MEMORANDUM

TO: Board Members

FROM: Terry B. Grier, Ed.D. Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: 2015 DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

CONTACT: Carla Stevens, 713-556-6700

The Texas Education Code (§ 29.051) requires school districts to provide every language minority student with the opportunity to participate in either a bilingual or English as a second language (ESL) program. Attached is the evaluation report summarizing the performance of students who participated in the district's Dual Language Bilingual Program. Included in the report are findings from assessments of academic achievement and English language proficiency for all students classified as English Language Learners (ELL) who participated in the Dual Language program. In addition, the report includes performance results of fluent English-speakers enrolled in the Dual Language teachers.

Key findings include:

- A total of 3,531 ELL students participated in the Dual Language program in 2014–2015.
- Current Dual Language students performed better than students in other bilingual programs on almost all subjects of the STAAR (English version), EOC, and Iowa Assessments.
- Current Dual Language students showed declines in reading performance on both the Spanish and English STAAR compared to the previous year, but they performed better than all students districtwide in mathematics on the English STAAR.
- Dual Language students showed more improvement in English proficiency than did students in other bilingual programs, as measured by the TELPAS.
- Students served in the Dual Language program but who had exited ELL status did better than the district, and better than students from other bilingual programs, in all subjects of the STAAR, STAAR EOC, and Iowa Assessments.
- English-speaking students in the Dual Language program showed evidence for bilingualism and biliteracy.

• Dual Language teachers had better overall EVAAS ratings (composite growth index) than did non-DL teachers.

Then B. Grien

Attachment

cc: Superintendent's Direct Reports Gracie Guerrero Chief Schools Officers School Support Officers Principals

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

RESEARCH Educational Program Report

DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM EVALUATION 2014 - 2015

HISD Research and Accountability ANALYZING DATA, MEASURING PERFORMANCE.



2015 BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rhonda Skillern-Jones President

Manuel Rodriguez, Jr. First Vice President

Wanda Adams Second Vice President

Paula Harris Secretary

Juliet Stipeche Assistant Secretary

Anna Eastman Michael L. Lunceford Greg Meyers Harvin C. Moore

Terry B. Grier, Ed.D. Superintendent of Schools

Carla Stevens Assistant Superintendent Department of Research and Accountability

Kevin Briand, Ph.D. Senior Research Specialist

Venita Holmes, Dr.P.H. Research Manager

Houston Independent School District

Hattie Mae White Educational Support Center 4400 West 18th StreetHouston, Texas 77092-8501

www.HoustonISD.org

It is the policy of the Houston Independent School District not to discriminate on the basis of age, color, handicap or disability, ancestry, national origin, marital status, race, religion, sex, veteran status, political affiliation, sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender expression in its educational or employment programs and activities.

DUAL LANGUAGE BILINGUAL PROGRAM EVALUATION 2014–2015

Executive Summary

Program Description

The Dual language program in HISD is intended to facilitate English Language Learner (ELL) integration into the regular school curriculum and ensure access to equal educational opportunities, while promoting biliteracy and bilingualism for both ELLs and native English speakers. The dual language program is offered in elementary schools and selected middle schools for language minority students who need to enhance their English language skills, but the program also includes English speakers who wish to improve their Spanish language proficiency. Beginning in prekindergarten, the program provide ELLs with a carefully structured sequence of basic skills in their native language, as well as gradual skill development in English through ESL methodology. In dual language programs, the function of the native language is to provide access to the curriculum while the student is acquiring English. Instruction in the native language assures that students attain grade level cognitive skills without falling behind academically, and also ensures that English-speaking students are immersed in a foreign language.

The present evaluation of the dual language bilingual program (DL) addresses the following topics:

- academic progress of dual language ELLs;
- English proficiency among dual language ELLs and Spanish proficiency of native English speakers;
- academic progress of native English-speakers enrolled in the dual language program; and
- the quality, retention, and professional development activities of dual language teachers.

Highlights

- There were 3,531 ELLs enrolled in the dual-language bilingual program (DL) in 2014–2015.
- DL was offered in 31 campuses districtwide, (27 elementary campuses, three secondary, and one K -8 campus).
- Current DL students performed better than did those in other bilingual programs in almost all subjects of the STAAR (English version), EOC, and Iowa Assessments in 2015.
- English language performance of both DL students and those in other bilingual programs was generally better on mathematics tests than it was on reading or language tests.
- DL students performed better than the district in mathematics (English STAAR).
- Reading performance of DL students declined in 2015 compared to 2014 on both the Spanish and English STAAR.
- Students who had exited ELL status but who had previously been in DL did better than the district average on all subject tests for the STAAR, STAAR-EOC, and Iowa.
- Exited DL students also did better than those who exited from other bilingual programs on all tests.

- On the TELPAS, fewer DL students scored at the highest level of English proficiency than did other bilingual students in grades K-4, but exceeded students in other bilingual programs by grade 5.
- DL students did show more improvement or growth in English proficiency (as measured by performance on the TELPAS) than did other bilingual students.
- Fluent English speakers in DL showed evidence of bilingualism and biliteracy, doing well on both the Spanish and English language STAAR reading assessments.
- DL teachers had better overall EVAAS ratings (composite growth index) than did non-DL teachers, although retention rates did not differ for the two groups.

Recommendations

- The dual language program continues to undergo a major expansion. During the 2014–2015 school year there were 31 campuses offering the dual language program, with 14 of them in their first year of operation. An additional 24 were scheduled to begin in 2015–2016. The district and Multilingual Programs department should continue the expansion of the Dual Language program to additional elementary campuses as a new implementation, and identify middle schools to continue the programming into grades 6-8.
- 2. The district and Multilingual Programs department should explore the plan for the expansion at early childhood centers to allow for an early start in bilingualism and biliteracy of prekindergarten students feeding into established Dual Language campuses.
- 3. As the DL program expands, campus visits should be conducted to provide feedback in order to ensure fidelity to program guidelines and district non-negotiables.

Administrative Response

The Dual Language program will continue to be expanded each year at the elementary level and explored at middle schools in the vicinity of dual language elementary schools to continue programming in the upper grades. Dual language implementation at Early Childhood Centers will be a priority.

The Dual Language handbook will be revised to include district assessment changes and additional program structure as campus vertical alignment continues. It will continue to serve as the guide of program implementation in Dual Language campuses across the district.

Units of Study for grades kindergarten through second grade have been developed and disseminated to all Dual Language campuses. Dual Language Instructional Planning will be conducted prior to each grading cycle to familiarize teachers with the curriculum, share instructional best practices, and create workstations.

A core package of instructional bilingual materials has been ordered and will be distributed to all prekindergarten through second grade Dual Language classrooms. This will ensure consistency and equity in programming across the district.

All dual language campuses will be supported through campus visits during the academic year by repre-

sentatives from the Multilingual Programs, Curriculum and Instruction, and Schools Office. Oral and written feedback after each visit will highlight campus best practices and identify areas for growth opportunity. Coaching provided by assigned Teacher Development Specialists will strategically target areas identified in need of development.

Dual language teachers will participate in three levels of training, starting with Level 1 during their first year of teaching in a DL setting and advancing to another level each year, for a total of 66 hours of face-to-face training. Choice staff development sessions are also available for teachers throughout the year.

Introduction

Texas requires school districts to provide specialized linguistic programs to meet the needs of students who are English language learners (ELL). These programs are intended to facilitate ELLs' integration into the regular school curriculum and ensure access to equal educational opportunities. HISD exceeds the state mandate by implementing three bilingual education programs: the Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL), the Transitional Bilingual Program (TBP), and a smaller Cultural Heritage Bilingual Program for Vietnamese-speaking ELLs offered at one campus. The Dual-Language Program differs from the Transitional Bilingual Program in two ways: in DL, classes are composed of a mix of Spanish-speaking ELLs as well as native English speakers, and there is a higher percentage of instructional time offered in Spanish. The dual language program is the focus of this report.

In the district's dual language program, roughly equal numbers¹ of ELL and fluent English-speaking students are taught together in an effort to develop full bilingualism and biliteracy for both groups. Participating campuses choose between implementing an 80:20 model and a 50:50 model. In the 80:20 model, students in kindergarten receive 80 percent of their instruction in Spanish and 20 percent in English. The percentage of instruction time in English gradually increases throughout the grade levels, until reaching 50 percent in grade 3. The 50:50 model differs slightly, in that students receive half of their instruction in English and half in Spanish starting in kindergarten, and this mix persists until at least 5th grade.²

Recent Changes to the Dual Language Program

The district has committed to an expansion and revision of its existing dual language program. Five new campuses were added to the program in 2013–2014, with 14 new campuses in 2014–2015 and a further 24 planned for 2015–2016. At each of the new DL campuses, only students up to and including grade one are initially enrolled in the program, with higher grades added as students advance. Thus, at the present time, the DL program includes a mix of campuses that have been offering the program through fifth grade for a number of years, and other campuses that only offer the program at lower grade levels. Eventually, all elementary DL campuses will offer the program through fifth grade. The second major aim of the DL initiative has been a revision of the program's curriculum and guidelines. These changes have included a standardization of the time and content allocation that campuses will be required to follow. As mentioned previously, currently DL campuses have the choice of following either a 50:50 or an 80:20 model. Under new guidelines, all DL campuses will have to follow the 50:50 model, and the time/ content allocation has been modified to correct for inadequacies in the design of the previous plans. These changes to the required DL model are being phased in, with students currently in kindergarten being the first ones to be instructed under the new guidelines.

