , §105.11, <u>Maximum Allowable Indirect Cost</u> from 15 percent to "no more than 45 percent" of the district's allotment for indirect costs related to the compensatory education program. Changes were made to <i>Module 9 Compensatory Education Guidelines, Financial Accounting Treatments, and an Auditing and Reporting System</i> .
2010	HB 3	High school, grade-based testing represented by TAKS was replaced with course-based EOC assessments in Algebra I, geometry, Algebra II, world geography, world history, U.S. history, biology, chemistry, physics, and English I, II, and III under STAAR. In order to graduate, a student was required to achieve a cumulative score at least equal to the product of the number of STAAR EOC assessments taken in each foundation content area (English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) and a scale score indicating satisfactory performance.

table continues

Appendix B (continued)

Year	Bill / Legislature	Main Point
2013	HB 5	Required students to pass five <i>STAAR</i> end-of-course exams to meet new graduation requirements. Exams required under HB3 are no longer being required and some students were classified as at-risk based on their failure on assessments that are no longer in use. A student who was identified as At-Risk based on this category in 2012-2013 should continue to be identified as At-Risk in 2013-2014, but the At-Risk status should be removed at the end of the 2013-2014 school year. Beginning with the 2009-2010 school year, added a provision to TEC Section 29.018(d)(1) that changed the compensatory education definition of “student at risk of dropping out of school” by excluding a student who did not advance from prekindergarten or kindergarten to the next grade level <u>only</u> as a result of the request of the student’s parents. Therefore, school personnel need to ensure that all requests for retention are carefully maintained for auditing purposes. Added a new section to education code specific to providing accelerated instruction (AI) to all high school students who fail to perform satisfactorily on required end-of-course exams. Beginning in 2014-2015, mandates that the district use appropriated compensatory education funds for the AI. Requires a district to separately budget compensatory education funds for the AI and prohibits use of the funds for any other purpose until the district adopts a budget to support the AI. Required districts to evaluate the effectiveness of the AI programs and hold an annual public hearing to consider the results. Increased the age of students considered at risk for dropping out of school from 21 to 26 years of age for CE eligibility purposes.
2019	HB 3	Beginning with the 2019-20 school year, a new method for funding estimates was implemented. Calculation of the compensatory education weight will be based on (a) the student’s designation as educationally disadvantaged and (b) the census block group where the individual students’ home or residence address is located. Census block groups are categorized into five tiers according to the relative severity of economic disadvantage. To determine the severity of economic disadvantage in a census block group, consideration will be given to: (1) the median household income; (2) the average educational attainment of the population; (3) the percentage of single parent households; (4) the rate of homeownership; and (5) other economic criteria the commissioner determines likely to disadvantage a student’s preparedness and ability to learn. New uses of SCE funds permitted include (a) childcare services, (b) assistance with childcare expenses for students at risk of dropping out of school, and (c) to pay the costs associated with services provided through a life skills program.

Source: TEA Financial Accountability System Resource Guide

Appendix C

Appendix C: 2024-25 Methodology and Data Sources

EQ	Data Component	Source	Data File Date(s)	Key Metrics	Aggregation
1	Student Demographics	Student Information System	05/12/25	Rates of students by gender, ethnicity, at-risk indicators, emergent bilingual	District, grade
	At-Risk Indicators	Student Information System	07/21/25	At-Risk Percent	District
2	Budget	Budget Services Department, Special Revenues Department	02/03/2025	Allocations, Expenditures	District
	District Improvement Plan	Plan4Learning	07/22/25	Needs Assessment, Goals	District
	Campus Improvement Plans	Plan4Learning	07/22/25	Needs Assessment, Goals	None
3	STAAR Reading, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies	Student Enrollment, TEA	07/22/25 (STAAR 3-8), 07/22/25 (STAAR EOC)	Approaches, Meets & Masters	District, campus, grade
	Graduation & Dropout	Student Enrollment, TEA	06/12/25	Annual graduation rates, annual dropout rates	District, Graduating Class

Note: TAPR – Texas Academic Performance Report. TEA – Texas Education Agency. DIP – District Improvement Plan. CIP – Campus Improvement Plan. STAAR - State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness.

