Instructional Leader: ESC Staff
Time and Date: ~2.5 hours, Date TBD by ESC
Topic: Focused Data Analysis for Targeted Improvement Plan Development

Objectives:	
DCSIs and Principals will be able to: 1. Identify why a campus did not meet standard and where the performance gaps are 2. Write data-driven problem statements and annual goals on which to base improvement planning	
Document(s):	
Materials	***Assessment & Follow-up***
I will need: Facilitators Guide PPT and Projector Copies for each participant of: Note-taking Guide Case Study A Case Study B Sample Data Packet **Participants will bring the following to the meeting:** • Vision statement from visioning activity	**Assessment/CFU during Workshop:** -whole group share outs -table monitoring using responses in Facilitators Guide -Responses on chart paper **Assessment Post-Workshop (deadline):** Problem Statements and Annual Goals in improvement plans (due to TEA on Sept. 14 or 28) **Follow-up by Instructional Leaders (dates):** • TBD by ESC/PSP

Agenda:

Time	***Mins***	***Description***	***Materials***
Set up		Set up tables for campus teams, print copies of materials and place at tables (or hand out as you go), set up projector and slides	In description
00:00-00:10	10 mins	**Introduction and Context Setting** **Section outcome: Participants will tie the vision they created back at their campuses to the planning training in which they are about to engage.** **Say (2 mins):** Over the next 2 hours, we will practice analyzing state accountability data and practice developing problem statements and annual goals that will be the foundation for improvement planning for the year. We will focus on analyzing state accountability data during this session to ensure that we have a deep understanding of why the	PPT slides 1-5 Note taking guide Vision statement

		campus did not meet standard. We will review other data sources during the root cause analysis. Before we begin, let's take a moment to think about what we need to achieve this year. You brought your vision statement with you today; this vision should drive the improvement planning work that you do this year. Individually, take 2 minutes to answer the first question in your note-taking guide **(show Slide 3)**: *How can data-driven improvement planning help our campus achieve this vision?* [Potential responses: Answers will vary; planning with data lets us know how far we are from the vision/if we are getting closer to achieving it] **Say (1 min):** We know that we need both a vision AND a plan to get our schools to improve. In order to anchor our plan in data, we are going to begin our planning work with Data Analysis. Individually, take one minute to answer question 2 in your note taking guide **(show Slide 4)**: *Why is data analysis the first step in creating the plan?* [Potential responses: because it helps us measure how far we are from our targets or from achieving our vision] **Say (1 min):** Do a quick turn and talk with someone next to you about your answer. (Wait 2 minutes) **Say (2 mins):** Let's share whole group. Why is data analysis step one? (Have 1-2 people respond whole group) **Say (1 min): (show Slide 5)** Key Idea: Analyzing our data as a first step lets us know exactly what we need to plan for and how much we need to accomplish.	
00:10-00:15	5 mins	**<u>Objectives</u>** **Section outcome: Participants will know what will be learned in this session and understand that they will replicate this work back at their campuses with their own data.** **Say (5 mins): (show Slide 6)** Today, you are going to practice doing 2 things so that you can return to your campus ready to conduct your own Data Analysis:	PPT slide 6

		1. Identify why a campus did not meet standard and where the performance gaps are 2. Write data-driven problem statements and annual goals on which to base improvement planning We will look at a couple of case studies to determine why these actions are important for planning, and then we will practice using tools to conduct a sample data analysis.	
00:15-00:40	25 mins	**<u>See It and Name It: Data Analysis Case Study A</u>** **Section outcome: Participants will identify the actions a sample campus took to arrive at a problem statement/annual goal that will serve as the foundation of their improvement plan.** **Say (1 min):** Before we practice doing a data analysis, let's look at two case studies from sample campuses to identify what the key actions for data analysis are. We are going to look at two case studies. **(Show Slide 7)** Pull Case Study A from your packet. Individually, read the case study and answer the questions in your note taking guide. Take 10 minutes for this. 1) *What actions did Campus A take to determine why they didn't meet standard?* [Potential answers: reviewed the data used to create accountability rating from the performance reporting website] 2) *What actions did the campus take to identify where their performance gaps are?* [Potential answers: determined why they didn't meet standard by looking at each domain by grade level and content area] 3) *What is the purpose of the problem statement and annual goal?* [Potential answers: tells you where you are and what you need to do to meet standard] 4) *How will these actions set them up for successful improvement planning?* [Potential answer: the campus will focus on the data/areas that show that they are underperforming; will be able to track progress toward goal more easily] **Say (1 min):** Turn and talk to your table group and discuss your answers. Take 3 minutes for this. <u>(Facilitators monitor table talk to make sure discussions are on track with the answers above)</u>	PPT slides 7-8 Note taking guide Case Study A