In the summer of 2014, an outside consultant (VIF International Education) was contracted to provide a comprehensive review of the existing DL program and to provide recommendations that would facilitate the expanded program's success. Some of the recommendations regarding program evaluation have been incorporated into the present report, including new sections on teacher quality and professional development activities.

Participants

Methods

ELLs in the dual language bilingual program were identified using 2014–2015 Chancery Student Management System (SMS)³, IBM Cognos, and Public Education Information Management System

Table 1. Number and Percent of Biling	gual ELL S	Students I	oy Progra	m, 2012–2	2013 to 201	4–2015
Bilingual Program		Enrolled			Percent	
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
Transitional Bilingual (TBP)	n/a	30,764	28,136	n/a	78	71
Traditional Bilingual (discontinued)	17,009	n/a	n/a	44		
Pre-Exit Bilingual	5,436	6,878	7,755	14	17	20
Developmental Bilingual (discontinued)	14,811	n/a	n/a	38		
Dual-Language (DL, Two or One-Way)	1,217	1,831	3,531	3	5	9
Gomez & Gomez (discontinued)	90	n/a	n/a	<1		
Cultural Heritage	168	162	152	<1	<1	<1
Mandarin Bilingual	10	20	63	<1	<1	<1
Other*	0	4	41	0	<1	<1
Total	38,741	39,659	39,678			
				-		

Source: IBM Cognos, Chancery

* Inappropriate code (ELL student listed as served through a bilingual program which has been discontinued).

(PEIMS) databases. A summary of enrollment figures for ELLs in the various bilingual programs is shown in **Table 1**. Note that enrollment in DL is substantially lower than enrollment in TBP; 9 percent of ELLs served through bilingual programs were served in the dual-language program and 71 percent were served in the transitional program. The dual-language bilingual program was offered at 27 elementary schools, three secondary campuses, and one K–8 campuses (see **Appendix A** for a complete list, p. 14). The number of campuses offering DL has increased from 12 in 2012–2013 and 17 in 2013–2014, to 31 for the present year, and an additional 24 campuses are scheduled to start in 2015–2016. All DL students with valid assessment results from 2014–2015 were included in analyses for this report, as were all students who had participated in the program but who had since exited ELL status.

Data Collection & Analysis

Results for DL students from the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), Logramos, Iowa Assessments, and Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) were analyzed at the district level. In addition, results for exited DL students on the STAAR End-ofcourse (EOC) were examined. Comparisons were made between dual-language students, other bilingual students, and all students districtwide.

STAAR results are reported for the reading and mathematics tests. For each test, the percentage of students who passed (met satisfactory standard) is shown. For STAAR EOC, the percent of students who met satisfactory standard are reported for English I and II, Algebra I, Biology, and U.S. History. In addition, for both the STAAR 3-8 and EOC assessments, results from the STAAR Progress and ELL Progress measure are reported. Logramos and Iowa Assessments results are reported (Normal Curve Equivalents or NCEs) for total reading, total language, and total mathematics.

TELPAS results are reported for two indicators. One of these reflects attainment, i.e., the overall level of English language proficiency exhibited by ELLs. For this indicator, the percent of students at each proficiency level is presented. The second indicator reflects progress, i.e., whether students gained one or more levels of English language proficiency between testing in 2014 and 2015. For this second TELPAS indicator, the percent gaining one or more proficiency levels in the previous year is reported. **Appendix B** (see p. 15) provides further details on each of the assessments analyzed for this report.



Figure 1. Percentage of students who met satisfactorsy standard on STAAR grades 3-8 reading and mathematics tests, 2015: Dual language students, other bilingual students, and all students districtwide.

What was the academic performance of ELLs in the dual-language program?

STAAR

- **Figure 1** shows the percent of students in grades 3-8 who met the satisfactory standard for the Spanish and English language versions of the STAAR in 2015 (reading and mathematics only).
- Results are shown for DL students, as well as all students districtwide and students from other bilingual programs.⁴ See Appendices C and D for further details (see pp. 16–17).
- DL students exceeded other bilingual students in all subjects except Spanish reading, but both groups were lower than the district in English reading (gaps of -11 and -13 percentage points).
- Figure 2 shows English STAAR performance in reading and mathematics for 2013 through 2015.
- Dual language students showed a decrease of 16 percentage points in reading over this time period, compared to -1 point for other bilingual students and -4 points for the district overall. In contrast, DL students showed larger gains in mathematics than did either of these groups.

Figure 2. Percentage of students who met satisfactory standard on STAAR grades 3-8 reading and mathematics tests, 2013 through 2015: DL students and all students districtwide (English STAAR).



Figure 3. Percentage of students who met satisfactory standard on English STAAR grades 3-8 reading test, 2015: Exited DL students, exited students from other bilingual programs, and all students districtwide.



- STAAR reading results for exited DL students in 2015 are shown in Figure 3.
- Exited students from the DL program had higher passing rates than the district, and also exceeded performance of students from other bilingual programs, in both reading and mathematics.
- Figure 4 (below) shows the reading and mathematics performance of exited DL students for the past three years. Exited DL students (+1 percentage point) and other exited bilingual students (+2 points) both have improved in reading over this time period, while the district overall has shown a decrease (-4 points). Increases in mathematics have been similar for each group (+1 to +2 points).
- Figure 5 (see p. 8) shows results for the ELL progress and STAAR progress measures (for an explanation of these measures see **Appendix E**, p. 18, and **Appendix F** for details, pp. 19-20). Only results for STAAR reading (English) are shown.

Figure 4. Percentage of students who met satisfactory standard on English STAAR grades 3-8 reading and mathematics tests, 2013 to 2015: Exited DL, other exited bilingual students, and all students districtwide.









Current DL students did slightly less well than did other bilingual students on both ELL and STAAR
progress measures, but exited DL students outperformed others in the district on the STAAR progress measure.

STAAR EOC

Figure 6 depicts results for the STAAR-EOC assessment. Shown are results for Algebra I, Biology, English I and II, and U.S. History. For each test, the figure shows the percentage of students who met the Satisfactory or above standard (dark green). Red indicates the percentage of students who scored Unsatisfactory. Figures in parentheses show the number of students tested (see also **Appendix G**, p. 21).





- Exited DL students performed better than the district, and higher than other exited bilingual students, on all tests. The highest passing rates were in Biology and U.S. History, with the lowest rates on English I and II. However, it should be noted that fewer than 100 exited DL students were tested in 2015 on the STAAR EOCs.
- **Figure 7** (below) shows results for the EOC Progress measure (exited ELLs only). Results show that exited DL students did better than students from other bilingual programs, and both groups outperformed the district average (see also **Appendix H**, p. 22.





Logramos and Iowa Assessments

- Figure 8 summarizes Logramos and Iowa data for the 2014–2015 school year (mean NCE scores for total reading, total language, and total mathematics). Results are shown for ELLs in the DL program, other bilingual students, and HISD. The dashed red line indicates an average NCE of 50.
- On the Logramos, students in DL were well above the expected average NCE of 50 in all subjects, but were slightly lower than students in other bilingual programs (see Appendix I for details including grade level results, p. 23).
- Dual language performance on the lowa was much lower than it was for the Logramos. DL students
 had average NCE scores below the expected average of 50 in reading and language, but were
 above average (NCE = 51) in mathematics (see also Appendix J, p. 24).
- DL students' lowa scores exceeded other bilingual students in reading and mathematics.

Figure 8. Logramos and Iowa Assessments Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) for DL, other bilingual students, and students districtwide, 2015: reading, language, and mathematics tests.





Figure 9. Iowa Assessments Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) for exited DL or other bilingual (OB) students, and students districtwide, 2015: Reading, mathematics, and language.

- **Figure 9** shows lowa results for monitored and former students from the DL program for 2015, as well as performance of students who exited other bilingual programs.
- Scores for exited DL students were higher than those for the district, and also higher than those for students who exited other bilingual programs; and this was true for all subjects.

What were the levels of English proficiency among ELLs in dual-language programs?

- **Figure 10** shows attainment, i.e., the percentage of students scoring at each proficiency level on the TELPAS in 2015. Further details can be found in **Appendices K** and **L** (pp. 25–26).
- English proficiency for DL students improved across grade levels, with 91% or more of students scoring Advanced or better by grade 5 in 2015.





• DL students showed lower overall English proficiency than did students in other bilingual programs, but exceeded students in other bilingual programs by grade 5.



Figure 11. TELPAS yearly progress for DL and other bilingual students, 2015.

• **Figure 11** shows yearly progress, i.e. the percentage of students who made gains in English language proficiency between 2014 and 2015. The percentage of students who made gains in English proficiency was higher for DL students than for other bilingual students (57 versus 56 percent).

What was the academic performance of fluent English speakers in the two-way bilingual program?

- The goal of the DL program is for students to achieve full bilingualism and biliteracy. Data have already been presented on the performance of current and former ELLs in the program. In this section, data are reported from the 1,758 students with fluent English proficiency (FEP) who participated in the DL program during 2014–2015.
- Spanish-language STAAR results show that fluent English speakers (n = 162) had higher passing rates than did Spanish speaking DL students on the reading test (see **Figure 12**).
- The passing rate for DL students was the same as for all bilingual students districtwide (69 percent).



Figure 12. STAAR performance of ELL and FEP students in the DLBP program, 2015: percent meeting standard in Spanish and English reading.

- English STAAR results show that FEP students (n = 360) also did well in comparison with former DL students who have exited ELL status.
- Both exited DL students and native-English FEP students, had higher passing rates than the district overall on the English STAAR (advantages of +25 and +26 percentage points, respectively).

How did dual language teachers compare to other district teachers in terms of qualifications and retention rate?