Appendix D

Appendix D, Table 1: Major Function and Object Codes

Major Function Code	Object Code
10 Instruction & Instruction-Related Services	6100 Payroll Costs
20 Instructional & School Leadership	6200 Professional & Contracted Services
30 Support Services-Student	6300 Supplies & Materials
40 Administrative Support Services	6400 Other Operating Costs
50 Support Services-Non-Student Based	
60 Ancillary Services	
90 Intergovernmental Charges	

Source: Dallas ISD Chart of Accounts, 12/22/23.

Appendix D, Table 2: Program Intent Codes (PICs)

PIC 24	Accelerated Education
PIC 26	Alternative Education Program (AEP) Basic Services
PIC 28	Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP) Basic Services
PIC 30	State Compensatory Education

Source: Dallas ISD Chart of Accounts, 12/22/23.

Appendix D, Table 3: 2023-24 Function Codes Used for SCE Allocations

Function	Campus	Central
10 Instruction and Instruction-Related		
11 Instruction	X	X
12 Instructional Resources, Media	X	X
13 Curriculum Dvlp. and Instructional Staff Dvlp.	X	X
20 Instructional & School Leadership		
21 Instructional Leadership		X
23 School Leadership	X	X
30 Support Services-Student		
31 Guidance Counseling & Evaluation Service	X	X
32 Social Work Services		X
33 Health Services		X
34 Student Transportation		X
40 Administrative Support Services		
41 General Administration		X
50 Support Services-Non-Student Based		
51 Facilities Maintenance/Operations		X
52 Security and Monitoring Services		X
53 Data Processing Services		X
60 Ancillary Services		
61 Community Services		X
90 Intergovernmental Charges		
95 Payments to Juvenile Justice Alt. Ed. Program		X

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 12/22/23.

Note: Alt. Ed. = Alternative Education. Dvlp. = Development.

Appendix D, Table 4: 2023-24 Summary of SCE Funding and Budget

Description	Amount (\$)
SCE 2023-24 Allocation Amount (Dallas ISD Received)	195,735,855.00
Required Direct Cost (At least 55% of the received amount)	107,654,720.00
PIC 24 - Accelerated Education	15,036,237.00
PIC 26 - AEP Basic Services	683,394.00
PIC 28 - DAEP Basic Services	3,829,654.00
PIC 30 - Title I, Part A SCE	93,975,648.67
Total SCE Direct Cost Budget	113,524,933.67

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25 and TEA Foundation School Program (FSP) School District State Aid Reports⁹

Appendix D, Table 5: 2023-24 SCE Budget Allocations by PIC

PIC	Amount (\$)	%
30 - Title I, Part A SCE	113,524,933.67	82.8
24 - Accelerated Education	15,036,237.00	13.2
28 - DAEP Basic Services	3,829,654.00	3.4
26 - AEP Basic Services	683,394.00	0.6

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Appendix D, Table 6: 2023-24 SCE Expenditures by Major Function Code

Major Function Code	Expenditure (\$)	%
10 - Instruction & Related Services	88,696,565.43	77.7
30 - Support Services – Student	20,696,895.58	18.1
20 - Instructional & School Leadership	4,618,471.47	4.0
50 - Support Services – Non-Student Based	55,899.46	<0.1
90 - Intergovernmental Charges	15,654.00	<0.1
60 - Ancillary Services	2,658.28	<0.1

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Appendix D, Table 7: 2023-24 SCE Expenditures by Object Code

Object Code	Expenditure (\$)	%
6100 - Payroll Costs	99,786,400.19	87.5
6300 - Supplies and Materials	12,263,354.00	11.6
6200 - Professional and Contracted Services	899,555.85	0.8
6400 - Other Operating Costs	136,834.18	0.1

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

⁹ <https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/fsp/Reports/ReportSelection.aspx>

Appendix D, Table 8: 2023-24 SCE Expenditures by PIC

PIC	Expenditure (\$)	%
30 - Title I, Part A SCE	84,726,478.36	74.3
24 - Accelerated Education	25,384,432.65	22.3
28 - DAEP Basic Services	3,572,309.66	3.1
26 - AEP Basic Services	402,923.55	0.4

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Appendix D, Table 9: 2023-24 SCE Expenditures by Major Function Code and Organization Type

Major Function Code	Campus (\$)	Central (\$)	Total (\$)
10 - Inst. & Inst.-Related Services	70,774,344.48	17,922,220.95	88,696,565.43
20 - Inst. & School Leadership	4,571,251.54	47,219.93	4,618,471.47
30 - Sup. Svcs.-Student	13,887,896.29	6,808,999.29	20,696,895.58
50 - Sup. Svcs.-Non-Student Based	0.00	55,899.46	55,899.46
60 - Ancillary Services	0.00	2,658.28	2,658.28
90 - Intergovernmental Charges	0.00	15,654.00	15,654.00
Total	89,233,492.31	24,852,651.91	114,086,144.22

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Note: Inst. = Instructional. Sup. = Support. Svcs. = Services.