		Say (5 min): Let's do a whole group share out. (Ask for 3-4 volunteers to share their responses) **Say (3 min):** (**show Slide 8)** Key idea: Knowing why you didn't meet standard and where the performance gaps come from keeps you focused on planning actions that will close those gaps.	
00:40-00:50	10 mins	**<u>See It and Name It: Data Analysis Case Study B</u>** **Section outcome: Participants will evaluate the missteps a campus might make in the data analysis process and identify actions to avoid those missteps.** **Say (1 min): (show Slide 9)** Let's look at another campus. This campus missed the same accountability targets, but they took a different approach to their data analysis. Individually, read the case study and answer the two questions in your note taking guide. Take 7 minutes for this. 1) *Why might Campus B's Problem Statement/Annual Goal lead to a less effective plan?* [Potential answers: they aren't aligned to state accountability targets, they are not measurable] 2) *What steps would you recommend campus B take to improve their problem statement/annual goal?* [Potential answers: narrow the data sources, maintain focus on state accountability targets] **Say (1 min):** Turn and talk to your table group and discuss your answers. Take 3 minutes for this. <u>(Facilitators monitor table talk to make sure discussions are on track with the answers above)</u> **Say (5 min):** Let's do a whole group share out. (Ask for 3-4 volunteers to share their responses) **Say (2 min): (show Slide 10)** Key idea: Campuses that focus on why they did not meet standard, identify where the performance gaps are, and write data driven problem statements are set up for more effective improvement planning.	PPT slides 9-10 note taking guide Case Study B
00:50-1:35	45 mins	**<u>Do it: Practice Data Analysis (Part 1: Identify trends)</u>** **Section outcome: Participants will determine why the sample campus did not meet standard and develop a data summary.**	PPT slides 11-14

		Say (2 mins): (show Slide 11) Now we are going to practice conducting a data analysis and writing data-driven problem statements and annual goals. You are going to work with your campus team on a sample set of data. (Facilitator note: if a campus team has more than 4, divide them into groups of 4-5.) Take out your Data Analysis Guided Discussion packet. This worksheet is meant to help teams uncover performance gaps and synthesize data into problem statements and should be used when you return to your campus to conduct your own data analysis. Use the sample data packets on your table to complete the worksheet. You will also answer the two reflection questions on the slide in your note-taking guide. Take 20 minutes. (Facilitators note: during this time, circulate among tables to ensure that participants are using the worksheet correctly) Domain 1: Teams should start by looking at the content areas, student subgroups, and performance levels. [Conversations should be taking place around the achievement by content area and student groups. To understand the grade level breakdown for each content area, the campus will use the student performance report that lists students' individual results.] Domain 3: Teams look at the Closing the Gaps table. The first table will help the campus with an overview of Domain 3. The second table provides a break down actual achievement numbers for Domain 3. [Conversations should be taking place around the Academic Achievement and Growth Status categories. The campus failed to meet many of the targets in these categories. Make sure that campuses understand the difference between the two tables and how they are used to help the campus understand the Domain 3 data.] **Say: (show Slide 12)** Now that you have reviewed the data, let's summarize why the campus didn't meet standard. With your table team, write 2-4 bullets for each domain the campus missed that describe WHY they missed the domain target. Record your data summary statements on the chart paper near your table. Take 10 minutes for this. (Facilitators note: circulate to ensure responses are aligned to expected responses; ask questions to redirect as needed)	note taking guide Data Analysis Guided Discussion sample data packet chart paper