District teachers receive annual ratings on a number of different measures, including EVAAS ratings as well as a rating derived from a TELPAS Comparative Growth measure. This section of the report summarizes these two ratings for teachers assigned to DL classes, compared to other teachers in the district. Only elementary teachers are included here, and the few secondary campuses where DL is offered are not considered.

- **Figure 14** shows the distribution of elementary teacher ratings for EVAAS (composite gain index, CGI) and TELPAS comparative growth (CG). Dual language teachers are compared to all other teachers in the district. For details of analyses see **Appendix M** (p.27).
- DL teachers ratings were more positive for EVAAS, and this difference was statistically significant. TELPAS comparative growth did not differ for DL teachers.
- Teacher retention data indicated that the retention rate for DL teachers (86.9%, or 187/215) was slightly higher than that for other HISD teachers (85.9%, or 4,484/5,222, elementary only), but this difference was not significant.



Figure 14. EVAAS CGI and TELPAS CG ratings for DL and other district teachers, 2015.

What was the frequency and scope of professional development activities provided to teachers and staff serving dual language students?

Data provided by e-TRAIN indicated that 101 staff development training sessions pertaining to dual language education were coordinated by the Multilingual Department during the 2015–2016 school year. These sessions, summarized in **Appendix N** (p. 28), were attended by total of 4,198 teachers and other district staff. Note that individuals may have been counted more than once if they attended multiple events (the unduplicated staff count was 1,293). A full record of professional development activities can be obtained from the Multilingual Department.

Discussion

Fourteen new campuses were added to the DL program for the 2014–2015 school year. In the 2015–2016 school year, an additional 24 new campuses will be added. Evidence reviewed here indicates that the dual language program in HISD provides ELLs with the support needed to succeed academically. ELLs who have participated in DL acquire English-language proficiency while in the programs, and outperform the district average on the STAAR, STAAR EOC, and Iowa assessments once they have successfully met exit criteria. Native English speakers (FEPs) involved in the program also do well. Based on these results, it would appear that the HISD Multilingual Department is fulfilling its mission to ensure that ELLs achieve their full academic potential. As the district continues to expand the DL program to more campuses and the new DL time and content allocations are introduced at higher grade levels, the program's performance will need to be monitored to ensure that this record of success continues.

Appendices 0.1 through **0.18** (pp. 29-46) provide summaries of student performance at the various DL campuses. Shown are results for Spanish-speaking DL students in classes with native English-speakers (YT), Spanish-speaking DL students in classes where there were no native English speakers (YO), and native English-speakers enrolled in the DL program (NT).

Endnotes

- The dual-language model proposes that approximately equal numbers of fluent and non-fluent English speakers should be enrolled in the class, but practitioners in the field stress that this ratio should be used as a heuristic and not an absolute rule. Ratios of 60:40 and even 70:30 may be considered appropriate under some circumstances. It should not be assumed that a functional dual-language program requires exactly equal number of students from both language groups (Collier, personal communication).
- 2. This is the sequence normally followed by students in the dual language programs. However, students in both the dual-language and the transitional bilingual programs can enter the pre-exit phase (i.e., predominantly English-only instruction) as early as grade 3, pending LPAC approval, if they have met certain performance criteria. These criteria can be found in the district's 2014–2015 Pre-Exit Student Performance Report.
- 3. The Chancery system replaced the School Administrative Student Information database system (i.e., SASI), which the district used prior to the 2006-2007 school year. Where data from multiple years are shown, archived files from SASI were used as needed, thus some tables or figures may include references to both sources.
- 4. Note that all districtwide performance data includes results from ELLs enrolled in the dual-language programs, as well as all other comparison groups (e.g., monitored and former ELLs).

References

- Houston Independent School District (2015). Pre-Exit ELL Students Performance STAAR/Stanford 2014–2015. HISD, Department of Research & Accountability.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Available at http://www.no childleftbehind.gov.

Appendix A

Campuses Offering Dual-Language Programs (DL), 2014–2015

						El	L Enr	olled	2014-2	015					
Campus	Date Started	Grades Served	РК	к	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	HS	Total ELL	# NT [*]
Briscoe ES		PK, K, 1, 2, 3, 4	25	34	33	37	22	4						155	35
Emerson ES		PK, K, 1, 2, 3	40	58	64	62	45							269	52
Helms ES		PK, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	34	31	32	30	30	24	24					205	168
Herod ES		K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5		15	16	16	26	18	14					105	61
Herrera ES		K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5		58	51	59	55	63	19					305	19
Northline ES	Prior to	PK, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	22	60	77	54	55	60	34					362	28
Sherman ES	2013-14	PK, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	30	38	47	39	51	22	15					242	49
Twain ES		K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5		9	11	7	9	3	4					43	97
Wharton K-8		PK, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	21	30	28	24	15	24	32	2				176	239
Burbank MS		6, 7, 8								108	84	71		263	8
Johnston MS		6, 7, 8								2	3	1		6	50
Reagan HS		9, 10, 11, 12											0	0	36
Daily ES		PK, K, 1		6	10									16	18
Deanda ES	2013-14	PK, K, 1, 2	67	77	86	75								305	75
Kashmere Gardens ES		K, 1		3	6									9	23
Law ES		PK, K, 1, 2	17	18	21	28								84	89
Reagan Ed Ctr		K, 1		64	53									117	14
Anderson ES		К		63										63	33
Ashford ES		К		30										30	14
Burnet ES		К		57										57	32
Coop ES		К		51										51	23
Dogan ES		PK, K	40	40	2									82	6
Garden Villas ES		К		42										42	16
Gregg ES	2014-15	К		47										47	32
RP Harris ES		К		60										60	9
McNamara ES		К		94										94	16
Memorial ES		PK, K	27	31										58	19
Osborne ES		К		12	1		1							14	15
Shearn ES		PK, K	61	66										127	73
Whidby ES		PK, K	8	7										15	39
White ES		PK, K	47	85										132	21

Source: Multilingual Department, IBM Cognos

* NT students are native English-speakers enrolled in DL

Appendix B

Explanation of Assessments Included in Report

The STAAR is a state-mandated, criterion-referenced assessment used to measure student achievement. STAAR measures academic achievement in reading and mathematics in grades 3–8; writing at grades 4 and 7; social studies in grades 8; and science at grades 5 and 8. For 2014–2015 high school students, STAAR includes end-of-course (EOC) exams in English language arts (English I, II), mathematics (Algebra I), science (Biology), and social studies (U.S. History).

With regards to the STAAR 3-8 mathematics assessment, note that in April of 2012, the State Board of Education revised the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for mathematics. These new stadards were implemented for grades K-8 in the 2014–2015 school year, and as a result the STAAR mathematics assessment was revised. For this reason, comparison of STAAR mathematics results from 2015 to those from previous years should be made with caution.

The lowa Assessments are norm-referenced, standardized achievement tests in English used to assess students' level of content mastery. These assessment provides a means of determining the relative standing of students' academic performance when compared to the performance of students from a nationally-representative sample.

The Logramos is a norm-referenced, standardized achievement test in Spanish. It is used to assess the level of content mastery for students who receive instruction in Spanish. The total reading, total language, and total mathematics subtests are included in this report for grades 1 through 6. Students take the Logramos (Spanish) or Iowa (English) according to the language of their reading/language arts instruction. The Logramos and Iowa were developed by Riverside Publishing. However, the Logramos is not simply a translation of the Iowa. The structure and content of the Logramos are aligned with those of the Iowa, but development and referencing differ in order to provide culturally relevant material for Spanish-speaking student populations across the United States.

The TELPAS is an English language proficiency assessment which is administered to all ELL students in kindergarten through twelfth grade, and which was developed by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in response to federal testing requirements (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Proficiency scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are used to calculate a composite score. Composite scores are in turn used to indicate where ELL students are on a continuum of English language development. This continuum, based on the stages of language development for second language learners, is divided into four proficiency levels: Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Advanced High.

Appendix C

Spanish STAAR Performance of Dual Language and Other Bilingual Students: Number Tested, and Percent Meeting Satisfactory Standard, by Grade Level, Subject, and Year

					Spanish	Reading		S	Spanish M	athemati	cs
		Enrol	lment	2014 2015			015	2	014	2015	
	-	2014	2015	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Program	Grade	Ν	Ν	tested	Met Sat.	tested	Met Sat.	tested	Met Sat.	tested	Met Sat.
Other	3	4,589	4,023	4,212	71	3,781	71	4,125	67	3,592	73
Bilingual	4	1,706	1,406	1,475	67	1,300	66	1,453	68	1,231	68
	5	343	148	35	37	69	52	33	6	54	46
	Total	6,638	5,577	5,722	70	5,150	69	5,611	67	4,877	71
Dual	3	161	309	159	80	305	70	159	88	305	70
Language	4	162	215	160	79	192	68	161	73	192	78
	5	153	142	2	*	5	60	2	*	5	60
	Total	476	666	321	79	502	69	322	80	502	73

Source: STAAR, Chancery

Appendix D

English STAAR Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students: Number Tested, and Percentage Met Satisfactory Standard, by Grade Level, Subject and Year