Appendix D, Table 10: 2023-24 SCE Expenditures by Object Code and Organization Type

Object Code	Campus (\$)	Central (\$)	Total (\$)
6100 - Payroll Costs	88,345,759.70	11,440,640.49	99,786,400.19
6200 - Prof. & Contracted Services	5,548.85	894,007.00	899,555.85
6300 - Supplies & Materials	765,541.26	12,497,812.74	13,263,354.00
6400 - Other Operating Costs	116,642.50	20,191.68	136,834.18
Total	89,233,492.31	24,852,651.91	114,086,144.22

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Note: Prof. = Professional.

Appendix D, Table 11: 2023-24 SCE Expenditures by PIC and Organization Type

PIC	Campus (\$)	Central (\$)	Total (\$)
24 - Accelerated Education	1,056,426.36	24,328,006.29	25,384,432.65
26 - AEP Basic Services	34,867.28	368,056.27	402,923.55
28 - DAEP Basic Services	3,556,65.66	15,654.00	3,572,309.66
30 - Title I, Part A SCE	84,585,543.01	140,935.35	84,726,478.36
Total	89,233,482.31	24,852,651.91	114,086,144.22

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Appendix D, Table 12: 2023-24 SCE Budget and Expenditures for Alternative Education

	Budget (\$)	Actuals (\$)
Alternative Education Programs		
Continuing Education	409,798.00	367,861.27
Maya Angelou High School	240,927.00	34,740.41
Multiple Career Center	69.00	126.87
Excess Personnel	0.00	181,743.27
Total	650,794.00	584,472.02
Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs		
High School DAEP	1,962,947.00	1,927,585.16
Middle School DAEP	1,374,834.00	1,295,785.15
Elementary School DAEP	329,178.00	333,275.35
Student Engagement & Support	902,985.00	15,654.00
Total	4,569,944.00	3,572,309.66

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Appendix D, Table 13: 2023-24 SCE Central Organizations Budget and Expenditures

Department	Budget (\$)	Actuals (\$)	Balance (\$)
Accelerated Education	14,144,899.00	24,328,006.29	(10,183,107.29)
Excess Personnel	0.00	181,743.47	(181,743.47)
Student Engagement & Support	902,985.00	15,654.00	887,331.00
Total	15,047,884.00	24,525,403.76	(9,477,519.76)

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Appendix D, Table 14: 2023-24 SCE Full-time Equivalents

Organization Type	Funded	Filled
Kindergarten-Grade 12 Staff	667.35	559.07
Prekindergarten Staff	682.00	616.00
Central Staff	115.15	100.00
Total	1,464.50	1,275.07

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Appendix D, Table 15: 2023-24 SCE Filled Positions by PIC and Organization Type

PIC	Campus	Central	Total
24 - Accelerated Education	1.92	96.50	98.42
26 - AEP Basic Services	0.00	1.00	1.00
28 - DAEP Basic Services	37.00	0.00	37.00
30 - Title I, Part A SCE	1,136.15	2.50	1,138.65
Total	1,175.07	100.00	1,275.07

Source: Dallas ISD Budget Services Department, 02/03/25.