		Potential responses: Domain 1: • Only 33% of students reached the Approaches Grade Level standard in Writing. • Only 33% of Economically Disadvantaged students reached the Approaches Grade Level standard in Writing. Lead teams to think about the Next steps: Identify the 4th grade teacher who had the lowest levels of achievement in Writing. • Only 45% of Current EL students reached the Approaches Grade Level standard in Mathematics. Lead teams to think about the Next steps: Identify the grade level that had the lowest level of achievement in Math for Current EL students. Identify the teacher who had the lowest level of achievement in Math in that grade level for Current EL students. Other Potential Answers: • 44% of African American students reached the Approaches GL standard in Math. • 34% of Hispanic students reached the Approaches GL standard in Writing. •47% of Economically Disadvantaged students reached the Approaches GL standard on all tests taken. Domain 3: • No Academic Achievement Status targets were met in Math and ELA. • In ELA, the student groups with the largest gaps are: Hispanic, Continuously Enrolled, and All Students. • In Math, the student groups with the largest gaps are: All Students, Hispanic, and Non-Continuously Enrolled. Lead teams to think about Next Steps: Identify the grade levels that had the largest academic achievement gaps. Focus in on the specific student groups that most contributed to	

		targets not being met. Identify the teachers who most contributed to the targets not being met. • Only 12% of African American and Hispanic achieved the Masters Grade Level standard. Lead teams to think about Next Steps: Identify the subject area that had the lowest number of African American and Hispanic students achieve the Master GL standard. Identify the grade level that had the lowest number of African American and Hispanic students achieve the Master GL standard. Focus on the teacher who had the lowest number of African American and Hispanic students achieve the Master GL standard. Other potential responses: • No growth status measures (the most heavily weighted component in Domain 3) were achieved by student groups in ELA or Math. • Student Success Status targets were not reached by any measurable subgroup with the exception of Current Special Education. • There is a large gap between the number of growth points earned by African American students and growth points earned by other student groups. **Say (5 mins): (show Slide 13)** So we can look around the room and see what some of the data trends for this campus are. Here are some of the trends that we surfaced: (read from slide. If the trends on the chart paper around the room don't match, open for discussion). **(show Slide 14)** Key Idea: When looking at state accountability data, evaluate by content area, grade level, teacher level, and student group to uncover where performance gaps really are.	
2:00-2:30	30 mins	**Do it: Practice Data Analysis (Part 2: Writing Problem Statements and Annual Goals for Improvement Planning)** **Section outcome: Participants will write, peer review, and provide feedback on data-driven problem statements and annual goals.** **Say (2 min): (show slide 15)** We have identified the trends in our example data, but now we need to turn these trends into	PPT slides 15-18 Note taking guide

		measurable problem statements and annual goals, which will serve as the foundation of our improvement plans. First, let's take a minute to look back at the problem statements and annual goals from our case studies. On page 4 of your note-taking guide, the problem statements and annual goals for each campus are listed. In your notes, answer the reflection question: *What is missing in Campus B's problem statement and annual goal?* [Potential responses: problem statement is not based on accountability data (not clear why this is the primary reason they didn't meet standard), annual goal is not measurable] **Say (4 mins):** (Ask for volunteers to share responses) **(show slide 16)** Key idea: Here are our criteria for problem statements and annual goals: A good problem statement is: • Substantiated by data • A key reason why the campus did not meet standard A good annual goal is: • Based on measurable results • Attainable and ambitious In your note-taking guide, take a minute to write your understanding of what makes a good problem statement and annual goal. **Say: (leave slide 16 up)** Now let's practice using the data trends we just uncovered in the sample data to write a problem statement and annual goal. Individually, take 5 minutes to write one problem statement and a corresponding annual goal for one of the data trends in your note-taking guide. Keep in mind our criteria for problem statements and annual goals! **(After 5 mins) Say:** We are going to review each other's problem statements and annual goals now. Find a partner from another table/campus. You are going to take 3 minutes to read each other's problem statements and annual goals and evaluate them against the criteria. You will then each	