				English Reading				English Mathematics					
		Enroll	ment	20)14	20	015	20	14	_20)15		
Program	Grado	2014	2015	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Flogram	Grade	<u>N</u>	Ν	tested	Met Sat.	tested	Met Sat.	tested	Met Sat	tested	Met Sat.		
Current	3	161	309	2	*	6	67	2	*	3	*		
DL	4	162	215	2	*	23	70	1	*	23	91		
	5	153	142	149	70	136	72	150	83	137	83		
	6	103	112	96	65	106	51	96	80	97	74		
	7	81	87	73	58	81	40	74	62	68	65		
	8	75	72	70	60	70	39	68	72	48	77		
	Total	735	937	392	64	422	55	391	76	376	77		
Other	3	5676	5424	1,372	70	1,580	70	1,417	78	1,704	80		
Bilingual	4	4701	4801	3,062	57	3,371	52	3,059	67	3,341	69		
	5	3174	3131	2,960	47	2,938	46	2,913	70	2,827	67		
	6	35	20	32	34	19	32	27	56	16	50		
	7	21	7	20	25	5	80	10	60	5	80		
	8	17	8	17	12	6	67	6	33	7	57		
	Total	13,624	13,391	7,463	55	7,919	53	7,432	70	7,900	71		
Exited	3	3	14	3	*	3	*	3	*	3	*		
DL	4	28	5	25	92	5	100	25	88	5	100		
	5	20	27	20	80	27	100	20	100	27	96		
	6	73	90	73	93	89	85	73	92	89	92		
	7	63	102	63	90	102	92	63	84	101	93		
	_ 8	57	85	57	95	85	95	26	88	40	88		
	Total	244	323	241	92	311	92	210	90	265	92		
Exited	3	67	108	60	95	99	96	60	97	100	93		
Other	4	394	532	389	94	525	92	389	90	526	93		
Bilingual	5	1,453	1,573	1,439	92	1,564	93	1,436	94	1,563	94		
	6	1,921	1,965	1,889	86	1,943	83	1,897	86	1,940	85		
	(1,936	1,852	1,903	82	1,835	81	1,862	//	1,764	82		
	8	1,844	1,857	1,820	87	1,830	85	1,315	83	1,270	//		
	Iotai	7,615	7,887	7,500	87	1,796	08	6,959	85	7,163	85		
HISD	3	17,592	17,669	12,201	67	12,761	69	12,139	65	12,657	/1		
	4	16,638	17,161	13,875	66	14,868	62	13,787	65	14,672	68		
	5	15,858	16,095	14,673	68	15,275	69	14,571	75	14,995	73		
	6 7	13,478	13,585	12,453	68	12,963	64	12,091	/3	12,458	70		
	1	13,691	13,388	12,768	67	12,746	64	12,048	62	11,733	65		
	8	13,250	13,667	12,414	/5	13,027	68	9,464	/2	9,816	65		
	Iotal	90,507	91,565	78,384	69	81,640	66	74,100	69	76,331	69		

Source: STAAR, Chancery

Appendix E

STAAR Progress and ELL Progress Measures

Included in this report are two additional performance measures from the STAAR (3-8) and EOC assessments, STAAR Progress and ELL Progress. Students who took the STAAR or EOC assessments can receive either one of these measures, but not both.

The STAAR progress measure provides information about the amount of improvement or growth that a student has made from year to year. For STAAR, progress is measured as a student's gain score, the difference between the score a student achieved in the prior year and the score a student achieved in the current year. The *Met Standard* for the Progress measure is defined as the distance between the final recommended performance standards from the prior year grade and the current year grade in the same content area. Put another way, the growth standard is (roughly) the improvement that would be needed for a student who passed the STAAR one year to be able to pass it the next at the same level.

STAAR Progress is reported for students who (a) had a valid STAAR score in both 2015 and 2014, (b) took the same version of the STAAR in both years, (c) were tested in consecutive grade levels in the two years, and (d) were not eligible for the ELL Progress measure. For this report, STAAR Progress is reported only for students who were tested in English in both years.

The ELL Progress measure is similar, but the growth standard is based on the number of years it should take for the students to reach proficiency in the particular STAAR content area. The expectations vary according to both the number of years the ELL students has been attending school, and their English proficiency level, as measured by the TELPAS. Thus, students who start at the same absolute performance level on a STAAR assessment may have different growth targets for the purposes of measuring ELL Progress, if they differ on either of these factors.

ELL Progress is reported for ELL students who (a) are classified as ELL, (b) took the English version of the STAAR, (c) did not receive a parental waiver for ELL services, and (d) were in their fourth year or less of enrollment in U.S. schools. ELL students not meeting these criteria may instead receive the regular STAAR Progress measure. Analogous versions of these two measures are reported for the EOC assessments.

Appendix Fa

	READING											
		Enrollment	ELL Pro	gress	STAAR P	rogress						
			#	%	#	%						
Program	Grade	N	tested	met	tested	met						
Dual	3	309	5	60	n/a	n/a						
Language	4	215	11	64	1	*						
(Current)	5	142	8	75	3	*						
	6	112	15	60	88	42						
	7	87	13	15	64	70						
	8	72	23	39	43	65						
	Total	937	75	48	199	57						
Other	3	5,424	1,179	66	n/a	n/a						
Bilingual	4	4,801	2,246	43	292	63						
(Current)	5	3,131	281	37	1,395	62						
	6	20	4	*	11	36						
	7	7	0		4	*						
	8	8	1	*	2	*						
	Total	13,391	3,711	50	1,704	62						
Dual	3	14			n/a	n/a						
Language	4	5			4	*						
(Exited)	5	27			25	72						
	6	90			87	57						
	7	102			101	51						
	8	85			85	60						
	Total	323			302	58						
Other	3	108			n/a	n/a						
Bilingual	4	532			495	59						
(Exited)	5	1,573			1,541	59						
	6	1,965			1,918	43						
	7	1,852			1,773	52						
	8	1,857			1,802	63						
	Total	7,887			7,529	54						
HISD	3	17,669	1,907	63	n/a	n/a						
(Includes ELL	4	17,161	2,873	42	9,945	100						
& Exited ELL)	5	16,095	537	40	12,268	67						
	6	13,585	500	35	11,374	42						
	7	13,388	613	23	10,939	70						
	8	13,667	727	31	11,404	65						
	Total	91,565	7,157	44	55,930	57						

STAAR Progress and ELL Progress Performance of Dual Language and Other Bilingual Students: Number Tested, and Percent Met Standard, by Grade Level, Reading Only

Source: STAAR, Chancery

Appendix Fb

		MATH	IEMATICS			
		Enrollment	ELL Pro	gress	STAAR P	rogress
			#	%	#	%
Program	Grade	N	tested	met	tested	met
Dual	3	309	2	*		
Language	4	215	11	82		
(Current)	5	142	8	88	Not Ava	ailable
	6	112	6	83	201	5
	7	87	0			
	8	72	5	60		
	Total	937	32	78		
Other	3	5,424	1,303	77		
Bilingual	4	4,801	2,203	65		
(Current)	5	3,131	167	71	Not Ava	ailable
	6	20	1	*	201	5
	7	7	0			
	8	8	1	*		
	Total	13,391	3,675	70		
Dual	3	14				
Language	4	5				
(Exited)	5	27			Not Ava	ailable
	6	90			201	5
	7	102				
	8	85				
	Total	323				
Other	3	108				
Bilingual	4	532				
(Exited)	5	1,573			Not Ava	ailable
	6	1,965			201	5
	7	1,852				
	8	1,857				
	Total	7,887				
HISD	3	17,669	1,791	72		
(Includes ELL	4	17,161	2,693	62		
& Exited ELL)	5	16,095	257	67	Not Ava	ailable
	6	13,585	86	69	201	5
	7	13,388	62	52		
	8	13,667	93	53		
	Total	91,565	4,982	66		

STAAR Progress and ELL Progress Performance of Dual Language and Other Bilingual Students: Number Tested, and Percent Met Standard, by Grade Level, Mathematics Only

Source: STAAR, Chancery

* Indicates fewer than five students tested

Note: Because a revised STAAR 3-8 mathematics exam was introduced in 2015, no STAAR Progress measure could be calculated since two years of performance data were not available.

Appendix G

STAAR End-of-Course Performance of Exited (Monitored and Former) DL Students: Number Tested, And Number and Percentage who Passed or Failed at the Phase-In 1 and Recommended Satisfactory Standards (2015 Data Only, All Students **Tested Including Ret esters**)

20	15 Results		Phase	-In I Satisf	actory Star	ndard	Recommended Satisfactory Standard				
		#	Fa	ail	Pa	SS	Fa	ail	Pa	ss	
	Student Group	Tested	N	% Stu	N	% Stu	N	% Stu	N	% Stu	
	Exited DL	94	8	9	86	91	34	36	60	64	
Algebra I	Other Exited Bil	1,907	231	12	1,676	88	879	46	1,028	54	
	HISD	14,183	3,904	28	10,279	72	8,620	61	4,735	33	
	Exited DL	81	3	4	78	96	28	35	53	65	
Biology	Other Exited Bil	1,762	105	6	1,657	94	826	47	936	53	
	HISD	13,288	2,098	16	11,190	84	7,528	57	5,248	39	
	Exited DL	80	11	14	69	86	25	31	55	69	
English I	Other Exited Bil	1,847	519	28	1,328	72	952	52	895	48	
	HISD	16,289	8,239	51	8,050	49	11,650	72	5,200	32	
	Exited DL	51	6	12	45	88	16	31	35	69	
English II	Other Exited Bil	1,315	344	26	971	74	676	51	639	49	
	HISD	14,182	6,707	47	7,475	53	8,722	62	4,927	35	
	Exited DL	60	3	5	57	95	20	33	40	67	
U.S. History	Other Exited Bil	1,130	72	6	1,058	94	441	39	689	61	
	HISD	10,733	1,531	14	9,202	86	5,539	52	4,581	43	

Source: STAAR, Chancery

Note: HISD percentages may differ from district EOC report due to rounding error

Appendix H

STAAR EOC Progress Performance of Dual Language and Other Bilingual Students: Number Tested, and Percent Met Standard, by Exam Subject

		STAAR P	rogress			
		(Exited ELL)				
		#	%			
Program	Exam	tested	met			
Dual	Algebra I	90	59			
Language	English II	49	53			
(Exited)	Total	139	57			
Other	Algebra I	1,776	55			
Bilingual	English II	1,221	50			
(Exited)	Total	2,997	53			
HISD	Algebra I	11,064	44			
(Includes ELL	English II	10,334	47			
& Exited ELL)	Total	21,398	45			

Source: STAAR, Chancery

Note: There was no ELL Progress data for current bilingual students in 2015. The EOC assessments are administered primarily to students in 9th grade and higher, and there were no students listed as being in the dual language pogram at those grade levels.