Appendix E

Appendix E: Dallas ISD District Policies Covering State Compensatory Education

Policy	Description
BQ(LEGAL)	Planning And Decision-Making Process
BQ(LOCAL)	Planning And Decision-Making Process
BQA(LEGAL)	Planning And Decision-Making Process: District-Level
BQA(LOCAL)	Planning And Decision-Making Process: District-Level
BQB(LEGAL)	Planning And Decision-Making Process: Campus-Level
BQB(LOCAL)	Planning And Decision-Making Process: Campus-Level
CB(LEGAL)	State And Federal Revenue Sources
CB(LOCAL)	State And Federal Revenue Sources
DFF(LOCAL)	Termination Of Contract, Reduction In Force
ED(LOCAL)	Organization Of Instruction
EHBA(LEGAL)	Special Education Students: Identification, Evaluation, And Eligibility
EHBC(LEGAL)	Special Programs: Compensatory/Accelerated Services
EHBC(LOCAL)	Special Programs: Compensatory/Accelerated Services
EHBD(LEGAL)	Special Programs: Federal Title I Programs
EHBD(LOCAL)	Special Programs: Federal Title I Programs
EHBD(REGULATION)	Special Programs: Federal Title I Programs
EHBE(LEGAL)	Special Programs: Bilingual Education/ESL
EHBE(LOCAL)	Special Programs: Bilingual Education/ESL
EHBE(REGULATION)	Special Programs: Bilingual Education/ESL
EIE(LEGAL)	Academic Achievement: Retention And Promotion
EIE(LOCAL)	Academic Achievement: Retention And Promotion
FEA(LEGAL)	Attendance: Compulsory Attendance
FO(LEGAL)	Student Discipline
FOA(LEGAL)	Student Discipline: Removal by a Teacher
FOB(LEGAL)	Student Discipline: Out of School Suspension
FOC(LEGAL)	Student Discipline: Placement in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Setting
FOC(EXHIBIT)	Student Discipline: Placement in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Setting
FOCA(LEGAL)	Student Discipline: Placement in a Disciplinary Alternative Education Setting: Disciplinary Alternative Education Program Operations
FOD(LEGAL)	Student Discipline: Expulsion
GNB(LEGAL)	Relations with Educational Entities: Regional Education Service Centers

Source: Dallas ISD Board Policy Manual.

Appendix F

Appendix F: 2024-25 At-Risk Criteria

Row	Grades	State Criteria	District Interpretation
1	All	Was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years.	Maintained same grade level status in any two consecutive school years.
2	7-12	Did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year <u>or</u> is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester.	If the sum of grades <u>in any one</u> of the following pairs is less than 140 during a semester in the preceding or current school year: a. English and Mathematics, b. English and Science, c. English and Social Studies, d. Mathematics and Science, e. Mathematics and Social Studies, <u>or</u> f. Science and Social Studies.
3	3-12	Did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 110 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument	This criterion identifies 4 population groups: (1) Students who fail to meet the passing standard on any subset of <i>STAAR</i> , and; (2) On subsequent <i>STAAR</i> , students who perform at a level equal to 110% of the level of satisfactory on any subset of <i>STAAR</i> will be exited from this at-risk category; (3) Students who do not perform at a level of satisfactory progress established by the ARD committee and; (4) On subsequent <i>STAAR</i> or <i>STAAR-Alt</i> , students who meet the assessment goal determined by the ARD will be exited from the at-risk category.
4	PK-3	Did not perform satisfactorily on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year.	Kindergarten: Students assigned to the Monitor or Support levels when administered the <i>TX-KEA</i> assessment.
5	All	Is pregnant or is a parent.	Has been identified as pregnant during the current school year and/or is a parent.
6	All	has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC Section 37.006 during the preceding or current school year.	Has been placed in a disciplinary alternative education program during the preceding or current school year.
7	All	has been expelled in accordance with TEC Section 37.007 during the preceding or current school year.	Has been expelled during the preceding or current school year.

table continues

Appendix F (continued)

Row	Grades	State Criteria	District Interpretation
8	All	Is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release.	Each campus is required to identify and provide appropriate services to this population. Due to confidentiality, safety, and security requirements, each campus is required to maintain documentation verifying the provision of supplemental services to identified students.
9	All	Was previously reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) to have dropped out of school.	Is a dropout <u>or</u> has been previously reported through the PEIMS to have dropped out of school.
10	All	Is a student of limited English proficiency (LEP), as defined by TEC Section 29.052.	Is EB (formerly LEP) on latest database snapshot.
11	All	Is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official.	Each campus is required to identify and provide appropriate services to this population. Due to confidentiality, safety, and security requirements, each campus is required to maintain documentation verifying the provision of supplemental services to identified students.
12	All	Is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302, and its subsequent amendments.	Has been identified as homeless based on the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 2001.
13	All	Resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.	Resided during the preceding school year or currently resides in a residential placement facility in the district. Includes a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home.
14	All	Has been incarcerated or has a parent or guardian who has been incarcerated, within the lifetime of the student, in a penal institution as defined by Section 1.07, Penal Code.	Student system is updated as campus personnel becomes aware of incidents of incarcerated of students or guardians.
15	All	Is enrolled in a district or a campus that is designated as a dropout recovery school under Education Code 39.0548.	Is enrolled in district dropout recovery school.