		have 2 minutes to provide your partner feedback, and then you will take one minute to revise. I'll walk you through the timeline as we go. For now, take 1 minute to find a new partner! **(After everyone is settled)** Ok, now you have 3 minutes to read each other's problem statements and annual goals and evaluate them against the criteria. Record your feedback on page 4 of your note-taking guide. You may begin. **(After 3 mins)** Take turns giving the feedback on the problem statement/annual goal. The person who has the closest birthday to today gives feedback first. You have 2 minutes to give your feedback. Begin! <u>(Facilitator will walk around while partners are giving feedback; ask those with strong problem statement/annual goals to share out once the activity is over.)</u> **(After 2 mins)** Now let's switch. Partner 2, give your feedback. You have 2 minutes! **(After 2 mins)** Take one minute and make any revisions to your Problem Statement/Annual Goal that your partner suggested. **(After 1 min)** Let's return to our original seats. (Wait for people to get re-settled.) I heard a couple of great examples of problem statements and annual goals while walking around. <u>(Facilitator asks selected participants to share and asks the room for their thoughts or feedback.)</u> **(show Slide 17)** We have practiced reviewing data and synthesizing it into something on which we can base our improvement plans. Before we leave, in your note taking guide, take a minute to reflect on the last question in your note taking guide: *What are the key actions I need to keep in mind when I do this work at my campus?* **(show slide 18)** This concludes the Data Analysis for Improvement Planning training! <u>(Facilitator note: include your contact info/follow up method here)</u>	

Data Analysis Note Taking Guide

Introduction and Context Setting

- Our campus' vision for improvement is:

- How can data-driven improvement planning help our campus achieve this vision?

- Why is data analysis the first step in creating a plan?

Key Idea: Why Data Analysis?

Identifying Key Actions for Data Analysis: Case Study A

- What actions did Campus A take to determine why they didn't meet standard?

- What actions did the campus take to identify where their performance gaps are?

- What is the purpose of the problem statement and annual goal?

- How will these actions set them up for successful improvement planning?

Key Idea: Identifying Key Actions for Data Analysis

Improving Practices: Case Study B

- Why might Campus B's Problem Statement/Annual Goal lead to a less effective plan?

- What steps would you recommend campus B take to improve their Problem Statement/Annual Goal?

Key Idea: Improving Data Analysis Practice

Identifying Data Trends:

- What is our plan to complete this data analysis at our campus?

- Who is responsible for the work, and who will hold them accountable?

Key Idea: Identifying Data Trends

Practice: Writing Problem Statements and Annual Goals

Campus A	Campus B
Problem Statement: 75% of 5th graders did not meet grade level in math. Annual Goal: We will reduce the percent of students who did not meet grade level in 5th grade math by 20%.	Problem Statement: Tier I instruction suffered because of the increase in discipline incidents on the campus. Annual Goal: We will decrease discipline incidents so teachers can maximize instruction time.

- What is missing in Campus B's problem statement and annual goal?

Key Idea: Problem Statements and Annual Goals

A good problem statement is:	A good annual goal is:

Independent practice

My data trend:

My problem statement:	My annual goal:

Feedback for my partner:

My revised problem statement:	My revised annual goal:

Reflection

- *What are the key actions I need to keep in mind when I do the data analysis at my campus?*

DATA ANALYSIS CASE STUDY A

Campus A is an elementary school with approximately 700 students. The campus serves grades PK-5. On August 15th, the campus learned that it had received its first Improvement Required rating. The campus missed the target for Domain 1: Student Achievement and for Domain 3: Closing the Gaps. The principal and DCSI have called together a team to begin working on the data analysis for the Targeted Improvement Plan the campus is required to submit at the end of September. The team is made up of:

- The District Coordinator of School Improvement (DCSI), who is also the principal's evaluator
- A district instructional coach that worked with the campus last year and will continue to work with them this year
- The Professional Service Provider (PSP)
- Several members of the Campus Leadership Team (CLT), including all the grade level chairs

Prior to the meeting, the DCSI went to the TEA website and downloaded the data tables for each domain. She sent these data tables along with a Data Analysis Worksheet to the principal and CLT, with the expectation that everyone reviews the data and brings a completed worksheet to the meeting. The stated purpose of the meeting is to calibrate their findings from the worksheet and develop the problem statements and annual goals that the campus will use in their Targeted Improvement Plan (TIP) this year.