Appendix I

Logramos Performance of DL Students: Number Tested and Mean Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE), by Grade Level and Subject, 2015

		N	Total Reading	Total Language	Total Mathematics
Program	Grade	Tested	NCE	NCE	NCE
Dual	1	526	71	67	69
Language	2	420	65	68	71
	3	303	68	62	69
	4	193	71	67	75
	5	0			
	6	8	72	61	68
	Total	1,450	69	66	70
All	1	5,604	77	73	72
Other	2	5,460	69	72	75
Bilingual	3	3,787	68	62	70
	4	1,287	70	66	75
	5	50	68	57	58
	6	1	*	*	*
	Total	16,138	72	70	73

Source: Logramos, Chancery

Appendix J

Iowa Assessments Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual (DL) Students: Number Tested and Mean Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE), by Grade Level and Subject, 2015

		N	Total Reading	Total Language	Total Mathematics
Program	Grade	Tested	NCE	NCE	NCE
Current	4	22	43	48	66
Dual	5	141	43	46	54
Language	6	102	33	41	48
	7	73	31	46	48
	8	53	30	41	44
	Total	391	36	44	51
Current	4	3,401	36	47	52
Other	5	2,985	34	40	47
Bilingual	6	17	27	33	36
	7	5	32	38	42
	8	7	24	34	34
	Total	6,415	35	44	49
Exited	4	5	52	67	74
Dual	5	26	54	62	63
Language	6	90	46	56	57
	7	101	48	58	59
	8	85	48	56	56
	Total	307	48	57	58
Exited	4	527	52	65	65
Other	5	1,566	48	57	61
Bilingual	6	1,943	42	53	54
	7	1,827	45	55	56
	8	1,824	46	52	53
	Total	7,687	46	55	56
HISD	4	14,915	44	53	53
	5	15,354	44	50	52
	6	12,674	41	48	48
	7	12,413	42	49	49
	8	12,490	42	47	48
	Total	67,846	43	50	50

Source: Iowa Assessments, Chancery

Appendix K

Composite TELPAS Results: Number and Percent of Students at Each Proficiency Level in 2015, by Grade. Results Shown Separately for DL and Other Bilingual Students.

DL Students											
Grade Level # Tested		Beginning		Interme	Intermediate		Advanced		iced h	Composite Score	
		N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%		
K	1,196	944	79	176	15	68	6	8	1	1.3	
1	553	290	52	196	35	47	8	20	4	1.6	
2	440	73	17	197	45	115	26	55	13	2.3	
3	312	25	8	104	33	97	31	86	28	2.7	
4	217	16	7	45	21	89	41	67	31	2.9	
5	142	2	1	10	7	37	26	93	65	3.4	
6	112	4	4	11	10	48	43	49	44	3.1	
7	87	9	10	3	3	33	38	42	48	3.0	
8	72	13	18	8	11	21	29	30	42	2.7	
Total	3,131	1,376	44	750	24	555	18	450	14	2.0	

All Other Bilingual Students

Grade # Teste		Beginning		Interme	Intermediate		Advanced		ced າ	Composite	
Levei		Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	00010	
К	5,166	4,484	87	570	11	100	2	12	0	1.2	
1	5,909	2,967	50	2,069	35	657	11	216	4	1.7	
2	5,779	897	16	2,452	42	1,636	28	794	14	2.3	
3	5,382	610	11	1,553	29	1,721	32	1,498	28	2.7	
4	4,774	283	6	1,077	23	1,909	40	1,505	32	2.8	
5	3,098	146	5	495	16	1,207	39	1,250	40	3.0	
6	16	1	6	2	13	10	63	3	19	2.6	
7	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
8	5	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40	3.3	
Total	30,132	9,388	31	8,219	27	7,242	24	5,283	18	2.2	

Source: TELPAS, Chancery

Appendix L

TELPAS Yearly Progress: Number and Percent of Students Gaining One or More Levels of English Language Proficiency in 2015, by Grade. Results Shown Separately for DL and Other Bilingual Students.

		_		DL Stud	lents	-			
Grade Level	Cohort Size	Gain Proficien	ed 1 cy Level	Gaine Proficienc	ed 2 :y Levels	Gair Proficier	ned 3 ncy Levels	Gained at Proficienc	Least 1 y Level
	Ν	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	510	197	39	25	5	0	0	222	44
2	417	205	49	76	18	3	1	284	68
3	298	151	51	7	2	0	0	158	53
4	206	100	49	1	0	0	0	101	49
5	136	110	81	2	1	0	0	112	82
6	107	67	63	0	0	0	0	67	63
7	78	55	71	1	1	0	0	56	72
8	58	35	60	0	0	0	0	35	60
Total	1,810	920	51	112	6	3	<1	1,035	57

All Other Bilingual Students

Grade Level	Cohort Size	Gaine Proficienc	ed 1 cy Level	Gaine Proficienc	ed 2 sy Levels	Gair Proficien	ned 3 cy Levels	Gained at Proficienc	Least 1 y Level
	Ν	N	%	N	%	N	%	Ν	%
1	5,553	2,044	37	495	9	75	1	2,614	47
2	5,444	2,634	48	796	15	112	2	3,542	65
3	5,091	2,650	52	145	3	1	0	2,796	55
4	4,523	2,444	54	71	2	2	<1	2,517	56
5	2,900	1,710	59	61	2	2	<1	1,773	61
6	12	8	67	0	0	0	0	8	67
7	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
8	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total	23.526	11.493	49	1.568	7	192	1	13.253	56

Source: TELPAS, Chancery

Appendix M

Analyses of Teacher Appraisal Data

There were two sources of data for the analyses related to teacher appraisals: EVAAS (Education Valued-Added Assessment System) ratings and TELPAS comparative growth. For each of these analyses, teachers were first identified if they were the teacher of record and had a home room assignment in 2014-2015, with at least 10 students listed (source: Chancery/Cognos). This list included a total of 5,660 teachers in grades PK through 5. Of these, a further 217 were identified as dual-language teachers by virtue of (a) teaching at one of the designated DL campuses, and (b) having at least 10 DL students in their classroom. Since both of these teacher appraisal measures only cover teachers in grades 3 through 5, note that teachers in grades 2 and lower were not included in the analyses reported.

For EVAAS, the teacher's composite gain index (CGI) was used. This measure summarizes a teacher's relative growth across all subjects taught. Forty dual-language teachers received EVAAS ratings, and there were 1,753 other teachers who served as the comparison group. Gain index scores were converted to a rating based on the following five-point scale:

EVAAS Composite Gain Index	Rating	Interpretation
2.0 or greater	5	Well above average
1.0 to 1.99	4	Above average
-1.0 to 0.99	3	Average
-2.0 to -1.01	2	Below average
< -2.0	1	Well below average

As the data in Figure 14 indicates, 56% of DL teachers received EVAAS scores of 4 or better (above or well above average), compared to 34% for all other HISD teachers at these grade levels. Interpreted as an odds ration, this means that DL teachers were more than twice as likely to have an EVAAS rating of 4 or better than were other teachers. This difference was highly significant (z = 2.82, p<.03).

A TELPAS comparative growth measure is calculated annually for all teachers of ELLs in grades 3 through 8 for use in the Teacher Appraisal and Development System (TADS). Teachers at these grade levels receive a TELPAS CG rating if they selected 'TELPAS' as the subject taught during the spring linkage and verification process. Full TADS data was unavailable at the time of publication, but those homeroom teachers who received a TELPAS comparative growth (CG) score were included in a secondary analysis, also summarized in Figure 14. Thirty-one DL teachers received TELPAS CG ratings, and 581 other teachers also received a rating. The data showed that 65% of DL teachers and 64% of other teachers received TELPAS ratings of 3 or 4, meaning that the TELPAS reading performance of students did not significantly distinguish DL from other teachers.