Source: Dallas ISD District Improvement Plan, 2024-25.

Note: An At-Risk student, for the 2024-25 school year, is defined as any student who is under 26 years of age and meets one or more of the criteria in column 4.

Appendix G

Appendix G: SCE Program Intent Codes and Description

Code	Description
24	Accelerated Education The cost incurred to use instructional strategies in accordance with the campus/district improvement plan to provide services in addition to those allocated for basic services for instruction, thereby increasing the amount and quality of instructional time for students at risk of dropping out of school.
26	Alternative Education Programs – AEP Basic Services (Effective September 1, 2004) All costs incurred for services to students who are separated from the regular classroom to a non-disciplinary alternative education program and are at-risk of dropping out of school. Services must be described in the campus improvement plan.
28	Disciplinary Alternative Education Programs – DAEP Basic Services All costs incurred to provide the basic line program (non-supplemental) services to students who are separated from the regular classroom to a disciplinary alternative education program.
30	Title I, Part A Schoolwide Activities Related to State Compensatory Education and other Costs on Campuses with 40 percent or more Educationally Disadvantaged Students The SCE costs incurred to supplement federal awards for use on Title I, Part A schoolwide campuses with at least 40 percent educationally disadvantaged students (including fund code 211), in the amount of the SCE allotment used to supplement federal awards. This program intent code is also used in the Special Revenue Fund for fiscal budgets approved in notice of grant awards for schoolwide federal projects benefiting Title I, Part A schoolwide Campuses with 40 percent or more Educationally Disadvantaged Students.

Source: TEA 2024 Financial Accountability System Resource Guide.

Appendix H

Appendix H: 2023-24 to 2024-25 STAAR 3-8 and STAAR EOC Approaches+ Rates and Performance Gaps between At-Risk and Not At-Risk Students

Subject	Grade	At-Risk			Not At-Risk			2023-24 Gap %	2024-25 Gap %	Gap Δ
		2023-24 %	2024-25 %	1 Year Δ	2023-24 %	2024-25 %	1 Year Δ			
Reading	3	55.7	65.6	9.9	95.1	88.2	-6.9	39.4	22.6	-16.8
	4	64.1	68.3	4.2	94.4	92.7	-1.7	30.3	24.4	-5.9
	5	70.2	72.3	2.1	95.6	91.5	-4.1	25.4	19.2	-6.2
	6	64.4	64.3	-0.1	95.2	87.0	-8.2	30.8	22.7	-8.1
	7	61.9	64.2	2.3	95.7	86.6	-9.1	33.8	22.4	-11.4
	8	72.1	73.3	1.2	96.8	87.9	-8.9	24.7	14.6	-10.1
English I EOC		55.1	53.9	-1.2	96.6	90.9	-5.7	41.5	37.0	-4.5
English II EOC		63.1	59.6	-3.5	98.0	94.7	-3.3	34.9	35.1	0.2
Math	3	56.3	62.3	6.0	94.9	84.0	-10.9	38.6	21.7	-16.9
	4	57.0	60.9	3.9	85.6	86.9	1.3	28.6	26.0	-2.6
	5	68.8	67.1	-1.7	93.1	87.3	-5.8	24.3	20.2	-4.1
	6	62.6	64.9	2.3	91.7	86.2	-5.5	29.1	21.3	-7.8
	7	32.2	56.5	24.3	73.2	81.4	8.2	41.0	24.9	-16.1
	8	64.1	54.4	-9.7	90.8	59.8	-31.0	26.7	5.4	-21.3
Algebra I EOC		75.9	74.8	-1.1	96.9	92.7	-4.2	21.0	17.9	-3.1
Science	5	37.1	52.4	15.3	74.0	79.2	5.2	36.9	26.8	-10.1
	8	56.2	62.4	6.2	90.3	85.5	-4.8	34.1	23.0	-11.1
Biology EOC		87.6	84.9	-2.7	98.9	96.9	-2.0	11.3	12.0	0.7
Social Studies	8	45.1	46.8	1.7	87.6	79.6	-8.0	42.5	32.8	-9.7
US History EOC		92.5	92.5	0.0	99.4	98.6	-0.8	6.9	6.1	-0.8

Source: District STAAR files dated 7/19/24 and 7/22/25. STAAR EOC data files dated 7/17/24 and 7/22/25.

Note: Δ = Difference.