When the meeting begins, the DCSI and the PSP ask the CLT members and the principal to pick a partner and discuss their data findings from the worksheets. The pairs have 10 minutes to discuss their findings, and then they are to record their top 3 findings on chart paper that has been posted around the room. After the pairs have discussed, the DCSI and PSP see the following findings most frequently posted around the room:

- Many students in grades 3, 4, and 5 did not meet grade level on STAAR reading.
- A majority of students who are English Learners did not meet grade level in STAAR reading.
- The campus' lowest performance was in math, specifically in the 5th grade.
- Many students who are economically disadvantaged and/or served in special education failed to meet grade level standards in all content areas.

Seeing that the group's work is calibrated (because they had similar findings), the DCSI directs the team to now begin writing problem statements. She reminds the team that problem statements need to be based on data and be one of the key reasons why the campus did not meet standard. One of the grade level chairs suggests writing problem statements based on the performance of student groups. "*If we can pinpoint which student group is struggling the most, we can target interventions toward that group and meet our Domain 1 target."*

The group thinks about this idea, and another grade level chair says, "*I have a concern about approaching our data that way. I think these student groups are probably spread across all our classrooms. It might be hard to target only one or two groups of kids.*" The principal says "*I agree. And ultimately, the accountability lies with us: we are the educators. Is there a way that we can look for problems in the data based on areas that we failed to meet kids' needs, rather than looking at it from the angle of where kids failed to meet a target?"*

The group agrees that they need to look at their data through a school-level lens rather than a student-level lens. The PSP says to the group, "*This is a great idea. And remember, Domain 3 also gives you the information about your student group performance. What are some school-level, not student-level criteria, we can use to analyze this data?"* After some discussion, the group decides to look at their data by grade level and content area.

After prompting from the PSP, the DCSI suggests looking at the data by content area first. She has each pair review their data worksheet and come with summary statements for each content area. After discussion, the team realizes that the campus' primary struggle is in math, with reading a close second.

Then they decide to drill down to another school-level criteria: grade level. The first look at math performance across all grades and see which grade levels are struggling and identify that 75% of 5th graders did not meet grade level in math. In reading, the team identifies that all grade levels had at least a third of students not meet grade level in reading.

The team has narrowed performance issues down to 5th grade math (3rd and 4th grade math results were higher, although not as high as the team would like) and reading in all grade levels. One team member wants them to get more specific than that and suggests adding the student group layer back in to the data analysis to get a targeted problem statement. Another CLT member suggests another school-level criterion: teacher level data. *"If we look at data by teacher, we will really know where to focus our professional development efforts first, and then we will impact a larger number of students."*

After reviewing data at the teacher level, the team identified that: there was consistent, low performance on the 5th grade math team; the 3rd and 4th grade math teams have several high performing teachers; and there are big inconsistencies in teacher performance in reading based on the years of teacher experience. At this point, the team also brought in the Domain 3 data. The DCSI notes that this Domain shows performance by student groups, which addresses some of the concerns the CLT had about targeting interventions to student groups. When the team compares their Domain 3 data with their teacher level data, they find that the students in their lowest performing groups were also assigned to the least effective teachers. In the end, the team identifies three problem statements that effectively summarize why the campus did not meet standard, and they develop the following annual goals:

Problem Statement	Annual Goal
75% of 5th graders did not meet grade level in math.	We will reduce the percent of students who did not meet grade level in 5th grade math by 20%.
At least 33% of all students in all grade levels did not meet grade level in reading.	We will reduce the percent of students who did not meet grade level in reading by 10%.
70% of the students in the lowest performing Domain 3 groups were in a classroom with a less effective teacher.	We will place at least 30% of the students who failed to meet grade level in 17-18 in the classrooms of our most effective teachers.

DATA ANALYSIS CASE STUDY B

Campus B is also a PK-5 campus serving approximately 700 students. This campus also missed Domain 1 and Domain 3 targets and has received its first Improvement Required rating. The District Coordinator of School Improvement (DCSI) has directed the principal to pull her Campus Leadership Team (CLT) together to conduct a data analysis that will result in the problem statement and annual goals for the Targeted Improvement Plan. The principal set the meeting and asked the participants to bring any data they think might be useful.

The meeting begins with the principal asking what data everyone brought. The CLT members brought their benchmark results from the last school year. The principal brought the campus' discipline data and the results of the climate survey they administered in the spring. She also has the data tables from the TEA website that the DCSI emailed to her.