Appendix N

Summary of Professional Development Training Attended by Teachers in the Dual Language Bilingual Program

Course Title	Course #	Total Attendance	# Sessions
Biliteracy Development I 1.2	ML0277	453	6
Biliteracy Development II 2.1	ML0275	39	3
Biliteracy Development II 2.2	ML0275	113	4
Development DL Units of Study	ML0243	55	4
Dinner & Dual 1	ML0270	41	1
Dinner & Dual 2	ML0271	30	1
Dinner & Dual 3	ML0272	60	1
DL Administrator Overview	ML0279	43	2
DL Essentials & Bil Workstatio	ML0256	69	2
DL Essentials 1.1 Pre-K	ML0294	19	1
DL Inst. Planning GR 1	ML0316	42	3
DL Inst. Planning GR 2	ML0317	12	2
DL Inst. Planning K	ML0315	106	5
DL Inst. Planning PK	ML0314	72	4
DL Inst. Planning/WS/ Gr1	ML0320	13	2
DL Inst. Planning/WS/ K	ML0319	19	3
DL Inst. Planning/WS/ PK	ML0318	31	4
Dual Lang Teaching Biliteracy	ML0229	45	1
Dual Lang. Biliteracy Training	ML0261	27	1
Dual Language Biliteracy	ML0245	114	2
Dual Language Book Study Teach	ML0231	44	5
Dual Language Essentials	ML0234	98	2
Dual Language Essentials 1.1	ML0269	320	3
Dual Language Just in Time C1	ML0252	80	2
Dual Language Just in Time C2	ML0253	91	2
Dual Language Just in Time C3	ML0254	64	2
Dual Language Just in Time C4	ML0255	32	2
Exploration of DL Resources	ML0266	126	3
GLAD 2Day Strategies Overview	ML0291	75	1
GLAD 4Day Classroom Demonstrat	ML0292	106	2
JobAlike2015: K-4 SLAR/DL	ML0282	939	2
Language Transfer & Beyond 2.2	ML0276	85	2
Language Transfer 1.3	ML0278	332	5
Language Transfer 1.3 Pre-K	ML0296	23	1
Language Transfer and Beyond	ML0244	120	2
Language Transfer Training	ML0262	40	1
Literacy Dev. & Language Trans	ML0225	104	2
Project GLAD AdminOverview 2.0	ML0284	34	1
Writing Gr 2 Units of Study	ML0274	82	9
TOTAL		4,198	101

Ö
č
Φ
0

Spanish STAAR Grade 3-5 Reading Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus (2015 Data)

				Nu	mber (of Stuc	lents	Tested								Perc	∋nt Me	t Stan	dard			
		Ĺ	Ţ			`	0			NT				۲			7	0			T	
Campus	с	4	5	Total	°,	4	5	Total	e	4	5 Tota	al 3	4	5	Total	°,	4	5	Total	e	4	5 Tot
Briscoe ES	21	-		22					-		-	86	*		86					*		*
Emerson ES	19			19	26			26	4		4	100			100	69			69	*		*
Helms ES	30	23		53					14	12	26	47	02		57					36	75	54
Herod ES	26	18	-	45					16	7	23	81	67	*	76					75	100	83
Herrera ES	19	21	ო	43	35	42	-	78	2	4	9	89	06	*	88	57	45	*	50	*	*	67
Northline ES	34	39		73	20	21		41	5	5	10	88	12		82	30	52		41	60	60	60
Sheman ES	25			25	26			26				72			72	50			50			
Twain ES	თ	ო		12					14	18	32	78	*		83					86	94	91
Wharton K-8 DL Academy	15	24		39					34	25	59	80	83		82					65	92	76

N
0
×
5
Č
Ő
Q

English STAAR Grade 3-5 Reading Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus (2015 Data)

				Nur	nber o	f Stud	ents Tes	ted								Perc	ent Me	t Stan	dard				
			۲			ž	0			Ĭ				노				0			z		
Campus	3	4	5	Total	3	4	5 Tot	al 3	4	5	Total	3	4	5	Total	3	4	5	Total	3	4	2	Total
Briscoe ES								1		3	4									*		*	*
Browning ES								-			-									*			*
Burrus ES								-	-		7									*	*		*
Condit ES										~	-											*	*
Coop ES								-			~									*			*
Durham ES								-			-									*			*
Emerson ES								2	~		ო									*	*		*
Helms ES		~	24	25				2	-	12	18		*	42	40					60	*	92	78
Herod ES			13	13					~	ი	10			92	92						*	100	6
Herrera ES			15	15	~			-		e	e			87	87	*			*			*	*
Law ES										-	-											*	*
Love ES									0		2										*		*
Memorial ES										-	~											*	*
Northline ES			33	33				~		5	9			76	76					*		80	67
Osborne ES	-			-								*			*								
Roosevelt ES								2	-		e									*	*		*
Sherman ES		20	15	35				e	2	З	1		70	93	80					*	80	*	91
Twain ES			4	4				-		15	16			*	*					*		100	100
Wainwright ES									-		-										*		*
Wharton K-8 DL Academy			32	32						27	27			63	63							100	100
Whidby ES									-		-										*		*

က	
Ö	
×	
p	
O	
d	

Spanish STAAR Grade 3-5 Mathematics Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus (2015 Data)

		Total	*	*	77	87	100	70	*	97	96
		5									
	z	4			75	100	*	60		100	96
		°.	*	*	62	81	*	80	*	93	97
dard		Total		65			64	44	58		
t Stan	0	5					*				
nt Me	۲	4					64	62			
Perce		3		65			66	25	58		
		Total	77	84	66	76	91	84	72	83	95
	Ť	5				*	*				
	٢	4	*		70	94	95	77		*	96
		3	76	84	63	65	84	91	72	89	93
		Total	1	4	26	23	9	10	٢	32	57
	F	5									
	Z	4			12	7	4	5		18	23
F		3	١	4	14	16	7	5	-	14	34
Testeo		Total		26			78	41	26		
dents	ò	5					-				
of Stue	1	4					42	21			
mber (3		26			35	20	26		
Nu		Total	22	19	53	45	43	73	25	12	39
	г	5				-	ю				
	۲	4	-		23	18	21	39		ю	24
		3	21	19	30	26	19	34	25	თ	15
		Campus	coe ES	rson ES	IS ES	d ES	era ES	hline ES	man ES	in ES	irton K-8
			Brisc	Eme	Helm	Hero	Herr	Nort	Sher	Twai	Wha

	Ţ
C)
5	K
ý	
3	Ě
9	D
-	2
2	-

English STAAR Grade 3-5 Mathematics Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus (2015 Data)

		Total	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	72	06	*	89	*	*	*	83		*	100	100	*	100	*
		5	*			*				100	100	*		*		*	80			*	100		100	
	Ż	4			*				*	*	*				*				*	100		*		*
		3	*	*	*		*	*	*	20							*		*	*	*			
dard		Fotal										*												
Stan	0	2																						
nt Met	×	4																						
Percei		3										*												
		otal								60	92	100					88	*		91	*		78	
		5 T								58	92	` 8					88			93	*		78	
	7	4								*		v								06				
		3																*						
		otal	4	-	2	-	-	-	ო	18	10	ო	38	-	2	-	9		ო	10	16	~	25	-
		5 T	с			~				12	ი	с		-		~	S			ю	15		25	
	Ŧ	4			-										2				-	5				-
		3	-	-	-		-	-	2	5							-		2	2	-			
sted	╞	otal										-												
nts Te		5 Tc																						
Stude	٨o	4																						
er of \$		۰ ۳																						
Numb	_	al								25	33	5					4	-		35	4		32	
		Tot									` ~	, IO					+			10	.		0	
	۲	5								5	÷	15					ъ,			15	7		33	
		4								· ·										20				
		3																						
		Campus	Briscoe ES	Browning	Burrus ES	Condit ES	Coop ES	Durham ES	Emerson ES	Helms ES	Herod ES	Herrera ES	Johnston MS	Law ES	Love ES	Memorial ES	Northline ES	Osborne ES	Roosevelt ES	Sherman ES	Twain ES	Wainwright ES	Wharton K-8	Whidby ES

* Indicates fewer than five students tested

ŝ	
Ο	
×	
σ	
Φ	
0	
0	

Iowa Assessment Total Reading Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by

-)	Tested
	Number
	Campus:

		8 Tot	8	~	4	2	-	~	80	2	с	1 6	19	11	4	28 50	7	2	-	4		-	£	e	16	16	~	6 52	
		-			e							0				5												12	
		9			-							ო				1												7	
	Ł	s S	ю				-						12	6	ო		~		-	4					ო	15		27	
		4				~					-		~	-				2						-	S		-		
		۳	-	-		~		-		~	-		с											2		~			
		7	2							-	-		-		-		2						7		с				
		-	2						ø				2	-			4					-	ю		2				
		Tot													-					-					-				
		∞																											
		~																											
ted.		9													_														
# Toc	} 	°.													·														
		4																											
		۳ ۵																											
																									÷				
	┢	ğ			24						ю		24	13	18	2				34	2				35	4		34	
		0			52 2											-													
		~			73																								
		9			66											~												2	
	Þ	2											24	13	18					34					15	4		32	
		4																							20				
																					-								
		7									~																		
		-									2										~								
		Campus	Briscoe ES	Browning	Burbank MS	Burrus ES	Condit ES	Coop ES	Deanda ES	Durham ES	Emerson ES	Hamilton MS	Helms ES	Herod ES	Herrera ES	Johnston MS	Law ES	Love ES	Memorial ES	Northline ES	Osborne ES	Patterson ES	Reagan Ed Ctr	Roosevelt ES	Sherman ES	Twain ES	Wainwright ES	Wharton K-8	VILLIAL ES

Appendix 0.6

Iowa Assessment Total Reading Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus: Mean NCE

		Tot	60	*	53	*	*	*	49	*	*	57	44	62	*	56	39	*	*	*		*	27	*	44	71	*	65	*
		8			*							*				56												63	
		7			*							*				55												71	
		9			*							*				54												81	
	NT	5	*				*						54	65	*		*		*	*					*	73		59	
		4				*					*		*	*				*						*	57		*		*
		3	*	*		*		*		*	*		*											*		*			
		2	*							*	*		*		*		*						*		*				
		-	*						49				*	*			*					*	*		37				
		Tot													*					*					*				
		8																											
		7																											
Щ		9																											
ean NC	۲o	5													*														
Σ		4																											
		3																											
		2																											
		-																		*					*				
		Tot			31						*		35	51	40	*				42	*				45	*		43	
		8			30											*													
		7			31																								
		9			32										_	*												*	
	7	5											36	51	40					42					51			40	
		4																			*				4(
		3									*																		
		2									*										*								
╞		-																											
		Campus	Briscoe ES	Browning ES	Burbank MS	Burrus ES	Condit ES	Coop ES	Deanda ES	Durham ES	Emerson ES	Hamilton MS	Helms ES	Herod ES	Herrera ES	Johnston MS	Law ES	Love ES	Memorial ES	Northline ES	Osborne ES	Patterson ES	Reagan Ed Ctr	Roosevelt ES	Sherman ES	Twain ES	Wainwright ES	Wharton K-8	Whidby ES