The principal tells the team that to develop the TIP, they need to analyze their data to create problem statements that summarize the reasons for the campus' underperformance and then set an annual goal that will lead to the campus meeting all its accountability targets. Realizing that everyone has arrived at the meeting with a plethora of data, she determines that they need a way to organize all the information. She begins the discussion by saying, "*Our campus missed the targets in student achievement and in closing the gaps. How can we frame this as a problem statement that we can set a goal around?"*

The 3rd grade chair says, "*Let's just write the problem statements really directly: we missed the Domain 1 cut point by 4 points. And then let's set our annual goal to be to increase our overall student achievement so that our Domain 1 score by 5 or more points."* The principal is concerned that this will not meet the DCSI's expectations for the problem statement. She asks the group, "*How will we know that we are increasing the Domain 1 score? What does it mean that we missed Domain 1 by 4 points?"* The group agrees that they need to dig deeper into the meaning of the Domain score and what the campus' actual performance was to understand what a Domain 1 score increase would mean.

The principal tells the group to go back to the drawing board. "*Let's look at the data we collected last year. What did we learn during the year that should have let us know that we might not meet standard?*" The grade level chairs open their binders with last year's benchmark data and start to share out observations like *"our 5th graders didn't do well on the MOY benchmark," "we saw growth in 3rd grade math after every benchmark,"* and "*5th grade science was a real problem area on the benchmarks*." The principal notes that the climate survey showed that teachers were not very satisfied with their jobs and that discipline referrals were up 35% last year. The principal asks again: *"From this data, we see some areas of strength and some areas where we need to grow. So where exactly are our performance issues coming from?"*

The CLT members all agree that teachers are very concerned about student behavior*. "It's really hard to get through all the TEKS when students are misbehaving*," asserts one team member. *"I agree*," says another, *"and our discipline referrals show that this is an issue school wide.*" The principal also knows that the district is concerned about discipline issues across the district and will be asking all campuses to implement a Positive Behavior Intervention System next year. The principal, noticing that this issue has energized members of the CLT, proposes setting one problem statement and annual goal around discipline. The team comes up with:

Problem Statement	Annual Goal
Tier I instruction suffered because of the increase in discipline incidents on the campus.	We will decrease discipline incidents, so teachers can maximize instruction time.

Texas Education Agency

SAMPLE

2018 STAAR Performance Data Table

SAMPLE EL (123456789) - DATA ISD

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current)	EL (Current & Monitored)	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu-ously Enrolled	Non-Continu-ously Enrolled
All Subjects															
Percent of Tests															
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	48%	51%	47%	30%	33%	71%	-	-	47%	47%	47%	36%	88%	51%	42%
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	20%	25%	19%	6%	0%	42%	-	-	20%	19%	19%	27%	67%	25%	17%
% at Masters GL Standard	6%	5%	6%	3%	0%	13%	-	-	6%	7%	7%	18%	55%	8%	4%
Number of Tests															
# at Approaches GL Standard or Above	354	107	225	10	1	17	-	-	350	216	216	20	8	239	115
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	152	51	89	2	0	10	-	-	150	88	88	15	6	116	46
# at Masters GL Standard	44	10	27	1	0	3	-	-	44	32	32	10	5	37	11
Total Tests	745	208	477	33	3	24	-	-	738	464	464	55	9	469	276
ELA/Reading															
Percent of Tests															
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	50%	53%	49%	30%	0%	81%	-	-	53%	45%	45%	44%	100%	54%	40%
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	19%	25%	19%	8%	0%	33%	-	-	22%	15%	15%	33%	75%	24%	12%
% at Masters GL Standard	9%	12%	7%	8%	0%	33%	-	-	10%	4%	4%	17%	75%	11%	7%
Number of Tests															
# at Approaches GL Standard or Above	134	33	89	5	0	7	-	-	132	72	72	8	4	85	44
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	52	15	34	1	0	3	-	-	55	24	24	4	3	38	13
# at Masters GL Standard	24	7	13	1	0	3	-	-	25	6	6	2	3	17	8
Total Tests	268	62	181	15	1	9	-	-	250	161	161	13	4	158	110
Mathematics															
Percent of Tests															
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	50%	44%	60%	42%	0%	86%	-	-	57%	62%	62%	39%	100%	66%	38%

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current)	EL (Current & Monitored)	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu-ously Enrolled	Non-Continu-ously Enrolled
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	21%	15%	23%	13%	0%	57%	-	-	26%	30%	30%	33%	100%	34%	15%
% at Masters GL Standard	3%	3%	2%	7%	0%	14%	-	-	9%	12%	12%	33%	100%	12%	4%
Number of Tests															
# at Approaches GL Standard or Above	138	32	95	5	0	6	-	-	148	101	101	7	3	106	44
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	58	11	41	2	0	4	-	-	69	49	49	6	3	54	17
# at Masters GL Standard	8	2	4	1	0	1	-	-	23	20	20	6	3	19	5
Total Tests	276	73	180	15	1	7	-	-	258	164	164	18	3	161	115
Writing															
Percent of Tests															
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	33%	30%	34%	0%	-	0%	-	-	33%	30%	30%	43%	100%	32%	34%
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	15%	15%	15%	0%	-	0%	-	-	15%	13%	13%	43%	100%	16%	13%
% at Masters GL Standard	2%	0%	3%	0%	-	0%	-	-	2%	3%	3%	29%	0%	3%	0%
Number of Tests															
# at Approaches GL Standard or Above	33	10	23	0	-	0	-	-	33	21	21	3	1	20	13
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	15	5	10	0	-	0	-	-	15	9	9	3	1	10	5
# at Masters GL Standard	2	0	2	0	-	0	-	-	2	2	2	2	0	2	0
Total Tests	101	33	68	0	-	0	-	-	100	69	69	7	1	63	38
Science															
Percent of Tests															
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	50%	69%	40%	67%	100%	75%	-	-	50%	38%	38%	43%	50%	57%	51%
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	23%	43%	6%	0%	0%	38%	-	-	22%	7%	7%	14%	0%	31%	33%
% at Masters GL Standard	6%	5%	2%	0%	0%	0%	-	-	6%	4%	4%	0%	0%	6%	6%
Number of Tests															
# at Approaches GL Standard or Above	50	28	19	2	1	6	-	-	50	17	17	3	1	38	17
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	23	17	3	0	0	3	-	-	22	3	3	1	0	21	11
# at Masters GL Standard	6	2	1	0	0	0	-	-	6	2	2	0	0	4	2
Total Tests	100	40	48	3	1	8	-	-	99	45	45	7	2	67	33

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current)	EL (Current & Monitored)	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu-ously Enrolled	Non-Continu-ously Enrolled
Social Studies															
Percent of Tests															
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
% at Masters GL Standard	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number of Tests															
# at Approaches GL Standard or Above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
# at Masters GL Standard	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Tests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

- Indicates there are no students in the group.

Texas Education Agency

SAMPLE

2018 Closing the Gaps Status Table

SAMPLE EL (123456789) - DATA ISD

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current & Monitored) *	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continuously Enrolled	Non-Continuously Enrolled	Total Met	Total Eligible	Percent of Eligible Indicators Met	Weight	Score
Academic Achievement Status																			
ELA/Reading Target	44%	32%	37%	60%	43%	74%	45%	56%	33%	29%	19%	36%	46%	42%					
Target Met	N	N	N						N	N			N	N					
Mathematics Target	46%	31%	40%	59%	45%	82%	50%	54%	36%	40%	23%	44%	47%	45%					
Target Met	N	N	N						N	N			N	N					
Total Indicators															**0**	**14**	**0%**	**30.0%**	**0.0**
Growth Status																			
ELA/Reading Target	66%	62%	65%	69%	67%	77%	67%	68%	64%	64%	59%	65%	66%	67%					
Target Met	N	N	N						N	N			N	N					
Mathematics Target	71%	67%	69%	74%	71%	86%	74%	73%	68%	68%	61%	70%	71%	70%					
Target Met	N	N	N						N	N			N	N					
Total Indicators															**0**	**14**	**0%**	**50.0%**	**0.0**
Graduation Rate Status																			
Graduation Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	n/a	n/a	n/a					
Target Met																			
Total Indicators																			
English Language Proficiency Status																			
ELP Target										42%									
Target Met										Y									
Total Indicators															**1**	**1**	**100%**	**10.0%**	**10.0**
Student Success Status																			
STAAR Component Target	47%	36%	41%	58%	46%	73%	48%	55%	38%	37%	23%	43%	48%	45%					