HISD Research and Accountability_

							þ	Cam	bus: N	Ium	oer T	estec				0								
											# Test	eq												T
ſ	,		≻ '	· '		•	ļ				, ×		'	•	ļ	_ .			-	₽ .			'	.
Campus Briscole F.S.	1 2	5 4	0	۵	~	20	ot	-	2	4	n	٥	-	∞	ot	- ^	~ ~	,, r	4		0	20	<u>°</u>	<u>بر</u> ا م
Browning																1	1	· ~		5				~ ~
Burbank MS				8	9 73	52	224															e	4	œ
Burrus ES																		-	-					2
Condit ES																				-				~
Coop ES																		-						~
Daily ES																-								~
Deanda ES																8								ω
Durham ES																	~	~						2
Emerson ES	5 1						9									-	~	2	-					2
Hamilton MS																					e	2	-	9
Helms ES			2	4			24									7	~	ю	.	12			÷	ი
Herod ES			÷	3			13									-				6			÷	~
Herrera ES			12	80			18				-				-		~			с				4
Johnston MS				~ -	-	-	2													·	11	1	8	0
Law ES																4	2			~			•	2
Love ES																			2					2
Memorial ES																								~
Northline ES			ň	4			34	~							-			-		4				2
Osborne ES	4	-					2																	
Patterson ES																-								~
Reagan Ed Ctr																С	2							2
Roosevelt ES																		2	-					e
Sherman ES		2	0 1	2			35	-							-	2	e		5	ю			7	9
Twain ES			~	4			4											-		15			÷	9
Wainwright ES																			-					~
Wharton K-8			ñ	0			32													27	7	2	6	2
Whidby ES																			-					~

lowa Assessment Total Language Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students

Appendix 0.7

0	0
1	
C	D
2	<u> </u>
7	0
6	
- 7	1)
- 6	5
7	5
5	

lowa Assessment Total Language Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus: Mean NCE

													Mean N	ICE												
					노								×									Ł				
Campus	-	2	°	4	5	9	7	8	¥	2	с	4	5	9	7	8	Tot	-	2	с	4	5	9	7	œ	Tot
Briscoe ES																		*	*	*		*				65
Browning																				*						*
Burbank MS						41	46	41 4	ς Ω														*	*	*	65
Burrus ES																				*	*					*
Condit ES																						*				*
Coop ES																				*						*
Daily ES									-									*								*
Deanda ES																		4								41
Durham ES																			*	*						*
Emerson ES	*	*						c	2									*	*	*	*					37
Hamilton MS																							*	*	*	52
Helms ES					36			c	9									*	*	*	*	55				48
Herod ES					54			2	4									*			*	63				62
Herrera ES					44			4	4				*				*		*			*				*
Johnston MS						*		*	*														57	64	64	62
Law ES																		*	*			*				34
Love ES																					*					*
Memorial ES																						*				*
Northline ES					49			4	<u>6</u>	*							*			*		*				51
Osborne ES	*		*						*																	
Patterson ES																		*								*
Reagan Ed Ctr																		*	*							30
Roosevelt ES																				*	*					*
Sherman ES				46	55			2	0	*							8	37	*		60	*				45
Twain ES					*				*											*		73				72
Wainwright ES																					*					*
Wharton K-8					43	*		4	e.													59	78	73	67	99
Whidby ES																					*					*

_

-	1
C	
5	
ć	
3	2
2	N
2	5
2	5
2	7

lowa Assessment Total Mathematics Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus: Number Tested

													#	Tested												
					ř									۶								T				
Campus	-	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	Tot	۲	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	ot 1	_	2	3 4	1 5	9	7	8	Tot
Briscoe ES																			2	2	-	e	~			80
Browning																					-					-
Burbank MS						66	73	52	224														-	n	4	ω
Burrus ES																					-	-				2
Condit ES																						~	_			~
Coop ES																					-					-
Daily ES																			-							-
Deanda ES																			œ							œ
Durham ES																				-	-					2
Emerson ES	2	-							9										-	-	2	-				5
Hamilton MS																							С	2	~	9
Helms ES					24				24										2	.	e	1 12	0.1			19
Herod ES					13				13										-			1	e			5
Herrera ES					18				18					-				-		-		e	~			4
Johnston MS						-		-	2														1	1	28	50
Law ES																			4	2		-				7
Love ES																						5				2
Memorial ES																						-	_			-
Northline ES					34				34	-								-			-	4	+			5
Osborne ES	-		-						2																	
Patterson ES																			-							-
Reagan Ed Ctr																			С	2						5
Roosevelt ES																					5	-				с
Sherman ES				20	15				35	-								-	5	e		5 3	~			16
Twain ES					4				4												-	15	10			16
Wainwright ES																						~				~
Wharton K-8					32	2			34													27	7	12	9	52
Whidby ES																						-				-

	-	
-	~	
(C)
	>	<
ŝ		
	۲	
	d	5
	C	2
	2	2
	_	Ρ.

Iowa Assessment Total Mathematics Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus: Mean NCE

l rcl	h ai	nd	Aco		Inta	abil	itv	-								-						_	-	_		_		•	-	38	-
			Campus	Briscoe ES	Browning	Burbank MS	Burrus ES	Condit ES	Coop ES	Daily ES	Deanda ES	Durham ES	Emerson ES	Hamilton MS	Helms ES	Herod ES	Herrera ES	Johnston MS	Law ES	Love ES	Memorial ES	Northline ES	Osborne ES	Patterson ES	Reagan Ed Ctr	Roosevelt ES	Sherman ES	Twain ES	Wainwright ES	Wharton K-8	Whidhy ES
			۲										43										*								
			2										8																		
			3																				*								
			4																								65				
		Ť	5												40	62	61					53					62	*		50	
			9			48												*												*	
			7			48																									
			8			45												*													
			Tot			48							46		40	62	61	*				53	*				64	*		51	
) /2			٢																			*					*				
אוווס			2																												
			3																												
	Mean	٢	1 5																												
	NCE	0	9														*														
			7																												
			8																												
			Tot														*					*					*				
			٢	*						*	42		*		*	*			*					*	*		36				
			2	*								*	*		*		*		*						*		*				
			3	*	*		*		*			*	*		*							*				*		*			
			4				*						*		*	*				38						*	61		*		*
		NT	5	*				*							59	79	*		*		*	*					*	85		99	
			9			*								*				56												77 7	
			7 8			*								*				56 5												72 6	
			Tot	6		* 67					42		2,	* 56	4	23		9 51	ъ,	ä		45			33		23	8		5 00	
	1			_ س	*		*	*	*	*		*	_	6	9	~	*	~	+	~	*	10		*	0	*	~	10	*	~	*

-	
C	
	5
-	ξ.
5	
D)
2	2
- 7	5

Logramos Total Reading Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Cam-pus: Number Tested

															;												
													*	# Tester	Ŧ												
nd					ΥT									۲o									μ				
Campus	-	2	с	4	5	9	7	8	Tot	-	2	с	4	5	9	7	8	Tot	-	2	e	4	6	9	7 8	Ť s	ы
Briscoe ES	33	18	22	-					74		19							19	9	ю	-					· ·	10
Burbank MS						8	10	15	33																		
Daily ES	10								10										œ								ω
Deanda ES	86	74							160										13	1							24
Dogan ES	-								-	-								-									
Emerson ES	42	37	18						97	17	20	25						62	10	9	4						20
Helms ES	32	30	30	23					115										32	21	15	13				ω	2
Herod ES	16	15	25	18					74										6	6	16	7				7	41
Herrera ES	17	2	19	21					78	34	38	36	42					150	4	2	2	4				·	12
Kashmere Gardens ES	9								9										Ø								ω
Law ES	21	28							49										16	13						(N	29
Northline ES	20	28	34	39					121	52	24	20	21					117	2	5	5	5				· ·	17
Reagan Ed Ctr	32								32	21								21	2								2
Sherman ES		37	24	-					62	46		26						72		7	e					· ·	10
Twain ES	1	7	ი	ო					30										16	16	14	18				U	34
Wharton K-8	28	24	15	24					91										20	35	36	31				1	22

2
Σ.
Ο
×
5
S
Ö
d
4

Logramos Total Reading Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Cam-pus: Mean NCE

													Me	an NCE												
					¥									γo								NT				
Campus	-	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	Tot	-	2	3	4	5	9	7	8 Tc	ot 1	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	Tot
Briscoe ES	93	75	70	*					81		68						9	88	, m	*						83
Burbank MS						53	43	4	46																	
Daily ES	89								89									88	~							88
Deanda ES	93	71							83									6	2 67							80
Dogan ES	*								*	*								*								
Emerson ES	92	77	71						82	66	91	65					œ	2 91	1 68	*						78
Helms ES	88	67	63	63					71									88	3 65	54	90	~				71
Herod ES	66	73	71	62					75									6	9 65	99	65	10				73
Herrera ES	66	78	70	67					78	91	63	64	57				9	8	*	*		*				72
Kashmere Gardens ES	85								85									77	+							74
Law ES	66	76							86									6	1 28							76
Northline ES	66	75	74	63					75	66	75	58	60				80	* 0	* 70	63	62	01				68
Reagan Ed Ctr	66								66	84							ω	82	01							82
Sherman ES		69	66	*					67	66		61					œ	5	99	*						64
Twain ES	66	88	65	*					84									6	02 (20	39	~				74
Wharton K-8	89	75	69	62					75									38	5 64	. 64	.0	_				67

			Tot	10		œ	24		20	82	41	12	8	29	16	7	10	64	122
			8																
			7																
			9																
20		NT	5																
6 2 2			4							13	7	4			5			18	31
			3	۲					4	16	16	7			4		с	14	36
			2	з			1		9	21	ი	7		13	5		7	16	35
			÷	9		ω	13		10	32	ი	4	80	16	2	7		16	20
2			Tot	19				~	65			150			117	2	72		
			8																
1000			7																
			9																
sted	Fested	YO	5																
er Te	L #		4									42			21				
nmbe			3						26			36			20		26		
S: NL			2	19					22			38			24				
bus			٢					~	17			34			52	21	46		
			Tot	74	33	10	160	-	98	115	74	78	9	49	121	31	63	30	91
			8		15														
-			7		10														
222			9		∞														
		ΥT	5																
			4	۲						23	18	21			39		-	ю	24
2			3	22					19	30	25	19			34		25	ი	15
			2	18			74		37	30	15	21		28	28		37	7	24
			٢	33		10	86	.	42	32	16	17	9	21	20	31		1	28
			Campus	iscoe ES	Irbank MS	iily ES	anda ES	igan ES	nerson ES	elms ES	erod ES	errera ES	tshmere ardens ES	w ES	orthline ES	agan Ed Ctr	lerman ES	/ain ES	harton K-8
				B	Bu	D	Ğ	Ğ	ш	Ψ	Η	н	ΧQ	La	ž	Re	ŝ	Ļ	N

Logramos Total Language Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Cam-

Appendix 0.13

Tot

œ

66

84 83 79 99

89 89

*

*

Northline ES

Law ES

Reagan Ed Ctr

Sherman ES

Twain ES

Kashmere Gardens ES

66

88 85

*

68

99

66

Wharton K-8

 89 80

69

73

98 86

*

* Indicates fewer than five students tested

anduade Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Cam-Total

Appendix 0.14

HISD Research and Accountability

			Tot	10		8	24		19	82	41	12	Ø	29	17	7	10	64	122
			8																
			7																
			9																
		NT	5																
			4							13	7	4			5			18	31
			3	-					4	16	16	0			5		ო	14	36
			2	с			;		9	21	ი	0		13	5		7	16	35
			۲	9		8	13		6	32	ი	4	8	16	7	7		16	20
			Tot	19				-	65			149			117	21	72		
			8																
			7																
ited			9																
. Tes	Tested	۲o	5																
nber	#		4									42			21				
Nur			3						26			35			20		26		
:snd			2	19					22			38			24				
Cam			۲					-	17			34			52	21	46		
			Tot	74	33	10	160	~	66	116	74	78	9	49	121	32	63	30	91
			8		15														
			7		10														
			9		80														
		ΥT	5																
			4	-						24	18	21			39		-	ю	24
			°	22					18	30	25	19			34		25	ი	15
			2	18			74		39	30	15	21		28	28		37	7	24
			۲	33		10	86	~	42	32	16	17	9	21	20	32		1	28
			Campus	Briscoe ES	Burbank MS	Daily ES	Deanda ES	Dogan ES	Emerson ES	Helms ES	Herod ES	Herrera ES	Kashmere Gardens ES	Law ES	Northline ES	Reagan Ed Ctr	Sherman ES	Twain ES	Wharton K-8

Logramos Total Mathematics Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by

Appendix 0.15

G	
C	
7	5
2	
ā	5
ē	2
Ē	Σ

Logramos Total Mathematics Performance of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus: Mean NCE

										Ď																
h a													Me	an NCE												
nd					ΥT									λо								NT				
Campus	۲	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	Tot	۲	2	3	4	5	9	7	8 T.	ot 1	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	Tot
Briscoe ES	66	66	73	*					91		78						7	36 8	6	*	*					98
Burbank MS						55	4	44	47																	
Daily ES	66								66									6	e							66
Deanda ES	66	92							96									6	96	(0)						98
Dogan ES	*								*	*								*								
Emerson ES	66	93	84						94	98	78	68					2	6	6	10	*					94
Helms ES	66	73	69	65					77									6	96	12 (4	-				87
Herod ES	66	96	76	67					83									6	.6	8	ò	~				91
Herrera ES	66	98	80	76					88	66	62	71	65				2	ص	*	*	*	*				86
Kashmere Gardens ES	66								66									66	0							66
Law ES	66	96							97									<u> 6</u>	96	~						95
Northline ES	66	94	82	70					84	66	89	59	68				ω	22	*	7 2	7 75	10				85
Reagan Ed Ctr	66								66	89							ω	36 62	6							66
Sherman ES		88	79	*					83	66		69					ω	80	ð	(0	*					91
Twain ES	66	66	87	*					92									6	ő	, б	86 86	ю				94
Wharton K-8	66	66	75	74					88									6	6	4	4 7.	7				88

* Indicates fewer than five students tested

HISD Research and Accountabilit

		5
	-	/
		1
ŝ	2	
1	C	5
	ē	
	٥	5
	Ž	5
	C	2
	2	-

TELPAS English Language Proficiency of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus

					Number	Toetod							Proficio	lot lot	aler D	rcont)		
						naicai								ury le	veis (L	a ceird		
			Т				r	٢o				¥				۲o		
Campus	Tested	# B	I#	¥	HAH	Tested	#8	#	¥	HAH	%В	%ا	% V %	6AH	%В	%ا	% V %	ΗH
Anderson ES	63	61	2	0	0						67	з	0	0				
Ashford ES	29	20	2	7	0						69	7	24	0				
Briscoe ES	108	49	26	15	18	19	7	12	5	0	45	24	14	17	1	63	26	0
Burbank MS	263	25	21	100	117						10	80	38	44				
Burnet ES	32	17	12	ю	0	24	24	0	0	0	53	38	6	0	100	0	0	0
Coop ES	51	51	0	0	0						100	0	0	0				
Daily ES	16	6	ß	2	0						56	31	13	0				
Deanda ES	233	134	99	27	9						58	28	12	ო				
Dogan ES	41	ω	20	12	~						20	49	29	2				
Emerson ES	162	39	61	34	28	65	12	34	15	4	24	38	21	17	18	52	23	9
Garden Villas ES	21	19	2	0	0	21	15	9	0	0	6	10	0	0	71	29	0	0
Gregg ES	47	28	19	0	0						60	40	0	0				
Harris, R.P. ES	13	7	7	2	2	47	24	18	5	0	54	15	15	15	51	38	1	0
Helms ES	171	68	48	29	26						40	28	17	15				
Herod ES	103	17	30	24	32						17	29	23	31				
Herrera ES	114	34	15	25	40	190	86	54	40	10	30	13	22	35	45	28	21	S
Johnston MS	9	-	-	2	2						17	17	33	33				
Kashmere Gardens ES	ი	4	ო	2	0						4	33	22	0				
Law ES	67	19	34	12	2						28	51	18	с				
McNamara ES	29	19	10	0	0	62	60	2	0	0	99	34	0	0	97	с	0	0
Memorial ES	30	30	0	0	0						100	0	0	0				
Northline ES	196	4	48	56	48	144	87	41	14	2	22	24	29	24	60	28	10	-
Osborne ES	12	12	0	0	0						100	0	0	0				
Reagan Ed Ctr	52	29	20	ю	0	65	49	14	0	0	56	38	9	0	75	22	ო	0
Shearn ES	99	35	18	1	2						53	27	17	с				
Sherman ES	116	29	25	26	36	96	69	14	1	2	25	22	22	31	72	15	1	2
Twain ES	43	17	7	8	1						40	16	19	26				
Wharton K-8	155	41	42	35	37						26	27	23	24				
Whidby ES	7	2	e	-	-						29	43	14	14				
White FS	37	37	C	C	С	47	43	4	C	C	100	С	C	С	6	σ	C	C

_

Appendix 0.18

TELPAS Yearly Progress of Dual-Language Bilingual Program (DL) Students by Campus

		1	Number o	f Students			P	Percent o	of Student	s
		ΥT			YO		۲۱	Г	YC)
Campus	Cohort	#Gain	#No Gain	Cohort	#Gain	#No Gain	% Gain	% No Gain	% Gain	% No Gain
Anderson ES	1	*	*				*	*		
Briscoe ES	71	46	25	17	9	8	65	35	53	47
Burbank MS	238	153	85				64	36		
Daily ES	11	4	7				36	64		
Deanda ES	149	75	74				50	50		
Dogan ES	2	*	*				*	*		
Emerson ES	97	70	27	56	27	29	72	28	48	52
Helms ES	133	66	67				50	50		
Herod ES	86	62	24				72	28		
Herrera ES	92	64	28	144	73	71	70	30	51	49
Johnston MS	3	*	*				*	*		
Kashmere Gardens ES	3	*	*				*	*		
Law ES	46	21	25				46	54		
Northline ES	156	101	55	112	34	78	65	35	30	70
Reagan Ed Ctr	31	18	13	21	14	7	58	42	67	33
Sherman ES	95	70	25	63	10	53	74	26	16	84
Twain ES	31	14	17				45	55		
Wharton K-8	123	74	49				60	40		