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current & Monitored) *	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu-ously Enrolled	Non-Continu-ously Enrolled	Total Met	Total Eligible	Percent of Eligible Indicators Met	Weight	Score
Target Met	N	N	N	N					N	N	Y		N	N					
Total Indicators															**1**	**9**	**11%**	**10.0%**	**1.1**
School Quality Status																			
CCMR Target	47%	31%	41%	58%	42%	76%	39%	53%	39%	30%	27%	43%	50%	31%					
Target Met																			
Total Indicators																			
Total																			**11**

Texas Education Agency

CONFIDENTIAL

2018 Closing the Gaps Data Table

SAMPLE EL (123456789) - DATA ISD

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current & Monitored)*	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu-ously Enrolled	Non-Continu-ously Enrolled
Academic Achievement (Percent at Meets Grade Level or Above)														
ELA/Reading														
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	19%	25%	19%	8%	0%	33%			22%	15%	33%	75%	24%	12%
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	52	15	34	1	0	3			55	24	8	3	38	13
Total Tests (Adjusted)	268	62	181	12	1	9			250	161	13	4	158	110
Mathematics														
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	21%	15%	23%	13%	0%	57%			26%	30%	33%	100%	34%	15%
# at Meets GL Standard or Above	58	11	34	2	0	4			69	49	6	3	54	17
Total Tests (Adjusted)	276	73	180	15	1	7			258	164	18	3	161	115
Growth (Academic Growth)														
ELA/Reading														
Academic Growth Score	54	56	52	67		50			53	49	29	50	46	66
Growth Points	59.5	14.5	40.0	4.0		1.0			58.5	37.0	2.0	1.0	32.5	27.0
Total Tests	111	26	77	6		2			110	75	7	2	70	41

	All Students	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Econ Disadv	EL (Current & Monitored)*	Special Ed (Current)	Special Ed (Former)	Continu-ously Enrolled	Non-Continu-ously Enrolled
Mathematics														
Academic Growth Score	56	58	54	58		100			56	54	64	100	54	59
Growth Points	66.0	18.0	42.5	3.5		2.0			65.0	42.5	7.0	2.0	39.0	27.0
Total Tests	118	31	79	6		2			117	78	11	2	72	46
Graduation (Federal Graduation Rate)														
% Graduated														
# Graduated														
Total in Class														
English Language Proficiency														
TELPAS Progress Rate										54%				
TELPAS Progress										188				
TELPAS Total										345				
Student Success (Student Achievement Domain Score: STAAR Component Only)														
STAAR Component Score	25	25	26	15	0	49			25	26	27	74	28	21
% at Approaches GL Standard or Above	47%	47%	48%	28%	0%	73%			47%	47%	32%	86%	51%	42%
% at Meets GL Standard or Above	20%	20%	20%	8%	0%	48%			20%	20%	26%	73%	23%	15%
% at Masters GL Standard	11%	5%	7%	5%	0%	23%			6%	7%	19%	61%	8%	4%
Total Tests	645	168	429	30	2	16			638	419	48	7	402	243
School Quality (College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance)														
% Students meeting CCMR														
# Students meeting CCMR														
Total Students														
Participation														
Target	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
ELA/Reading														
% Participation	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Participants	268	62	181	15	1	9			250	161	13	4	158	110
Total Tests	268	62	181	15	1	9			250	161	13	4	158	110
Mathematics														
% Participation	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Participants	276	73	180	15	1	7			258	164	18	3	161	115
Total Tests	276	73	180	15	1	7			258	164	18	3	161	115
Additional Targeted Support														
Target	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%
% Indicators Met	0%	0%	0%	0%					0%	17%	100%			
# Indicators Met	0	0	0	0					0	1	1			
# Indicators Evaluated	5	5	5	1					5	6	1			

* Ever HS ELs are included in the Federal Graduation Rate